

THE  
**RELIGIOUS MONITOR,**  
AND  
**EVANGELICAL REPOSITORY.**

DEVOTED TO THE PRINCIPLES OF THE REFORMATION, AS SET FORTH IN  
THE FORMULARIES OF THE WESTMINSTER DIVINES, AS  
WITNESSED FOR BY THE  
**ASSOCIATE SYNOD OF NORTH AMERICA.**

---

**Rev. James Martin, Editor and Proprietor.**

---

**VOLUME XIII.**

---

They 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 BY HOFFMAN & WHITE.  
1836-7.

ANDOVER HARVARD  
THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY  
CAMBRIDGE, MASS.

Period. 1718.55  
v. 13  
1836-1837

THE

# RELIGIOUS MONITOR,

AND

EVANGELICAL REPOSITORY.

---

JUNE, 1836.

---

**ART. I. Remarks on 1 John ii. 2.**—“*And he is the propitiation for our sins and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world.*”

WHEN a man is justified by the imputation of Christ's righteousness, he is that moment set free from condemnation forever; but being sanctified only in part, he may sin after this, and although it cannot condemn him before God, it can and will bring trouble upon the conscience, and cause him to condemn himself. The christian only knows what trouble this gives. What darkness, fear and dismay! But such a one shall not be left to despair. There is a fountain opened whose virtue washes away sin from the conscience, and returns it to quiet rest. It is a Father not a Judge whom we have offended. And if this is not enough to quiet our apprehensions, we have an Advocate with the Father, perfectly able to manage our cause. He is the Father's fellow and equal, perfectly skilled in law and equity. He is Jesus the Almighty saviour. He is *Christ*—one appointed and anointed by the Father for this purpose. He is *the righteous*, as none ever was. From his love to righteousness, he engaged to magnify the authority of a broken law, and he has done it most perfectly, the Father himself being Judge; therefore is *he with the Father*. Once more: He is a propitiation for our sins, that is, a covering for them. The word is the proper name for the covering, or lid of the Ark, which covered the two tables of the law deposited in it. He so covers our breaches of the law, that God in communing with us, through him, sees not our faults as any ground of condemnation. Yea, he is merciful to our unrighteousness, our sins and iniquities he will remember no more. Here is a complete system of comfort to the believer.

The apostle adds, “not for ours only, but for the sins of the *whole world.*” Those who are in favor of a universal atonement take the words “*whole world,*” in the most unlimited sense, as comprehending the whole race of man. And perhaps there is no phrase used in the New Testament, with reference to this subject, that looks more like it.



But such a sense would stand in irreconcilable contradiction with the other scriptures. If He is the propitiation for the sins of the whole race, then must the whole race be pardoned and saved, else he is a propitiation in vain; but neither of these conclusions will be admitted. Some may reply that, if any perish, it is through their own perverseness and unbelief. Suppose this be granted, it will not help the matter, because this is a sin which, after being covered by Christ's blood, would have, according to them, power to condemn. The apostle says "*sins*" without discriminating;—original and actual, sins of nature and practice, sins of perverseness as much as any other.

Are there not many of the saved who have been guilty of this sin of perverseness and unbelief? Yet they are saved, because his blood covered it. If Christ will say to any of our race, "Depart from me, I never knew you," must we not believe that He never knew them—as his sheep for whom he says that he lays down his life, whose sins he covered with his blood?

If the reader will observe closely, he will find a convincing proof in the verse itself, that this phrase does not mean the whole race. Are there not two parties mentioned here, perfectly distinct and exclusive of each other? *First*, The party in whose name the apostle speaks, when he says "*our sins*;" and, *Second*, That which he calls "*the whole world*." He did not include himself and his party in this *whole world*, and, therefore, if he and they were *men* and *women*, it does not mean the whole race.

When we meet with a phrase in a writer somewhat obscure, it is accounted fair to take it in the sense in which he uses it in other places that are more clear.

We find this phrase used in ch. v. 19, "And we know that we are of God, and the *whole world* lieth in wickedness." Here it must be clear that they who are born of God are not included in the *whole world*. In the fairness of construction the apostle did not mean by it any of the millions of men that were dead and gone, nor the millions that were yet to be born, for the word "*lieth*" limits it to the present time, nor any of those who professed Christ, but only the rest who were living in unbelief, or in heathen darkness.

Again, (Rev. xiii. 3,) this same apostle says, "And *all the world* wondered after the beast and they worshipped the dragon," &c. "and they worshipped the beast," &c. Must we in order to save the hypothesis of a universal atonement, believe, that the whole of Adams posterity, those that lived before the flood as well as those who shall live in the happy latter days, shall be all papists!! The "*whole world*," in the 3d verse is neither broader nor longer than that in the 8th verse—"And all that dwell upon the earth shall worship him whose names are not written in the book of life of the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world;" or than the "All," verse 16, viz: "both small and great, both rich and poor, bond and free." If we turn to his gospel, (ch. xi. 48,) we find the council of the Jewish nation using the same universal term—"If we let him thus alone *all men* will believe on him, and the Romans will come and take away our place and nation." Meaning only that the majority of the common people of the Jewish nation would believe on him and no more. In ch. xii. 19, they say, with a like extent of meaning, "Perceive ye how ye prevail nothing at all. Behold the *world* is gone after him." Luke says, (ch. ii. 1,) there went out a decree from Cæsar Augustus that *all the world* should be

taxed," meaning no more by it than the Roman Empire, for the time being, which was a very small part of Adams family indeed.

But to return to the subject in hand. Our apostle in his gospel, (ch. xi. 51,) commenting on the speech of Caiaphas says, "And this he spake not of himself, but being High Priest that year, he prophesied that Jesus should die for that nation, and not for that nation only, but that also he should gather together in one the children of God that are scattered abroad." This I apprehend will serve to explain his meaning in the epistle—"not for our sins only but also for the sins of the whole world," viz: Not for ours only who are of the Jews, descendants of Abraham, as the scribes and pharisees would have it, but also for the sins of all the children of God in his purpose of effectual calling, which are scattered abroad among all nations and places of the gentile world, and ages of time, that he may in due time by his gospel gather them, Jews and Gentiles, into one church. That this is the meaning of the "*whole world*," seems to be put beyond all doubt in Rev. v. 9, where he brings in the same party as describing itself, saying, "For thou wast slain and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood *out of* (not all of,) every kindred and tongue, and people and nation." To redeem by his blood is the same as to cover their sins by his blood. All they, and only they, whose sins he has covered, here speak, and they are *out of* every kindred, &c., therefore, some are left, whose sins were not covered, and are not redeemed by his blood.

After duly considering these limitations on this "*whole world*," there can be no difficulty found (or I should rather say, countenance given to a universal atonement) in John i. 30.—"Behold the Lamb of God which taketh away the sins of *the world*," viz. God's children, Jews and Gentiles "scattered abroad" in "every kindred, tongue, people and nation" of the world.—Nor in ch. xii. 32—"And I, if I be lifted up from the earth will draw *all men* unto me," either *all men* must be taken in the sense already explained, or all mankind, without one exception, will be drawn by Christ to himself and become actual believers, or Christ will fail to accomplish his promise—his free unconditional promise. The friends of a universal atonement may choose which conclusion they please.

Nor in Heb. ii. 9—"that he by the grace of God, should taste death for every man." In the Greek, *ὑπὲρ πάντων* instead of all or every one. But passing this. Either this phrase "every man" is to be taken as of the same extent with the preceding phrases, or the same with "many sons," "brethren," "children whom thou hast given me" and "seed of Abraham," in the verses following, which cannot with any fairness be questioned; for they are the same, and they are all so many names for actual believers; or admit that Christ's tasting death for every man does not prevent every man from tasting it for himself. Now how is this? will the judge of all the earth cause the same debt to be twice paid—the same punishment to be twice inflicted? far be it from him to do this: but all mankind do not "become sons of God" nor brethren, therefore, "*every man*" does not mean the race.

Nor in 1 Tim, iv. 6—"who will have all men to be saved—"who gave himself a ransom for all," viz. the same "*all men*" who will "come to the knowledge of the truth," as in the next words, namely, a saving knowledge and profession of it—which, when it comes to pass in its "*due time*" will be a sufficient testimony that Christ gave himself a ransom for them. Moreover, it is the same "*all men*" for whom we

are exhorted (verse 1st,) to make supplications, prayers, intercessions and giving of thanks. Either this is the same party which we have already shown to be only a part of Adam's race, or else we must, in order to obey the Apostle, go back again to the church of Rome, and like good and zealous Papists, fall down before the virgin, and make supplications, intercessions, &c. in behalf of the many millions that are dead, and for the spirits of the antedeluvians who are now shut up in the prison of hell, or as the Pope would call it, the limbus patrum. And that is not all, for if "all men" means the whole race of men, we must also pray for those who have committed the unpardonable sin, for whom John forbids us to pray.

Nor in Rom. v. 18, where it is said, "even so by the righteousness of one (for one righteousness) the free gift came upon all men to justification of life." Grace will make its entrance into their souls and take possession in and by a sentence of justification, and it will as certainly and effectually reign unto eternal life, as sin in the other case did, through a sentence of condemnation, unto death. Will the most sanguine believer in a universal atonement venture to affirm this of the whole race of man, Judas and the Pharisees not excepted, that all will be justified or sentenced unto life, that all will receive it *by faith*, (see verse 1st;) that all will have grace *in* them, as the reigning principle governing their affections and ruling their actions? (for this much, if any thing at all, must be meant see verse 21.) Or in other words, will they venture upon the assertion that no man or woman ever died an unbeliever, which amounts to the same and no more? Will they assert that all the human family will be raised at the last day, to glory, honor and immortality, and that there will not be so much as one, which is expressly contrary to Daniel xii. 2, that will awake to shame and everlasting contempt? This *must* be their conclusion, if they will have it that Christ's one righteousness comes on the whole family to justification of life. For whom he justifies, them he also glorifies, Rom. viii. 30.

Now I apprehend that this "whole world," "all men," &c. cannot be of wider extent than that to which the gospel is sent. Mark xvi. 15.—"And he said unto them, go ye into *all the world*, and preach the gospel to every creature, &c.;" which according to Mathew is, "go ye therefore, and teach *all nations*, &c."\* Having said this much to show the extent of meaning which we are to attach to the phrase "whole world," I would now observe that the extent to which Christ's blood will be a covering for sins or a propitiation, must be limited by the five following things. The father's gift of persons to Christ, Christ's design in shedding his blood, his intercession in heaven, actual believing or coming to Christ, and a glorious resurrection.

1st. The following passages will convince, if evidence will, that there was such a thing as God the Father *giving persons to Christ*, to be saved by him.

---

\* But in neither of these places can it possibly mean the whole race of man, for many generations were dead, before that the apostles were sent forth. It cannot be of so wide extent as this commission to preach, because, *first*, the gospel has never yet been so extensively preached as this commission authorizes. It will not be questioned on either side, that many thousands since the apostle's days, have died without so much as hearing that there was any gospel or any saviour. Then, *second* "they could not believe on him of whom they had not heard," and to suppose that they might be saved, i. e. their sins might be covered by his blood, *without believing* on him, is to suppose that he who cannot lie did not speak the truth when he said, "he that believeth not shall be damned." Nay, it cannot be so wide as the actual *preaching* of the gospel, for many hear and yet never believe, and therefore "die in their sins," consequently their sins were never covered.

John vi. 37. All that the Father *giveth me* shall come unto me.— Verse 39, And this is the Father's will that sent me, that of all which he hath *given me*, I should lose nothing. Ch. x. 29. My Father which gave them me is greater than all, and none shall pluck them out of my Father's hand. Ch. xvii, 2. As thou hast given him power over all flesh, that he should give eternal life to as many as thou hast given him. Verse 6. I have manifested thy name to the men whom thou hast given me out of the world; thine they were, and thou gavest them me.

Is it objected that Christ meant only his apostles, and spake only in relation to them, their office, and official work? I answer that this cannot be admitted, because Christ has given eternal life to more than the Apostles; and yet, only "to as many as the Father has given him," verses 2. He includes in the word "all who shall believe on him through their word," verse 20.

2d. Christ's design in shedding his blood is limited to those same persons before described as the Father's gift. In proof of this I offer first the character, "*Sheep*," as describing precisely those persons for whom Christ had it in his eye to shed his blood. That this name applies to them all will appear from the following places. John x. 10, "I am the good shepherd—the good shepherd giveth his life for the sheep." Verses 14. 15, 16 and 17. "I am the good shepherd and know my sheep and am known of mine—and I lay down my life for my sheep. And other sheep have I which are not of this fold, them also must I bring, and they shall hear my voice, and there shall be one fold and one shepherd." Here observe that as Christ laid down his life as a shepherd, it follows as an inference, that they, whom he had in his eye in this *act*, are all properly denominated sheep, and to put this beyond all doubt, he expressly says this much. "I know my sheep," and "I lay down my life for my sheep." And if you ask, why he calls them *his*? verse 29 answers by identifying them with those given him by the Father. "My Father who *gave* them me is greater than all," &c., therefore the Father gave him the sheep for whom he laid down his life, and to them it is *limited*, by his declaring that he does this act as a shepherd.

3d. To the same *given* persons does he limit his intercession, (ch. xvii. 9,) "I pray for them, I pray *not* for the world, but for them whom thou *hast given me*." (Ver. 6,) "The men whom thou gavest me out of the world." (Ver. 11,) "Holy Father, keep through thine own name those whom thou hast given me, that they may be one as we are." (Ver. 20,) "Neither pray I for these (*here present*) alone, but for them also who shall believe on me through their word, that they all may be one." (Ver. 24,) "Father I will that they also whom thou *hast given* me be with me where I am, that they may behold my glory." Observe how Christ in this last petition, or rather claim, connects their eternal happiness in heaven with the Father's electing love, as its consummating effect through his own merits and mediation.

4th. The texts are many that prove that all those given by the Father, redeemed by the blood of Christ, and for whom he prays, will be believers in time. (John vi. 37,) "All that the Father *giveth me* shall come unto me." That *coming* unto him means believing on him, I think none will deny. (Chap. x. 14,) "I know my sheep, and am *known* of mine." (Ver. 2, 4,) "The sheep *hear* his voice, and they follow him for they know his voice." (Ver. 16,) "And they shall *hear* my voice." These terms, *hear*, *know*, and *follow*, do certainly express that faith.

which is characteristic of all true believers. (Ver. 26,) "But ye believe not, because ye are *not* of my sheep, as I said unto you." Equivalent to—not given to me of my Father—not of those for whom I lay down my life—not those for whom I pray. It follows, "My sheep hear my voice, and I know them, and they follow me, and I give unto them eternal life, and they shall never perish," &c. Several other texts might be added from chap. xvii. verses 6, 7, 8, 9, 20.

5th. The same persons are all that will be raised at the last day to everlasting glory and happiness. Thus in the forecited passages. (John, xvii. 2,) "As thou hast given him power over all flesh, that he should give eternal life to as many as *thou hast given him.*" (Ver. 24,) "Father, I will that those whom thou hast given me, be with me where I am, that they may behold my glory." (Chap. x. 28,) "And I give unto them eternal life, and they shall never perish, neither shall any pluck them out of my hand. My Father, who *gave* them me, is greater than all, and none shall pluck them out of my Father's hand." In these passages it is clearly implied. But in the next it is expressed, (chap. vi. 39,) "And this is the Father's will which hath sent me, that of all which he hath *given* me, I should lose nothing, but should *raise it up again at the last day.*" Here observe that the extent of the Father's gift, Christ's work as the great shepherd of the sheep, and of the glorious resurrection, is precisely the same; and the number of real believers coincides with them. (Ver. 40,) "And this is the will of him that sent me, that every one that seeth the son and believeth on him, may have everlasting life, and I will raise him up at the last day." Once more, (1 Cor. xv. 2,) "For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive." *Question.* What, all? *Ans.* All who are *in* Christ—"who walk not after the flesh, but after the spirit." (See Rom. viii. 1.) "All who are *chosen* in him before the foundation of the world." (Ep. i. 4.) And are by the Father's gift, as well as his own purchase, *his.* See the next verse, "But every man in his own order, Christ the first fruits, afterward *they that are Christ's,* (this is the *all*) at his coming."

I would add a few remarks by way of conclusion :

1. This limited sense of the phrase "whole world" agrees with the chief design of God in the economy of salvation, which is to display the *sovereignty* of his grace, and to stain the pride of all human glory. There is not any reason that can be given that is higher for any thing done in the mystery of salvation than this, "Even so Father, for so it seemeth good in thy sight."

2. This view of the subject is calculated more than any other to stir up those to whom the gospel is sent, to *believe.* For if they believe, that is proof complete, that the Father gave them to Christ, that Christ died for them, and now prays for them, and that he will raise them up at the last day. And to make them afraid of unbelief, for if they should die in their unbelief they will infallibly be damned forever.

3. If any perish to whom the gospel is sent, it is not because the blood of Christ is not *sufficient in merit* to save them, for it is infinite; but it must be through means of their own unbelief. And however God, according to his own purpose, withholds *his own* renewing grace, still the unbelief which damns them is *their own* will and deed, and therefore their damnation is just.

EGO.

ART. II. *Observations and Reflections on the life of Abraham and Sarah.*

THERE is a charm attached to the history of every thing which belongs to the early ages of the world, and the mind dwells with pleasure on passages which give an account of persons and things which were in existence so long before we were. Even when the information given is very limited, the imagination delights to fill up the picture. Indeed some learned writers have shown more solicitude and zeal in criticising the curiosities of the bible, than in endeavoring to understand and make plain its precious truths. The song which the children of Israel sung about the well, related in the xxi. ch. of numbers, and the words which Joshua used when he commanded the sun and moon to stand still, seem to engage as much of Dr. A. Clarke's attention, as does the most knotty point in divinity. Whoever reads the bible, wishing to be edified, must have a higher aim than the gratification of his curiosity, or the pleasing of his fancy.

In making a few observations on the lives of Abraham and Sarah, our principal aim shall be to shew wherein their conduct is worthy of our imitation.

The first thing of importance we have recorded of Abraham, is, his being called to leave his kindred and his fathers house, which he readily obeyed, as is mentioned to his praise, he went out by faith "*not knowing whither he went.*" (Heb. XI. 8.)

We may here remark the strength of Abraham's faith, which could so far overcome the attachment he must have felt to his native country; he must not only leave his country, but his kindred and his father's house. This was an instance of that faith which became so eminent as to give him the name of "*faithful Abraham.*"

We may suppose that Sarah offered no hindrance to her husband on this occasion, either by fretting at this dispensation of Providence, or by causing unnecessary delay; for her conduct throughout life is commended by the Apostle. "Even as Sarah obeyed Abraham, calling him lord: whose daughters ye are; as long as ye do well." Honor is thus put upon Sarah through all ages, because she so readily yielded obedience to her God, and consequently, to her husband. While the conduct of her cotemporary Lot's wife, is held up to us as an admonition, to beware, lest we suffer the friendship, or riches of this world, to hinder our obedience to God

It is probable that Abraham kept up the worship of God in his family before he was called to go out of his native country. So he did not omit it when journeying to the land of Canaan, but wherever he pitched his tent, there also, he built an altar to the Lord. Thus he was already a blessing to his family.

We might be ready to conclude that Abraham would receive some immediate mark of favor from God, after giving so signal an evidence of his faith, at least that he would find plenty, and that he might rest in the land which was now his by promise. But no, there is a famine in the land, and a grievous one, so that he is obliged "*to go down into Egypt, to sojourn there.*" The land of Canaan was a fruitful country, but the famine was now sent, partly because of the sins of the inhabitants, and perhaps also, as a trial to Abraham's faith. It might be a temptation to him to return from whence he came, and to think lightly of the country that was given to him. But so far was he from return-

ing to his native country, that he went in an opposite direction, as Chaldea lay north east of Canaan, and Egypt south west.

The grace for which Abraham was most eminent was faith; yet the next passage in his life which we have, is an account of his falling into sin, through unbelief, and distrust of the divine Providence. Gen. xii. 5. "And it came to pass when he was come near to enter into Egypt, that he said to Sarai his wife, behold now I know that thou art a fair woman to look upon: Therefore, it shall come to pass, when the Egyptians shall see thee, that they shall say, This is his wife: and they will kill me, but they will save thee alive. Say, I pray thee, thou art my sister: that it may be well with me for thy sake: and my soul shall live because of thee."

Abraham was faulty here in entertaining an unreasonable suspicion of the people amongst whom he intended to sojourn—and exceedingly faulty in teaching his wife, and probably his attendants to equivocate and dissemble. Sarah was faulty also in yielding so implicitly to the suggestion of her husband. Yet her conduct may be more readily excused than his. Their sin was soon severely punished, by the peril in which Sarah was placed. "The princes of Pharaoh saw her, and commended her before Pharaoh, and the woman was taken into Pharaoh's house." The Princes did not commend her for that which was really her praise—her virtue and modesty, her faith and piety—but for her personal beauty, which was probably great, and the more remarkable amongst the Egyptians, who were of a swarthy, sallow complexion.

Though Abraham and Sarah were brought into trouble by their own sin and folly, yet God who forgets not his own, even when they are forgetful of him, delivers them out of it, by afflicting Pharaoh, and probably those who had commended Sarah before him, with great plagues, and it would appear of such a kind as made it known on what account they were sent. Thus, "*He reprov'd Kings for their sake.*"

After leaving Egypt, Abraham came to Bethel, to the place where his tent had been at the beginning, and to the place of the altar which he had made there at the first. He is represented as being very rich, *very heavy*, so the Hebrew word signifies. For riches are a burthen, and they that will be rich, do but "load themselves with thick clay." Henry says, "There is a burthen of care in getting riches, fear in keeping them, temptation in using them, guilt in abusing them, sorrow in losing them, and a burthen of account, at last to be given up concerning them." But happily Abraham was not only rich in silver and gold, and cattle, but also in faith and good works, and in the promises. Lot, who went with Abraham was rich also, and as every comfort in this world has its cross attending it, so their riches were the occasion of a strife between their herdsmen. On this occasion Abraham gives one evidence of the character of a child of God, that is, being a peace-maker. He earnestly entreats Lot that there may be no contention between them, and gives this cogent reason, "*for we be brethren.*" He knew that the eyes of all their neighbors were upon them, because of the singularity of their religion, and the extraordinary sanctity they professed—and notice would be taken of this strife, and it would be turned to their reproach—by the *Canaanite and Perizzite who dwell in the land*. The proposal he made for peace was very fair, and shewed a very disinterested spirit, and it was withal expressed in a most affectionate manner. "Is not the whole land before thee? Separate theyself, I pray thee from me." He does not charge him to depart, but humbly desires him

to withdraw. "If thou wilt take the left hand, then I will go to the right; or if thou depart to the right hand, then I will go to the left." It was undoubtedly Abraham's right to choose first, but he yields, not only the punctilios of honor, but also his interest for the sake of peace.

After the departure of Lot from Abraham, the promise that he should have a numerous seed, and should inherit the land in which he then dwelt, was graciously renewed. After this he also removed his tent to the plain of Mamre, where he built an altar unto the Lord.

The next thing recorded of Abraham is the account of the military expedition in which he was engaged, to which he was not prompted by avarice or ambition, but by a principle of fraternal love; it was not to enrich himself but to assist his friend. Never was any military expedition undertaken and prosecuted, more honorably. The remembrance of the relation that was between himself and Lot, made him forget their former quarrel and Lot's disrespectful treatment of him. He readily forgave him, and proved that *a brother is born for adversity*. After this display of disinterested generosity, God makes him a gracious visit, appearing to him in a vision and saying, "Fear not Abram: I am thy shield, and thy exceeding great reward." Abraham's answer is a complaint of his great affliction, that he is childless—"Lord what wilt thou give me?" As if he had said all this is nothing to me, if I have not a son. We cannot suppose that Abraham was so anxious merely for a temporal comfort, but must have had an eye to the promised seed, and the importunity of his desire may appear commendable; all was nothing to him if he had not the earnest of that great blessing, and an assurance of his relation to the Messiah. Yet the complaint was culpable so far, that he did not appear to be thankful for the many mercies he already enjoyed, especially that great promise God had just given him, of being his shield and exceeding great reward; and he shewed a weariness of waiting God's time.

It must have been this impatience in waiting on God's time, which prompted Sarah to make the singular proposal to her husband, that he should marry her maid as a secondary wife; in which she induced him to break God's law, for, *from the beginning it was not so*. She acknowledges God's providence in her affliction—"The Lord hath restrained me:" and uses this as an argument with Abraham to marry his maid. His compliance with Sarah's proposal, was from an earnest desire to see the promise to him fulfilled; but temptation to sin may often have fair pretences, and be colored very plausibly. Abraham should not have attempted any thing so important, and suspicious, without earnestly asking counsel of God by prayer: herein he failed, by marrying without God's consent.

Hagar, who had been the instrument of sin to Abraham and Sarah, was soon the cause of their trouble, for after her marriage, she looks with scorn on her mistress, thinking herself a better woman than Sarah, and more favored by Heaven. It has been generally remarked, that mean and servile spirits, when favored and advanced, either by God or man, are apt to grow haughty and insolent, and to forget their place and origin. Sarah instead of condemning herself, seems to claim merit for her conduct, unreasonably blaming Abraham with Hagar's insolence, and very improperly appealing to God. In these perplexing circumstances, Abraham wisely relinquishes Hagar, shewing that he had not been actuated by carnal affection, and instead of rendering railing for railing, he treats his wife in the most courteous and respectful manner. Indeed



his conduct on almost every occasion is an excellent pattern for husbands: no wonder he had so good a wife. Hagar, who could not brook to be treated as a slave, when she expected the privilege of a wife, passionately and inconsiderately leaves Abraham's house. The angel who found her in the way to Egypt, addressed her as Sarah's maid, not as Abraham's wife: thus her marriage was tacitly censured and disallowed. By inquiring of her whence she came, and whither she would go: the angel implicitly charged her with leaving her proper station: and by commanding her to return and submit to her mistress, he reminded her that her trouble was the consequence of sin.

The next appearance which God makes to Abraham, occurs nearly fourteen years after his marriage with Hagar. So long a time intervening seems to imply a rebuke for his misconduct in that transaction. The Lord by revealing himself as "the *Almighty*," or the all-sufficient "God," powerfully enforces the subsequent exhortation to Abraham, "to walk before him" and to "be perfect." Intimating that they who are interested in his covenant, are perfect in him, that they are to be entirely dependent on him, that he will *perfect that which concerneth them*. In this interview God grants to Abraham the seal of the covenant, "a seal of the righteousness of the faith which he had, being yet uncircumcised; that he might be the father of all them that believe." (Rom. iv. 2.) This "made Abraham the father of the church in all future ages.—All that the christian world enjoys, or ever will enjoy, it is indebted for to Abraham and his seed! A high honor this to be the stock, whence the Messiah should spring, and on which the church of God should grow."—(*Fuller*.) Sarah is also graciously remembered at this time, and as her husband's name had just before been changed from Abram, a high father, to Abraham, a father of a *great multitude*; so her name is changed from Sarai my princess, to Sarah a princess—intimating that her name would be honorable in the whole church of God as well as in Abraham's family.

The intimation which Abraham received at this time that he should have a son by Sarah, seems to have filled him with joy. "*Then Abraham fell upon his face and laughed.*" He "staggered not at the promise through unbelief, but was strong in faith giving glory to God." He yet shows his affection for Ishmael, by earnestly entreating the favor of God for him, and that he may not be separated from his worshipers.

The next passage in the life of Abraham, gives an account of his entertaining the *angels unawares*. He was sitting in the tent door, waiting for an opportunity to exercise hospitality, by entertaining any weary traveller who might need refreshment, and a cooling shade. The attention which Abraham rendered his guests on this occasion, gives us an idea of the simple, liberal, active and obliging hospitality of the ancient patriarchs. Both Abraham and Sarah were very attentive, and busy in entertaining their guests with the best they had. Sarah herself seems to be cook and baker, or at least superintends and assists. Abraham runs to fetch the calf, brings the milk and butter, and waits at the table to shew that his guests were heartily welcome. Like Job, he did not eat his morsel alone.

"And they said unto him, Where is Sarah, thy wife? And he said, Behold in the tent." This question seems to be a tacit reproof of the custom of that age, in excluding women from the society of men. They did not sit at meat with them, but were confined to their own apartments. It was Sarah's privilege and duty to have enjoyed this visit of

her Lord, as well as it was Abraham's. And there could be no more impropriety in Sarah's appearing in the company of her guests at this time, than there was afterwards, when holy women ministered to our Lord and his apostles.

Abraham's answer, "Behold in the tent," is as much as if he had said, "she is at home, where else should she be?" Henry says, "The daughters of Sarah must learn of her, to be chaste keepers at home."

The news which Sarah overhears in the tent door, she thinks too good to be true, so that she laughs within herself. We may suppose, it was not a laughter of faith, as was Abraham's, but rather of doubting and mistrust. Her conduct in endeavoring to conceal her fault, shewed great weakness, yet she receives but a gentle rebuke, connected with a renewal of the promise. At this interview, God makes known to Abraham *his friend*, what he intends to do with Sodom and Gomorrah, and as a reason for this condescension, he gives this high commendation of Abraham's character. "*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.*"

How well worthy the imitation of every parent, is this part of Abraham's character. Although he was a *mighty prince*, yet he did not think it beneath him, or that it was too much trouble to teach his own family. We do not find that he delegated to any other person the care of instructing his household in the way of the Lord. "Will command his children and his household after him," seems to imply that he will not only teach his children himself, but will see to it, that his instructions are attended to, and his precepts obeyed. The patriarch's house exhibited a specimen of the old fashioned, but scriptural Sabbath School—one in every family, and the head of the family himself the chief teacher. Had these still prevailed, how greatly would true religion have been diffused and mankind blest.

In interceding for the devoted cities, Abraham shows a magnanimous philanthropy and strength of affection, which are indeed remarkable. How little are the ungodly aware, that they are so much indebted for temporal comforts to the prayers of the very persons, whom they despise and injure.

After the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah, some Providential circumstance makes it necessary for Abraham to remove his tent from Mamre, where he had lived nearly twenty years, to Gerar. He here falls into the same sin, of which he had before been guilty, of denying his wife. Again we see the "father of the faithful" manifesting distrust of God, and undue solicitude about life; equivocating, relapsing into his former error, though he had been before reproofed for it, and convinced of the folly of the suggestion which induced him to it. He also draws in Sarah to share his guilt, thereby exposing her honor and chastity. These things are written for our warning, that while we think we stand, we may take heed lest we fall; and that we may know that even "*Abraham hath not whereof to glory,*" but must be justified in "that righteousness of God, which is upon all, and unto all them that believe." The reproof of Abimelech could not have been worded more kindly, or more severely. "Behold I have given to thy brother a thousand pieces of silver: Behold he is to thee a covering of the eyes, unto all that are with thee, and with all others." He calls him her brother to remind her of the dissimulation of which she had been guilty, in saying, "he is my brother."

The promise for which Abraham and Sarah had so long looked, at last comes. Isaac is born according to the promise. "The Lord visited Sarah in mercy as he had said." "*Sarah by faith received strength.*" (Heb. xi. 11.) God, therefore, by promise gave that strength. True believers, by virtue of God's promises, are enabled to do that which is above the powers of human nature, for by them *they are partakers of the divine nature.* (2 Pet. i. 4.) As Abraham is commended for his attention to his family, so Sarah shews more care of her child than mothers some times do. Although she is a person of quality, and is aged, yet she will perform the duty of nursing her son herself.

There is but little sweet in life, without some alloy of bitter. When Abraham made a great feast, and all was joy and gladness that Isaac was weaned, Sarah saw the son of Hagar, the Egyptian, mocking, mocking Isaac, no doubt, for it is said in reference to this, (Gal. iv. 29) that "he that was born after the flesh, persecuted him that was born after the spirit." The children of promise must expect to be mocked. This is persecution which they that will live godly must count upon. What Sarah proposed on this occasion, is very grievous to Abraham, yet her words are quoted (Gal. iv. 30,) as if they had been spoken in a spirit of prophecy. *Cast out the bond woman,* is the sentence passed on all hypocrites and carnal people. But none are rejected and cast off from God, but those who have first deserved it. Ishmael might have continued in Abraham's family, had he not become a disturbance and grief to it.

All the trials and hardships, which Abraham has heretofore undergone, do not prevent him from having yet another more sharp and severe than they all. He is commanded to sacrifice his only son, Isaac, whom he loves. The Hebrew may be read, "Take now that son of thine, that only one of thine, whom thou lovest, that Isaac." Every string is touched, which could agonize a parental heart, *that Isaac,* that son which gladdened thy heart: *whom thou lovest.* It was a trial of Abraham's love to God, and therefore it must be in a beloved son. He will here have Abraham show, that he *gives him his heart.* When Ishmael was to be cast out, a just cause was assigned, which satisfied Abraham; but here Isaac must die, and Abraham must kill him, and neither the one or the other must know on what account. Truly, strong faith is often exercised with strong trials, and put upon hard services.

It does not appear that Abraham manifested that anguish or anxiety which might have been expected from the command; or that either Sarah or his attendants, or even Isaac, perceived any thing unusual in his conduct. It is probable that he did not inform Sarah, lest her feeble faith, and more tender frame, might not sustain so severe a shock.

That his obedience might appear to be the result of calm deliberation, his faith is tried till the third day. Isaac's question, "*where is the Lamb for a burnt offering?*" must have tended to put Abraham's resolution to the sharper trial. How could he endure to think that Isaac is himself the lamb? The Holy Spirit, by Abraham's answer, predicts "the Lamb of God," which God hath provided, and "*which taketh away the sin of the world.*" This obedience of Abraham in offering up Isaac is a faint representation of the love of God to us, in delivering up his only begotten Son to suffer and die for us, as a sacrifice. But Abraham was obliged, both in duty and gratitude, to part with Isaac; and he parted with him to a friend; but God was under no obligation to us, for we were enemies.

His obedience, may also remind us of our duty to God in return for that love; we must tread in the steps of this faith of Abraham. We should part with all for Christ, all our sins, though they have been as a right eye, or an Isaac, every thing that is a competitor and rival with Christ for the sovereignty of the heart.

As this command to Abraham was only given for trial, and it appearing that he loved God better than he did Isaac, so the end of the command is answered, and therefore the order is countermanded. "Lay not thine hand upon the lad." Our creature comforts are most likely to be continued to us, when we are most willing to part with them.— Abraham for this obedience obtains an honorable testimony from God himself, that he is righteous. "Now I know that thou fearest God." And not only is his obedience accepted, but graciously recompensed; for those who are willing to part with any thing for God, shall have it made up to them with unspeakable advantage. Abraham has but one son and is willing to part with him, and God promises that he shall be recompensed with thousands and millions. How illustrious were Abraham's descendants; and how numerous at this day, are those, who boast of having Abraham for their father!

After this severe trial of Abraham, he has yet another. The desire of his eyes is removed by death. The entrance of sin, and the sentence of death, have filled all below with vanity and vexation. But blessed be God, there is a world, where sin, death and sorrow gain no admission; that there are relations formed, which death cannot part, and that mankind sinners may enter into this union and intimate relation with God, by faith, in his only begotten Son. (John xvii. 20, 23.)

It has been remarked that Sarah is the only female whose age is revealed in scripture. She was ten years younger than Abraham and died thirty-eight years before him.

Two words are used to express the great sorrow which Abraham felt on this occasion, he came to *mourn* for Sarah, and to *weep* for her. Yet he sorrowed not as those who have no hope. It is lawful to lament the death of our near relations and friends, in compliance with the providence of God, who thus calls us to weeping and mourning.

The transaction between Abraham and the children of Heth, illustrates the excellent spirit of the "father of the *faithful*," and exhibits a specimen of *manners*, which might do honor to any age. He assumes no civil superiority on the ground of his high religious distinctions; on the contrary, while they pronounce him a *mighty prince among them*, he styles himself a mere "stranger and sojourner." They evidently sympathize with him, and study to show him all the respect due to his character and circumstances. Ephron begs him to accept the land as a free gift, "The field give I thee, and the cave that is therein, I give it thee, bury thy dead." Of this liberal offer Abraham is too disinterested to avail himself, and Ephron consents to accept of the price of the land, observing, however, that it was a matter of no consideration between them. Nothing could, throughout, be more agreeable to every principle of good manners. The impression made by Abraham's general character and conduct must have been strong, to procure him such respect among persons to whom his religion would naturally be obnoxious. Although the whole land of Canaan was Abraham's in reversion, yet the first, and only spot of ground which he ever possessed in it, was a burying-place. This would be a constant memento of death to himself and his posterity, that he and they might learn to die daily.

The next passage in Abraham's life shews the interest he took in having his son well married. All the circumstances relating to this marriage are related very particularly. We are thus directed to take notice of God's providence in the common occurrences of life, and also to exercise our prudence and other graces therein.

Abraham does not appear to have been actuated in his views by any taint of worldly policy, or those motives which too frequently govern parents in the settlement of their children. His great aim was to procure his son a wife from his own kindred, among whom the worship of God was still in some measure maintained, and as God's will was consulted, and his blessing implored in the undertaking, so it was eminently successful. The narration, the servant gives to Rebecca's family, is beautifully simple, and well suited to recommend Isaac, and promote the object of his journey. Although the answer of Rebecca does not accord with modern taste, yet the excellence of her character forbids us to think there was any thing in it which was inconsistent with true delicacy. Indeed the excessive refinements of the present age are frequently subversive of sincerity. The last event recorded of Abraham's life, is his marriage with Keturah. This was probably necessary to his happiness. After the loss of so good a wife as Sarah, he would naturally feel solitary. Even Isaac, who would feel the loss less sensibly than Abraham, seems not to have been comforted after "his mother's death," until he was married to Rebecca. But Abraham was one of those who knew that "the time is short," and that they that had wives should "be as though they had none," knowing that the "fashion of this world passeth away." The remaining years of his life seem to have glided silently along, and at last he dies, "*in a good old age, an old man and full of years.*" "The righteous shall be in everlasting remembrance," and, "their memory shall be blest."

Reader, may you and I by faith be children of Abraham, and thus be entitled to an interest in his inheritance, and "sit down with him in the kingdom of heaven." A.

---

## MINUTES

*Of the Associate Synod of North America, at their Meeting in Philadelphia, May 25th, 1836, and continued by adjournment, being their Thirty-Fifth Annual Meeting.*

The Synod met pursuant to adjournment, and was constituted with prayer by Rev. Joseph Clokey, moderator.

### MEMBERS PRESENT.

*Of the Presbytery of Cambridge.*

#### MINISTERS.

A. Anderson,  
James P. Miller,  
David Gordon.

#### ELDERS.

John Robertson,  
Moses Robertson.  
*Of the Presbytery of Albany.*

#### MINISTERS.

\*Andrew Stark,

James Martin,  
John G. Smart,  
John Graham,  
\*Peter Campbell.

#### ELDERS.

Elisha Putnam,  
\*John Edwards,  
\*James Geery.

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

*Of the Presbytery of Philadelphia.*

MINISTERS.

William Easton,  
Alexander T. McGill,  
John S. Easton,  
\*John Adams.

ELDERS.

Samuel Smith,  
William Cummings,  
James Hutcheson,  
James Auld.

*Of the Presbytery of Miami.*

MINISTER.

Andrew Heron.

ELDERS.

David Brown,  
George Galloway.

*Of the Presbytery of Carolinas.*

MINISTER.

H. Thompson.

*Of the Presbytery of Muskingum*

MINISTERS.

John Walker,  
Joseph Clokey,  
\*Samuel Hindman.

*Of the Presbytery of Chartiers.*

MINISTERS.

Dr. Ramsay,  
Thomas Beveridge,  
Bankhead Boyd.

*Of the Presbytery of Alleghany.*

None.

*Of the Presbytery of Ohio.*

MINISTER.

\*Joseph Banks.

*Of the Presbytery of Shenango.*

MINISTER.

\*A Boyd.

*Of the Presbytery of Stamford.*

None.

On motion, the reading of the minutes of last year was dispensed with, as they had been read and approved before publication.

On motion, resolved, that the stated hour of meeting in the morning be nine o'clock; of adjournment, half past twelve, and of meeting in the afternoon, half past two.

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

*Thursday, May 26th.*

The moderator having preached last evening from Zech. viii. 3, "Jerusalem shall be called a city of truth"—

The Synod met this day pursuant to adjournment, and was opened with prayer.

Members present as above, together with Rev. H. Thompson, from the Presbytery of the Carolinas, Rev. Joseph Banks, from the Presbytery of Ohio, Rev. John Adams, from the Presbytery of Philadelphia, Rev. Peter Campbell, from the Presbytery of Albany. Mr. James Auld, from the session of Philadelphia congregation, being present, was invited to a seat.

Rev. John G. Smart was chosen Moderator.

The following standing committees were appointed, viz.

*Committee of Supplies.*—Dr. Ramsay, Messrs. Anderson, Clokey, Martin, Banks, Wm. Easton, Thompson and Heron.

*Committee of Bills and Overtures.*—Messrs. Miller, Beveridge and McGill.

*Committee on the Funds.*—Messrs. Miller and Cummings.

*Committee on the Theological Seminary.*—Dr. Ramsay, Messrs. Walker and Clokey.

*Committee to transcribe the minutes.*—David Gordon and John S. Easton.

*Committee on Missions.*—Messrs. Walker, Adams and McGill.

On motion, it was resolved, that a new standing committee be appointed, to be called the Committee of Appeals. Messrs. Clokey, Banks and Boyd were appointed said committee.

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

No. 1. Report of the Presbytery of Miami, which was, on motion, referred to the Committee of Supplies, and also to the Committee on Bills and Overtures.

*Report of the Presbytery of Miami.*

During the short time that has elapsed since our last report, no material change has taken place in the churches under our inspection, as far as is known to us. Peace and harmony have prevailed among us to a good degree. Gospel ordinances are generally well attended, and we are not left without some tokens of the Lord's presence in them. The installation of Mr. Kendall in his pastoral charge has not yet been effected, but is expected to take place early in the present summer. The appointments made by Synod for the supply of our vacant churches have been fulfilled with commendable punctuality, with the exception of those of the Rev. S. McLane, who neither appeared in our bounds, nor communicated to us any reason for his failure. Messrs. Isaac N. Loughhead and James M. Brown, students of Theology, have been prosecuting their studies during the winter under the inspection of a committee of Presbytery, and have manifested commendable diligence and made considerable progress.

On the subjects of dividing the Synod and meeting by delegation, transmitted by Synod for the consideration of the several Presbyteries, we have to report, that having considered the whole subject as maturely as we could, we view both the measures proposed as inexpedient at this time, and consider any change in our present plan of Synodical meeting as uncalled for now.

We hope that in the allotment of supplies, the necessities of our scattered vacancies will not be forgotten or overlooked; and we would earnestly call the attention of Synod to the Western Missionary field. Unless some more efficient measures are soon adopted on behalf of that destitute region, there is reason to fear that the cause which once was fair in promise will languish and die. We hope that prompt and decisive measures, will, in the wisdom of the Synod be devised to "strengthen the things that yet remain."

The Presbytery have agreed to request the Synod to establish a geographical boundary line between this Presbytery and the Presbytery of Muskingum, and that the line proposed be the following, viz. Beginning at the mouth of the Sciota river, and extending upwards along the course of said river, till its intersection with the dividing line between the counties of Miami and Huron, Ohio, thence running with said line due north to the Maumee Bay.

Respectfully submitted.

SAMUEL WILSON, *Moderator.*

ANDREW HERON, *Clerk.*

No. 2. Report of the Presbytery of Cambridge, which was, on motion, referred to the Committee of Supplies, and also to the Committee on Bills and Overtures.

*Report of the Presbytery of Cambridge.*

To the Associate Synod, to meet in Philadelphia on the 4th Wednesday of May, 1836. The Associate Presbytery of Cambridge report—

That, whatever evidences there may be of the prosperity of religion within our bounds, or of the success of the gospel in the congregations under our care, there are roots of bitterness springing up and troubling us. The seeds of discord, which has wounded the cause in our hands, yet remain after all that is done to eradicate them. An appeal to Synod has been taken from a decision of this Presbytery, on a charge against Dr. Bullions. Accompanying papers will explain it.

It was found on enquiry that the Synod's fast was observed in all our congregations, excepting, that from Barnet and Ryegate, no report was received.

Though all our organized congregations are settled, yet according to our report to Synod last year, there have been calls to us for gospel ordinances from some northern sections of this state, and from Lower Canada. To those people we might, perhaps, have given more supply had we not depended on the labours of the missionaries appointed to us by Synod. Mr. Galbraith neither rendered any of the services appointed to him within our bounds, nor gave any reasons for neglect. It is surely time that Synod take more energetic measures to compel the obedience of their missionaries to their appointments.

On the subject of sub-synods, &c., this Presbytery report, That however reluctant they are to recommend any measure which would prevent personal intercourse

between the ministers and elders in the Associate church, yet they judge it expedient that the Associate Synod be divided into sub-synods, and that they should meet in general Synod by delegation; and for the following reasons.

1. Because a large portion of the members cannot now meet in any one place.
2. Because in local matters, at least, in which some sections of the church may be deeply interested, members lie under temptations to vote in favor of their own convenience, and sections of the church which have a small representation in Synod may be injured.
3. Because the business of the Synod is generally in proportion to the increase of the church, and it cannot be all overtaken in the ordinary time of one meeting.
4. Much of the business which employs Synod under their present arrangement, is of such a nature, that sub-synods would be as competent to its transaction as a general Synod.
5. As long as the present arrangement continues, much business of importance must be postponed, without an authorized court to attend to it; while sub-synods could with propriety conduct it.
6. Such business being taken off the hands of the general Synod, the matters of general interest, now frequently postponed, could be attended to in due time.

For the above reasons, it is inexpedient to meet by delegation without division into sub-synods.

Those things which directly concern the whole church, should be transacted in general Synod only, and sub-synods be declared incompetent to perform them.

By order;

A. ANDERSON, *Presbytery Clerk.*

No. 3. Report of the Presbytery of Muskingum, which was, on motion, laid on the table.

*Report of the Presbytery of Muskingum.*

But few changes of importance have occurred in that portion of the church under our immediate inspection, since last meeting of Synod. The failure of the call from Wooster, and the growth of our vacancies, together with some new openings, render the demand for supply at the disposal of Synod, more than usually urgent; and we hope that particular attention will be given to our wants in making out the scale of appointments. At a meeting of Presbytery in November last, the congregation of Cadiz presented their petition, praying for the whole of the ministerial labours of the Rev. Thomas Hanna, which was granted. Since that time, the congregation of Piney Fork petitioned for a connection with the congregation of Mount Pleasant, and have called the Rev. Joseph Clokey; their petition was granted and the call is accepted—consequently the congregations of McMahan's creek and Belmont, formerly under the pastoral care of Mr. Clokey, have been declared vacant. This increases our demand for supply.

With respect to the propositions laid on Synod's table at last meeting, and submitted to the consideration of Presbyteries, contemplating either a division of the Synod into sub-synods, or a meeting by delegation, we have to report: That we have maturely considered the subject, and are opposed to the adoption of either of those measures for the present. The formation of sub-synods, arranged according to such geographical lines as may be agreed on by a general synod, and meeting annually, will not fail to excite local feelings and prejudices, nor will their meeting once in two years be sufficient to counteract their influence. To excite one another to zeal and faithfulness in maintaining the principles of our witnessing profession, and effectually to rebuke and repress all aberrations from it, so that jointly, with one mind and one spirit we may strive together for the faith of the gospel, is an object which we apprehend (judging from the condition of a sister church) would not be secured by this arrangement. The yearly supervision of the representatives of the whole church, would we believe more effectually gain this object. We are also opposed to the proposed plan of meeting by delegation. 1st. Because we know of no scripture authority to deprive any regular minister of the gospel of the privilege of discussing any subject, or voting on any question that may come before the highest judicatories of the church. And 2d. because we fear that intrigue and improper influence would be resorted to in the choice of such delegates, when any favorite measure was in view. We hope Synod will pause, and maturely consider the difficulties connected with the arrangement proposed. Whatever partial inconveniences



may attend the present plan of meeting, we think they are more than counterbalanced by the evils and dangers arising from either of the changes contemplated.

By order of Presbytery,

THOMAS HANNA, *Presbytery Clerk.*

N. B. The order of Synod directing Presbyteries to inquire into the observance of the fast by their members, has been complied with, and was found to have been universally observed.

No. 4. Report of the Board of Managers of the Theological Seminary, which was, on motion, laid on the table.

*Report of the Board of Managers of the Theological Seminary.*

The Board of the Theological Seminary report as follows :

The Board met at the Hall at the close of the last session, and attended to the duties assigned them by Synod. During the two days the Board were in session, discourses were delivered by all the students who were in attendance, excepting those of the first year. They were also examined on Hebrew, Ecclesiastical history, and the system of Theology. The performances were, in general, highly gratifying to the Board, and exhibited a system of instruction on the part of the Professors, and of diligence and application on the part of the students, highly commendable. The funds appropriated by Synod for the increase of the library, have been committed to the Professors, with instructions to purchase such books as they may judge necessary for the institution, of which a report will be made to Synod in due time. The following students attended the Lectures the last session, viz : Messrs. William Bruce, Samuel Douthet, James McGill, Joseph McKee, and John M. Scroggs, of the 4th year. Messrs. Robert Forrester, Wm. Y. Hamilton, Edward Small, and James P. Smart, of the 3d year. Messrs. Joseph T. Cooper, J. M. Harsha, James Law, and John L. McLane, of the 2d year. Messrs. William Cunningham, Thomas Gilkerson, James Hawthorn, William Smith and David R. Imbrie, of the 1st year. Messrs. Chauncey Webster and Samuel McArthur, who had previously studied under the care of the Presbytery of Albany, attended the Hall last session. It will remain with the Synod to determine their relative sanding.

After some further examination of the students of the senior class, viz : Messrs. Wm. Bruce, Samuel Douthet, James McGill, Joseph McKee, and John M. Scroggs, it was resolved unanimously, that they be recommended to Synod to be taken on trials for license.

Respectfully submitted by order of the Board.

THOMAS HANNA, *Secretary.*

No. 5. Report of D. Houston, Treasurer, which was, on motion, referred to the Committee on the Funds.

*Report of Daniel Houston, Treasurer.*

<i>Daniel Houston in account with Associate Synod, Dr.</i>	Oct. 23, cash paid for accmpt book for Synod, . . . . .	3 00
To balance in treasury as per report, Oct. 1835, . . . . .	\$1,765 63	
1835, Oct. 20th, to cash contributed from Peters Cr. congregation, . . . . .	10 00	
Oct. 20, to cash from female friend of Associate Synod, . . . . .	10 00	
1836, to cash in part of Charters congregation subscription to seminary, per Teupleton and Buchanan, . . . . .	8 00	
Jan. 20, cash received, donation from Dr. Samuel Murdock, . . . . .	10 00	
April 5, cash received from Adam Gib, legacy from Alex. Gib, . . . . .	100 00	
May 9, cash received from Charters congregation, contribution, . . . . .	25 10	
May 9, cash received from Glade run congregation, Carrol Co. contribution, . . . . .	5 50	
May 14, cash received from J. M. Moore, interest on Margaret Moore's legacy, . . . . .	1 00	
	\$1,935 23	
Disbursements, . . . . .	808 93	
Balance in treasury, . . . . .	\$1,126 30	
By the above report it appears that there is the above balance in hands of Treasurer, May 16th, 1836.		
DANIEL HOUSTON, Treasurer.		
	Oct. 23, cash paid John Watson for fixing stove, . . . . .	25
	Oct. 27, cash paid H. Taylor for raising chimney, . . . . .	19 00
	Dec. 16, cash paid postage, sundry times, . . . . .	56
	Cash paid Mrs. Jane Carson, (room rent discounted), . . . . .	44 62
	1836, cash paid stove pipe, carriage, &c., . . . . .	16 25
	Cash paid for lamps, oil, &c. for Hall, . . . . .	19 25
	Cash paid Titus Bashfield services to Synod, . . . . .	6 00
	Cash paid for sundries, . . . . .	1 00
	Cash paid for flagging cellar at seminary, . . . . .	8 00
	Cash paid John White for repairs on Seminary, . . . . .	7 75
	March, paid James Ramsay, D. D. Prof., . . . . .	300 00
	Cash paid Rev. T. Beveridge, half year's salary, . . . . .	250 00
	Cash paid Mrs. Jane Carson, coal for Seminary, . . . . .	3 00
	April, cash paid Henry Havelin, fixing stoves, lamps, scrapers, &c., . . . . .	6 25
	Cash paid Dr. Samuel Murdock, for journal, printing acts of incorporation, &c., . . . . .	7 80
	Cash paid postage, . . . . .	20
	May 7, cash paid Rev. T. Beveridge, for enlarging library, . . . . .	100 00
		\$808 93
<i>Contra</i>	<i>Cr.</i>	
Treasurer claims credit for the following payments :		
1835, Oct. 23, by cash for stove for room in Seminary, . . . . .	15 50	

No. 6. A communication from Thomas Gillespie of Bucyrus, Ohio, renewing his application of last year, for the appointment of a missionary for one year; to labor a part of his time, at Bucyrus, and the remainder in the circumjacent region of country. This paper was, on motion, referred to the committee of supplies.

The records of Presbyteries being called for, the following committees of examination were appointed, viz: To examine the records of Cambridge Presbytery, Messrs. Walker and Clokey. To examine those of Albany, Messrs. Miller and McGill. To examine those of Philadelphia Presbytery, Dr. Ramsay and Mr. Boyd.

The minutes of the Presbytery of the Carolinas not being forward, said Presbytery was, on motion, required to bring up their minutes for examination, at next meeting.

On motion, it was resolved, that part of to-morrow's forenoon sederunt be devoted to the exercises of praise and prayer. Messrs. Graham and J. S. Easton were appointed to lead in the exercises.

Synod proceeded to call for the Reports of Committees appointed last year. The following committees not being fully ready to report, craved further time, which was granted; namely, the committee to draught a warning against Popery; the committee on the book of discipline; the committee to draught an act for a fast; and the committee to prepare an address to our people, on the nature and duty of fasting. The last named committee were required to report at the next meeting of Synod.

The report of the Committee of Missions, published in the minutes of last year, was taken up, and a motion made to adopt said report. After a considerably free discussion, it was, on motion, resolved, that said report be referred to the Committee on Missions, with instructions to report on Monday morning, and that the consideration of this subject shall be made the order of the day, for Monday's forenoon sederunt.

Mr. Miller asked and obtained leave of absence for the remainder of this sitting.

Reasons of protest by Messrs. Allison and others, against the Synod's late act on the subject of the publication of marriage, were called up. Information being given that the aforesaid reasons of protest had been some way or other lost, in the hands of the answering committee; it was, on motion, resolved, that provided said reasons cannot be found, the protestors be requested to furnish a copy to be laid before Synod at next meeting.

Adjourned till the usual hour. Closed with prayer.

*Half past 2 P. M.*

The Synod met, and was opened with prayer. Members present as above, together with Mr. John Edwards, ruling elder, from the first congregation of New-York. The minutes of last sitting were read and approved. The following papers were given in and read, viz:

No. 7. a communication from the Rev. A. White, containing an unofficial report of the state of the Presbytery of the Carolinas, and soliciting supply of gospel ordinances. This paper was, on motion, referred to the committee of supplies. The above mentioned communication gave information of a call for Mr. James Patterson, from the united congregations of Sharon, Neilie's Creek, Smyrna, and Little River, S. C.; which had been moderated, and as attested, is now forwarded to Synod, with a request that it be sustained and presented.

The call was read; and a motion being made to sustain said call, after a free discussion, the question was put "sustain, or not," and carried "sustain." From this decision, Messrs. Martin, Walker, Banks, Wm. Easton, Campbell and Putnam, craved their dissent to be marked.

The presentation of the call was postponed till Tuesday next week.

Nos. 8. and 9. The Reports of the Presbyteries of Ohio and Charters, which were, on motion, laid on the table.

*Report of the Presbytery of Ohio.*

In the few months which have elapsed since the meeting of Synod, no material changes have taken place in the congregations under our care. The decision of Synod on the subject of our connection with the Original Seceders, is satisfactory to the members of our Presbytery, and, we rejoice that this cause, which once presented a threatening aspect, is now so happily issued. The peace of Zion, when not procured at the expense of truth, is much to be desired, and will ever occupy a chief place in the supplications of all her true friends. But while we rejoice at the removal of this ground of controversy, which affected the church at large, we have still to lament that some few difficulties exist in our own immediate bounds. In Mr. Donaldson's former charge there are some who still adhere to him, and Presbytery would now complain to Synod of the conduct of Mr. Donaldson in preaching regularly to those adherents, contrary to the express orders of our Presbytery, and while by the appointment of Synod, he should have been employed in other Presbyteries. A petition laid upon your table at last meeting, praying for a new organization, has been presented to us, and, after consideration, rejected, inasmuch as the places mentioned in the petition were too near their former places of worship—and owing to the local situation of the petitioners, no geographical lines could be drawn effecting such separation as they desired, and therefore, the boundaries would have been fixed solely upon the principle of elective affinity; and further, because they have for some time previous withdrawn from public ordinances, as dispensed by appointment, from this Presbytery.

A resolution adopted at the last meeting of Synod renders it our duty to report on the expediency of forming sub-Synods, and meeting by delegation in general Synod. As a matter which deeply affects the welfare of the church, we have had this subject under serious consideration, and fearing that the advantages anticipated from the plan proposed would not be realized, and that evils of serious consequence might possibly result, we are, for the present, opposed to the measure.

In submitting our report we would again request the attention of our fathers and brethren to the subject of slavery, hoping that Synod will still proceed in judicious and effective measures for the removal of this evil; and further, we would respectfully suggest the propriety of adopting such measures, as will effect a uniformity in the practice of our members, with respect to that part of our Book of Discipline which forbids an attendance upon the ministrations of religious societies, from which we judge ourselves bound by the word of God to maintain separate communion.

At our meeting in December last, Mr. David R. Imbrie was admitted to the study of theology. As no change has taken place in our vacancies we request as liberal a portion of supply as usual.

By order of Presbytery,

DAVID GOODWILLIE,  
*Presbytery Clerk.*

*Report of the Presbytery of Charters.*

To the Associate Synod, to meet at Philadelphia, on the 4th Wednesday of May, 1836.

The Rev. Thomas Beveridge, having, in consequence of his appointment to a professorship in the Theological Seminary, removed into our bounds, a unanimous call was given to him from the congregation of Washington, which he accepted.— In other respects things continue amongst us as they were at our last report. And we therefore, desire to be remembered in the distribution of supply. Messrs. Thomas Gilkerson and James Hawthorn, graduates of Jefferson, and Samuel Cunningham, of Marion college, offered themselves last fall as candidates for the study of theology, under the care of Synod. Having satisfactory attestations of their being in full communion in this church, &c. but having had no opportunity of applying to the Presbyteries where they reside, they were, on examination, admitted by us. Inquiry was made respecting the observance of the Synodical fast, and it was found to have been attended to by all the members who were present.

The Presbytery agree to report in favor of a division of the Synod into a number of Provincial or Sub-Synods, to be subordinate to one general Synod. It is their judgment, however, that previously to such a division, a system of rules more full than those proposed, should be prepared for the regulation of the supreme and subordinate courts. Perhaps the plan of meeting by delegation, is not at present imperiously necessary, and as we have learned that some of the Presbyteries are not in favor of it, this might be left for future consideration.

A protest was entered by Mr. Allison, against a decision of Presbytery in his case, which with the papers that accompany it, shall be laid before Synod.

JAMES RAMSAY, *Presbytery Clerk.*

No. 10. An overture on the subject of geographical boundaries, referred to Synod by the Presbytery of Cambridge. Said overture was, on motion, referred to the Committee of Bills and Overtures.

Certain papers were laid on the table, forwarded by the Rev. J. Donaldson, relative to his case; and, on motion, it was resolved, that said papers be referred to the Committee of Appeals, with instructions to report to-morrow morning. Mr. Walker was, on motion, added to said committee.

On motion, resolved, that Mr. Patterson be appointed to officiate, next Lord's day, in the 2d congregation of New-York; and H. Blair in Baltimore, on that day.

Adjourned till the usual hour to-morrow morning. Closed with prayer.

*Friday, May 27th.*

The Synod met, and was opened with prayer. Members present as above. After the exercises of praise and prayer, the minutes of last sitting were read and approved.

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

No. 11. The Report of the Presbytery of Philadelphia, which was, on motion, laid on the table.

*Report of the Presbytery of Philadelphia.*

Through the mercy of the most High, and according to the good hand of our God upon us, we "continue to witness both to small and great, saying none other things," and contending earnestly for no other truths, than those delivered by God, as a sacred trust to the church. Though such a faithful testimony has roused and in every age will rouse the enmity of the carnal heart, and provoke opposition; yet we trust, that in our bounds, the use of these divinely appointed means has not, during the past year, been without a blessing. God has given us peace in all our congregations, and we have reason to hope, has made the preaching of the word, and the dispensation of ordinances, the means of causing our people to "grow in grace, and in the knowledge of our Lord and saviour Jesus Christ.

It may be necessary to report, that in consequence of the reception of a petition from the Congregations of Stone Valley, Kishacoquillas and Lewistown, for leave to withdraw their call from Mr. William Galbraith, and the granting of another moderation:—Presbytery refused to grant their request, but required Mr. Galbraith to attend the next meeting, to be held on the 15th Dec. last, and accept or reject the said call. He did attend accordingly, and declined, accepting. Since that time, a unanimous call, from those congregations, has been made out for Mr. John S. Easton, and by him accepted. His trials for ordination having been, approved, he was at our last meeting, on the 5th, of May in Stone Valley, ordained to the office of the Holy ministry, and installed as pastor of said congregations.

All the members of Presbytery observed the act for the fast.

The supplies allotted us by Synod have, in general, punctually fulfilled their appointments with the exception of Mr. McLean. A petition from individuals in Belfonte and Sinking Creek, Centre Co., for organization and supply of ordinances, has been received by Presbytery. This, in connection with our other vacancies, especially Baltimore and Philadelphia, which would require almost constant supply, induces us to ask for at least as much as the constant labours of three missionaries in our bounds, if at the disposal of Synod. On the propriety of dividing Synod into three Sub-Synods, and the meet-

ing by delegation of a general Synod, every two years; this Presbytery report in favour of the measure; and think, that as the principle of attendance by delegation is sanctioned by the example of the primitive church, so expediency recommends the proposed division and representation. The yearly attendance of the distant members at either Philadelphia, or Canonsburg, cannot be expected; and, in all probability, the sessions of Synod will soon all be held as far west at least as Pittsburg. Neither do we think, that the interests of the church at large will suffer by this arrangement, nor, that any tendency to disunion will thus be generated. By the proposed representation, the general Synod will be even more largely attended than the yearly Synods are now; while that representation will be a more correct declaration of the sentiments of the church. The care of the Seminary, Missions &c. being also committed to the general Synod thus represented; there can be no danger that any section of the church will suffer by neglect. By order of Presbytery.

WM. EASTON, Presbytery Clerk.

**No. 12. The Report of the Presbytery of Albany, which was, on motion, referred to the Committee of Appeals.**

*Report of the Presbytery of Albany.*

In the state of our congregations we can report nothing particularly different from what has been done heretofore. Our Brother Mr. Irvine after a lingering illness, borne with christian meekness, has since our last report rested from his labours, thus weakening our hands, but by the liberality of Synod the congregation over which he was pastor together with our other vacancy have been regularly supplied. A call from the second associate Congregation in New-York, for Mr. H. H. Blair, probationer has been moderated. In case this call should be accepted we shall have but one organized vacancy, this however requiring constant supply. Two applications for sermon have been made to Presbytery; one from Oswego Co. New-York, and the other from Fall River, Massachusetts, openings for the spread of our principles which we have been unable as yet to embrace. And Presbytery would respectfully solicit of Synod such a portion of supply as will enable them to continue preaching in these places for some time. However our present system of supplying vacancies may answer in new countries; it is perfectly manifest that in old settlements, and among a dense population, it is next to useless, as far as the extension of our cause is concerned, to send only occasional preaching. A permanent occupancy of such places presents the only probable prospect of success. But while there is this outward prospect of extending our bounds we have to lament that there is not with us that internal peace which characterized our Presbytery, for some years after its organization.

The case of Mr. Webster, a student of Theology, under our care, who had been libelled for certain alledged slanders against a number of Ministers, in our communion, being under consideration, the following Resolution was offered by a member, Resolved, that it is contrary to the discipline of the associate church, to allow a person to prove what he has already declared to be unfounded. This resolution was rejected by Presbytery, and against this decision Mr. Stark, protested, for reasons to be given in, which together with the answers are respectfully submitted to Synod for their adjudication.

During the trial of Mr. Webster, various matters affecting the moral and ministerial character of the Rev. Andrew Stark, of New-York, appeared in testimony, so that Presbytery have deemed it necessary to put him on trial for them. Accordingly a libel has been put into his hands. Mr. Stark, has not appeared to answer to this libel though cited three times, but has sent in a paper protesting against all action of the Presbytery, in his case. After considering this paper, the following preamble and resolutions were unanimously adopted.

Whereas a libel containing many serious charges against the Rev. Andrew Stark has, by order of this court, been put into his hands; and whereas after having cited him three times, Mr. Stark has not appeared before Presbytery to answer to said libel, but has sent in a paper, protesting against all action of the Presbytery, in his case, on account, as he alledges, of their interestedness and partiality; and whereas Presbytery feel a reluctance in entering upon a trial of the libel in his absence, and in the face of such cruel, unjust, and slanderous statements as are contained in said paper of Mr. Stark, therefore,

Resolved, that the case of the Rev. Mr. Stark, as involved in the above mentioned libel, be referred simpliciter to Synod for final adjudication.

Resolved, further, that the Presbytery do earnestly beseech Synod, to issue said cause and not remit the same to this court.

Resolved, further, that Presbytery still retain the right, if they shall think it proper, hereafter to call Mr. Stark to account for the truly offensive and libellous matter contained in his reasons of protest, which go before the Synod, and also in the paper alluded to, in which he gives his reasons for refusing to be tried by this Presbytery.

This Presbytery, having had under consideration the resolutions, transmitted by Synod to the Presbyteries in relation to sub Synods and a general Synod, and the meeting of Synod by delegation, beg leave to report the following resolutions adopted by them.

Resolved, that in the judgment of this Presbytery, it is not expedient at the present time to alter the plan of Synod's meetings, provided the meetings continue to be held alternately on the East and West side of the Alleghany mountains as heretofore.

As to the observance of the Synod's fast, Presbytery report, that so far as ascertained it was observed in all our settled congregations, except the first congregation in New-York.

By order of Presbytery.

JOHN G. SMART, Clerk.

Albany May 18th 1836.

The Rev. Alexander Boyd of the Presbytery of Shenango appeared and took his seat.

Certain papers referred to in the report of the Presbytery of Albany, were handed in, containing an appeal by the Rev. A. Stark, from a decision of said Presbytery, rejecting the following resolution which had been submitted by him; viz: "That it is contrary to the discipline of the Associate Church, to allow a person to attempt to prove what he has already declared to be unfounded." Mr. Stark's reasons of protest, with the Presbytery's answers, were read, and on motion referred to the committee of appeals.

Adjourned till the usual hour. Closed with prayer.

*Half past 2, P. M.*

The Synod met, and was opened with prayer.

Members present above. Mr. James Geery, ruling elder from the 2d congregation of New-York, being present, was invited to a seat.

The report of the Presbytery of Shenango was called for, but not being in a state of readiness for presentation, leave was granted to defer its presentation till to-morrow morning.

A libel against the Rev. A. Stark, referred by the Presbytery of Albany, for trial, with accompanying papers, was read. While these papers were under consideration, the Rev. J. Hindman, from the Presbytery of Muskingum, and James Hutchinson, ruling elder from the Presbytery of Philadelphia, appeared and took their seats. After considerable discussion as to the order to be taken with the above-mentioned papers, it was, on motion, resolved, that the Synod accept the reference, and try the libel. From this decision Mr. Heron craved his dissent to be marked.

On motion, it was resolved that the trial of the libel be made the order of the day for the forenoon sederunt of Tuesday next week:

On motion, resolved, that the clerk of Synod be directed to give Mr. Stark notice of this decision.

The committee of appeals presented a report in the case of Mr. Donaldson, referred to them yesterday, which report was laid on the table, together with the papers belonging to the case.

A written excuse for the absence of Dr. Bruce was read, which, being explained by a statement from Mr. Banks, was sustained.

Papers relative to an appeal by the Rev. Messrs. Miller, Anderson,

Alexander and David Gordon, from a decision of the Presbytery of Cambridge in the case of Dr. Bullions, alluded to in the report of said Presbytery, were given in. The reasons of protest with the Presbytery's answers were read.

In consequence of the lateness of the hour, the reading of other documents, connected with the appeal, was postponed for the present.

Messrs. Graham, Anderson, and Martin, were on motion appointed to preach in this place on Sabbath first.

Adjourned till the usual hour to-morrow morning. Closed with prayer.

*Saturday, May 28th.*

The Synod met, and was opened with prayer.

Members present as above. The minutes of last sitting were read and corrected. Mr. Hindman offered his excuse for late attendance, which was sustained.

Papers being called for, there was given in and read, No. 13, the report of the Presbytery of Shenango, which was, on motion, laid on the table.

*Report of the Presbytery of Shenango.*

The circumstances of the congregations under our care furnish little ground for report. Those settled are generally increasing and prosperous; we have few vacancies. There is, however, within our bounds much room for the extension of the Church if it could be efficiently occupied.

Our presbytery has been constituted agreeably to the appointment of Synod, by the Rev. Daniel McLane, and Rev. Isaac Beggs was appointed our stated clerk.

Your reverend Synod has made it our duty to report our views on the resolutions printed in your minutes in relation to *sub-synods*. With the first of these resolutions we cordially agree; we believe it would tend to general and particular convenience, advance the interest of the Associate Church, open new and greater facilities to extend her influence, and greatly enlarge the means of communicating the knowledge of a scriptural profession and practice of religion in the *United States*; but such a measure is not without its difficulties; the principal of which are brought into view by the following resolutions. The division proposed is natural, and the blank in the 2d division proposed might be filled with the "Synod of Pittsburgh."

In the event of a division of *Synod*, a General Synod will be indispensably necessary. The ratio of representation is not perhaps so easily settled. The number proposed, "two ministers and two ruling elders from each presbytery," would seem at first an equitable proportion; but it is liable to some objections.

The presbyteries are not equally large, and the number proposed would be a very small representation from some of them; while it would sometimes constitute the half, and at present, in two instances all the members of a *presbytery*. Moreover, the members of the General Synod must meet by delegation. They will necessarily be representatives of their respective presbyteries; and consequently chosen and commissioned by their representees. Now, it would seem inequitable to confine a presbytery, consisting of ten or twelve, or even more ministers, to a representation of two in the General Synod, while, perhaps, some other presbytery might be all present. We would respectfully suggest the propriety of enjoining on every presbytery to appoint two ministers with their elders, and allowing them the privilege of increasing the number to one half of their own constituent members. We concur with the opinion that once in two years will be sufficiently frequent for the meeting of the General Synod.

The third resolution contemplates that the decisions of sub-synods be final, except in matters of doctrine in which only appeals be allowed to the General Synod.

Whilst the order and discipline of the church should guard against the encouragement of unnecessary appeals, yet the rights and privileges of church members should be carefully secured. The right of appeal is a privilege precious to every member of Christ's house: it accords with the maxims of civil liberty, and will not be easily relinquished by those who may be particularly and personally interested in it. There are many important causes tried in church courts, besides those which involve doctrinal questions, which may give occasion to appeals, either in their progress or deci-

sions, and which, perhaps, it would not be safe to prohibit from appearing before the highest tribunal. Questions of order may arise, which certainly should not be confined to the decision of an inferior court, we believe that very few, if any, restrictions should be laid on the right of appeal.

We think our members will be better satisfied to have the way of access to the highest tribunal open, and leave the management of causes to the wisdom and discretion of individuals and courts concerned.

We concur in the general principles of the last resolution, believing that every matter of general interest should be under the direction of the General Synod.

We prefer a division into sub-synods to a meeting by a delegation. Without such a division it is manifest some members would seldom if ever appear beyond the bounds of their respective presbyteries. If you should adopt the delegate system without the intermediate expedient of sub-synods, members would have to travel equally as far as they now have, and under the same inconvenience, while presbyteries would most likely appoint their most active and influential members to attend the Synod. If such would be the course pursued by presbyteries, it would tend to indulge some in privacy, manifestly to their own injury, and to the general injury of the church; while it would leave the government of the church in the hands of those who, either from their own desire or appointment, would attend the general meetings.

Although not especially called upon to report on the report of the committee on missions; yet from your order respecting that report we take the liberty to observe that—

1. The Church of Christ is by her divine constitution pledged to exert herself in missionary labors. To her, and to her alone, has Zion's King committed the work of evangelizing the world. That "the law shall go forth from Zion, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem," is assigned by Isaiah as the reason, that "many people shall go and say, come ye, and let us go up into the mountain of the Lord, to the house of the God of Jacob, and he will teach us of his ways, and we will walk in his paths." Every effort to spread the Gospel must be in a great measure fruitless, while the directions of the Holy Spirit are disregarded, and the institutions of Christ unemployed; nor should the lovers of truth and order neglect this necessary and all-important part of christian duty.

2. Whilst we have reason to hope that much good would result from the labors of your missionaries, we believe that the effort would produce an abundant harvest at home. The Associate Church has been reproached, (we believe, however, unjustly) with being opposed to missionary labors. Her members could not consistently unite in promiscuous and unpresbyterial missionary enterprises; and while her enemies loudly reproached, many of her members privately complained that their liberality was restrained from being employed, in the spread of the gospel to the benighted nations of the earth. These complaints have been changed to strong but respectful petitions, (we might say remonstrances) to your reverend Synod, entreating you, to whom it properly belongs, to afford them an opportunity of contributing of that worldly wealth with which God has blessed them, for the salvation of benighted heathens. Their prayers will be heard, and we trust their efforts blessed in the renewal of a liberal and christian spirit at home, and the increase of our blessed Redeemer's kingdom abroad. We have only to add, that we concur in the spirit and general tenor of the resolutions presented by your committee on missions and lying on your table.

Another important subject will occupy your attention at the present session of Synod, viz: the first resolution of your committee on slavery, left over from your last meeting. We have always been opposed to the granting of any privilege to our members of continuing to participate in this iniquitous traffic; nor would we now encourage any evasion of the act of Synod respecting it. But we doubt the propriety of passing such a resolution at the present time, without making some efficient provision in the room of those set aside. The act of 1851 was passed in faith of having the provisions of said act carried into effect by Synod. If this be impracticable, let others be substituted, which will answer the intended purpose, and let it not be said that at a time like this, when the jealousy of the southern, or slave states, is already excited, we, by the passage of this resolution, would cut off our brethren of the south from the communion of the church, and from all hope of our interference in their behalf. It is well known that the southern governments, as well as citizens, are aroused to a jealous watchfulness of their laws and institutions by the conduct of Northern citizens and associations, who in almost every possible way insist upon the immediate and unqualified emancipation of the slaves. It is also said



that almost every barrier that civil power can construct has been opposed to their emancipation, and doubtless present circumstances will not allow greater facilities than formerly. If your reverend Synod pass this resolution, you will be considered by the southern governments and people, as the abettors of insurrection and civil war. Prejudice will be raised against your principles and practice, not easily eradicated. But let your reverend body, in this difficult matter, act in the true spirit of your fathers, at one and the same time manifest your abhorrence of slavery and your respect for civil authority. Faithfulness to yourselves requires you to pursue such a course. The act of 1831 was passed in the faith, that the Synod would appoint an agent, and exert herself to redeem the church in the south from all connection with slavery. Your southern members declare themselves willing to give up their slaves to your agent, whilst they insist that existing laws prevent them from giving them a legal emancipation in their own states. If these things be true, would not the passing of this resolution bind a heavy burden on them, which you yourselves are not willing to touch with one of your fingers? But the act of 1831, more than suggested to our brethren of the slaveholding states, certain ways by which its purpose might be carried into effect. It promised co-operation and assistance, and we think Synod would do well to consider the effect of a breach of faith, with her own members, as well as the irritation of public feeling, and unnecessary provocation of prejudice against the principles and practices of the Associate Church.

In your act for fasting last year, you mentioned as your first reason, insubordination to good and wholesome laws, and setting the civil authorities at defiance. Although the laws on slavery are not good and wholesome, yet the civil authorities support these laws. But this resolution if passed, will either excommunicate some of your southern members, or oblige them to act in opposition to the civil authorities under which they are, in Divine Providence, placed. We think the provisions of the act of 1831 should be faithfully followed by Synod, or some other expedient adopted equally consistent with the principles of the Associate Church on the subject of slavery, and a due respect for the civil authorities under which they are placed.

Further, we are sorry to state that a scandalous report has been circulated against the character of Mr. Beggs, on account of which we have suspended him from the exercise of his office, until the case be legally investigated.

By order of Presbytery,

DANIEL McLANE, Moderator.

ALEXANDER BOYD, Presbytery Clerk. *pro tem.*

On motion, resolved, that a committee of three be appointed to prepare a minute respecting the Synod's acceptance of the reference of a libel against the Rev. A. Stark, by the Presbytery of Albany. Messrs. Beveridge, Clokey, and Bankhead Boyd, were appointed said committee.

The committee of bills and overtures presented a report, on the overture respecting geographical boundaries. After considerable discussion, the report as amended, was adopted, and is as follows, viz: "It is the opinion of your committee that it would be inexpedient to set aside the rule establishing geographical lines between congregations, as obligatory in all ordinary cases. They would recommend, however, that Synod declare their mind, that though no member should be attached to any other congregation, without a regular dismissal from that of which he has been a member, yet in cases, where there is opposition to such dismissal, the Presbytery shall judge whether there would be such an increase of distance, such inconvenience, or other causes by the change of membership, as would occasion scandal and if not, they shall not sustain the opposition.

"JAS. P. MILLER,

"T. BEVERIDGE,

"ALEX. T. MCGILL."

From the decision adopting the above report, Mr. Heron entered his dissent.

Mr. Thompson having been absent a part of yesterday afternoon, without leave, his excuse was heard and sustained.

The following question was proposed to Synod, and answered in the affirmative, viz: "Have Presbyteries a right to alter the geographical lines between congregations, which have long existed, if it appear to them equitable to do so?"

The committee of appeals reported in the case of the appeal by the Rev. A. Stark from the decision of the Presbytery of Albany, which had been referred to them for consideration. Their report was, on motion, recommitted, and the minutes of the Presbytery of Albany were ordered to be put into the hands of the committee.

The following Theological students were, on motion, ordered to be taken on trials for licensure, viz: Messrs. Wm. Bruce, Joseph McKee and John M. Scroggs, by the Presbytery of Muskingum; Messrs. Samuel Douthot and James McGill, by the Presbytery of Shenango.

Adjourned till the usual hour. Closed with prayer.

*Half past 2, P. M.*

The Synod met, and was opened with prayer.

Members present as above. Read the minutes of the forenoon sitting.

On motion, it was resolved, that the Presbytery of Albany be directed to take Mr. Chauncey Webster on trial for licensure. Messrs. Heron and Thompson requested it to be marked, that they voted in the negative.

On motion, it was resolved, that Mr. Samuel McArthur be considered a student of the second year.

The following resolution was offered, and, on motion, laid on the table, viz: "Resolved, That it be henceforth an indispensable rule that no man be licensed in our church as a preacher, nor admitted from other churches, until he have formally sworn and subscribed our covenant bond."

Mr. Clokey was, at his own request, released from the committee of supplies, and Mr. Hindman substituted in his room.

The committee, appointed to draught a minute relative to the Synod's acceptance of the reference from the Presbytery of Albany, reported the following, which was, on motion, adopted, viz: "It is judged proper to state as the reasons of this procedure, that Mr. Stark, after having been cited three different times by the Presbytery of Albany, had protested against their proceeding to any trial in his case, not accompanying this protest with any appeal to the Synod; and that he had in this protest made such charges against the presbytery, that they judged it not suitable for them to proceed to try him in his absence, as might have been done agreeably to the Book of Discipline: so that there appeared to be no alternative to Synod, but, either for them to try Mr. Stark, according to the earnest request of the Presbytery of Albany, or suffer him to remain under charges of the most serious nature, without an attempt either to vindicate or convict him. To this course Mr. Stark himself can make no reasonable objection. Having declined the authority of the Presbytery, there could be no other court, but the Synod, competent to try him.

"THOMAS BEVERIDGE.

"J. CLOKEY,

"B. BOYD."

The Synod resumed the subject under consideration last evening, viz, the appeal of Mr. Anderson and others, from the decision of the Presbytery of Cambridge, in the case of Dr. Bullions. A memorial from

the congregation of Cambridge was read. This, with the papers read last evening, and the minutes of the Presbytery of Cambridge, was referred to the committee of appeals.

Mr. Campbell asked and obtained leave of absence for the remainder of the present sitting.

The following preamble and resolution were offered and adopted, viz: "The synod having taken into consideration the reports of the Presbyteries, respecting a division into particular synods, subordinate to a General Synod, agreed to postpone a final decision on this measure, and in the mean time to appoint a committee to prepare a system of rules for the regulation of said synod, to be reported to Synod, and if approved, to be laid before the Presbyteries as an overture, for their judgment." Dr. Ramsay, and Messrs Beveridge and Miller were appointed said committee.

Adjourned till the usual hour on Monday morning. Closed with prayer.

*Monday, May 30th:*

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, viz:

No. 14. A communication from the Rev. Dr. Bruce, complaining of an alledged alteration in the published minutes, on the subject of the Synod's decision of last year, in reference to our connection with the Associate Synod of original seceders in Scotland; and renewing his protest, which had been then withdrawn.

This paper was, on motion, referred to a select committee, with orders to report to-morrow morning. Messrs. Heron, Beveridge, and B. Boyd, were appointed said committee. No. 15. A communication from Mr. John McAllister of this city, with regard to the bequest of his deceased father, accompanied with a preamble and certain resolutions, submitted to Synod, in reference to said bequest. These papers were, on motion, referred to a select committee, consisting of Dr. Ramsay and Messrs. Miller and Martin.

At the request of Mr. Miller, as executor of the estate of Mrs. Eleanor Henry, deceased, a committee was appointed to audit his accounts in reference to the legacy left to Synod by the deceased. Messrs. Moses Robertson and Wm Cummings were appointed said committee.

Papers relating to an appeal by the Rev. Thomas Allison, from a decision of the Presbytery of Chartiers, referred to in the report of said Presbytery, were given in, and, on motion, referred to the committee of appeals.

The committee of appeals reported on the appeal of the Rev. A. Stark, from a decision of the Presbytery of Albany. Their report was, on motion, laid on the table.

The draught of an act for a Fast, was read, and, on motion, recommitted for correction. Mr. Martin was, on motion, added to the committee.

The Synod proceeded to the order of the day, viz: the subject of Missions. The majority of the committee of missions presented a report, which was recommitted, with instructions to report to-morrow morning.

The report of the committee on appeals, on the appeal of the Rev. A. Stark, was, on motion, called up. After some discussion, it was, on

motion, resolved, that testimony be taken on oath, in reference to certain facts involved in this case.

Mr. Walker having taken the chair, the testimony of the Moderator was taken and recorded, and the Synod adjourned till the usual hour.

Closed with prayer.

*Half past 2, P. M.*

The Synod met, and was opened with prayer.

Members present as above. The minutes of the last meeting, were read and approved.

Papers being called for, there was given in and read, No. 16, the report of the Presbytery of Alleghany, which, although out of the prescribed time, was received, and, on motion, referred to the same committee to which the communication of Dr. Bruce had been referred.

*Report of the Presbytery of Alleghany.*

Since the last meeting of Synod nothing very remarkable has occurred among us. We wish Synod to consider, that a considerable part of our country is new, and thinly settled, and society in a state of infancy; and the interests of religion cannot be attended to sufficiently, unless synod afford us more supply than we have had heretofore, and a more impartial distribution of the labors of our unsettled ministers. A considerable part of our young men has been settled, without having ever been heard in the bounds of our presbytery. We hope Synod will attend to our claims with more particularity in future appointments.

We have considered the overture of Synod, proposing to meet, hereafter, in one Synod by delegation; or in sub-synods, and, every second year, in general synod. We have decided in favor of sub-synods; but would prefer either of the plans to that on which we meet at present. Presbytery are of opinion that our present plan is liable to more and greater abuses than either of the proposed systems could be; and that it gives no security for the steady and regular administration of the principles of our public profession, but exposes us to sudden changes and unsteadfastness. E. g. This present meeting at Philadelphia was urged at last Synod, because of business in some of the Eastern Presbyteries, which would require such meeting; and no report could be made of this business by members, neither had presbyteries reported it. Now, were a number of members ill-disposed towards our principles, or determined on new schemes, (a thing of which we have no suspicion) how easily might their designs be accomplished at such a thin meeting, and such an unequal representation as will obviously be in our Synod. We hope Synod will consider this important question in all its bearings on the interests of the church, and settle on such a plan, as may better tend to maintain the unity of the spirit in the bonds of peace.

There was a call moderated in January last, for Mr. — Galbraith, in the congregations of Bethel, Turtle creek, Freeport, and Warren, and sustained at our last meeting. We hope Synod will send him immediately into our bounds, that the call may be presented to him. Our next meeting is on the fourth Wednesday of June, at Indiana. All who know any thing of the distressed and distracted situation of these congregations must know that their call for a settlement is very urgent. We would fondly hope that Synod sympathize with us in thinking on the desolations of this portion of Zion; and that every obstacle, which may lie in the way of building up the old wastes, will yield to this call of Providence.

We beg leave to call the attention of Synod to an error in the printed minutes of Synod, in their last decision in reference to our connection with the original seceders in Scotland. The word *act* is used instead of the word *fact*. We know that *fact* is the term that was used in Synod, when the decision was passed. *Act*, as it stands in the connection, besides having a tendency to convey incorrect ideas, represents Synod as reasoning absurdly. We think it strange, that, after the minds of the members having been applied with such intensity to this subject, and the interest taken in this last decision, by all, any such error should appear in the record. We think it necessary that this error be corrected by giving a true copy of that decision in the next minutes of Synod.

We send herewith a corrected statement of our statistical table, except as regards the number of families and communicants, which we cannot, just now, ascer-

tain; but which, against another year, we hope to be able to furnish also. The appointments of Synod have, as far as known, been observed by presbytery.

JOHN HINDMAN, *Presbytery Clerk.*

Proceeded with the business left unfinished in the forenoon, viz: the report of the committee on the appeal of Mr. Stark.

The testimony of the Rev. P. Campbell was taken and recorded.

A communication from the Rev. A. Stark relative to his case, was then read. The members of the Presbytery of Albany were heard, and the members of the Synod having expressed their views at some length, the question was taken on the report of the committee, as amended, and carried unanimously "adopt." The report is as follows, viz: "The committee on appeals, to whom was referred reasons of protest from the Presbytery of Albany, with their answers, report: That they find the case contained in those papers to have originated in a motion, made at the commencement of the trial of Mr. Webster, on a libel, which motion was—" Resolved, that it is contrary to the discipline of the church to allow a person to attempt to prove what he has already declared to be unfounded." This resolution was, on motion, rejected. Against this decision Mr. Stark protested for reasons to be given in. This protest was not admitted. Against this decision, not admitting his protest, Mr. Stark protested and appealed; which latter protest and appeal is now the case before Synod. On this your committee submit the following resolutions.

"*First*: That though the question immediately at issue is on the decision of Presbytery refusing to admit the first protest by Mr. Stark, yet, as both parties have recognized the primary question in their reasonings, it is on this the decision of Synod should turn, viz: Is it contrary to the discipline of our church to allow a person to attempt to prove what he has already declared to be unfounded?

"*Second*, That the reason of this appeal appears to be without foundation. From the testimony of the moderator and Mr. Campbell, it has been proved to the satisfaction of Synod, that the paper which Mr. Stark alleges to have been a retraction of the charges, made by Mr. Webster against him in a certain pamphlet, was never subscribed or assented to by Mr. Webster in the form, in which it is given in Mr. Stark's reasons of appeal. Mr. Webster had only agreed to retract one or two statements respecting which he had been deceived. The term *some* used by Mr. Webster, was changed into *all*, and other alterations, to which Mr. Webster had never agreed, were made both by Mr. Stark and a committee of conference, before the paper went into the hands of Mr. Stark. This paper was also obtained by Mr. Stark, on the express condition that no use was to be made of it injurious to Mr. Webster, which condition has been manifestly violated, in a manner discreditable to the appellant. Resolved, therefore, that the appeal be not sustained.

On motion, resolved, that as exceptions have been taken against the papers of Mr. Stark on various accounts, these papers are hereby referred to the Presbytery of Albany, to deal with him respecting them.

Dr. Ramsay asked and obtained leave of absence for the remainder of this sitting.

The committee on the question of sub-synods, presented a report, which was read, and, on motion, laid on the table.

The request of the Presbytery of Miami for the establishment of the boundary line between said Presbytery and the Presbytery of Muskin-

gum, was called up and granted. The line to run as designated in the report of the Presbytery of Miami.

The following preamble and resolution were offered and adopted, viz:—

Information having been received by the Synod, that the Rev. John Wallace has not fulfilled any of the appointments given him by Synod at its last meeting, but that he has abandoned his profession of religion in connection with this church, and thus violated the engagements made at his ordination, without assigning any reason for so doing: Therefore, Resolved, That the Presbytery of Muskingum be directed to take measures to deal with him, in order to bring him to a sense of his sin, and a return to his duty.

Adjourned till the usual hour to-morrow morning. Closed with prayer.

*Tuesday, May 31.*

The Synod met and was opened with prayer.

Members present as above, together with the Rev. A. Stark, from the Presbytery of Albany. The minutes of last sitting were read and approved.

The call to Mr. Patterson, from the congregations of Sharon, Neily's Creek, &c., was presented, but Mr. P. not seeing his way altogether clear, its presentation was, on motion, delayed for the present.

Mr. Beveridge stated, that he had received \$100, a donation from a friend to the secession church, to purchase books for the library belonging to the Theological Seminary. The committee already appointed by the board of managers for the purpose, were, on motion, authorized to appropriate the donation to its specified object.

The synod proceeded to the order of the day, the libel against Mr. Stark, referred by the Presbytery of Albany; Mr. Clokey in the chair.

The question was first taken on the admissibility of the libel, and decided in the affirmative, with one dissenting vote.

The several articles of charge contained in the libel, were then separately read, and the question of relevancy, on each, decided in the affirmative, with the exception of the last charge, which was, on motion, laid on the table for the present.

Before proceeding to the proof, Mr. Stark stated that he was not prepared for trial, having received such short notice, that the Synod intended to try the libel to day. Whereupon, a motion was made to rest farther proceedings, in order to afford Mr. Stark farther time to prepare for trial. After a free discussion, the question being taken the motion was negatived. From this decision Mr. Brown entered his dissent.

Messrs. Banks and A. Boyd were, on motion, added to the committee of supplies. Mr. Hutcheson asked and obtained leave of absence for this afternoon.

Adjourned till the usual hour. Closed with prayer.

*Half past 2, P. M.*

The Synod met and was opened with prayer.

Members present as above. The minutes of the forenoon sitting were read and approved.

On motion, resolved, that the following explanation be given of the

motion negatived in the close of the forenoon's sitting, viz: that the object of said motion was to give Mr. Stark time for preparation beyond the present meeting.

The report of the select committee, on the communication of Dr. Bruce and the report of the Presbytery of Allegany, was read, and on motion adopted, as follows, viz:

"The committee to which were referred the letter of Dr. Bruce and the report of the Presbytery of Allegany, beg leave to state, that after careful examination of the printed copy of the act of the last Synod, in relation to the original seceders of Scotland, with the act recorded by the clerk, they find no variation between them, except a typographical error, slightly obscuring, but no ways affecting the meaning of said act. This error consists in substituting the word *act* for *fact*, in the last sentence of this deed, which we are persuaded was the consequence of oversight, and not of design. The alteration supposed by Dr. Bruce to have been intentionally and deceitfully made, and on the ground of which he proposes to renew his protest, has, as we believe, no existence but in his own mind. The committee are sorry to find in these papers some severe reflections upon brethren, for which there appears to be no just foundation; and they recommend that Synod should express their decided disapprobation of bringing charges before them, whether true or false, in this informal manner.

"ANDREW HERON,  
"T. BEVERIDGE,  
"B. BOYD."

Mr. Martin requested from Synod an attested copy of Dr. Bruce's letter, which was ordered.

Proceeded with the business left unfinished in the forenoon sitting, viz., the libel against Mr. Stark, Mr. Clokey in the chair.

The proof of the 1st charge in the libel, viz. that of "writing and publishing pamphlets and letters of a mendacious, calumnious, and ribaldish character," was produced, viz. the recorded testimony of the Rev. P. Bullions, as taken by the Presbytery of Albany, on the trial of C. Webster, in the presence of Mr. Stark. Also a note in the pamphlet entitled "The case of Dr. Bullions fairly stated," in corroboration of which the written testimony of the Rev. P. Campbell, and Messrs. John Law and Andrew Kirkpatrick, as taken in the case above mentioned, in the presence of Mr. Stark, was admitted and read as testimony. From the admission of the testimony of the three last-mentioned witnesses, Mr. Heron entered his dissent.

The question was then taken, "Is the 1st charge in the libel, of writing and publishing the pamphlets specified in the libel, viz., "A true and faithful history of the trial of Dr. Bullions"—"A letter to the Associate Presbytery of Cambridge"—and "The case of Dr. Bullions fairly stated," proved as charged against Mr. Stark? This was decided in the affirmative by a vote of 22 to 7; Messrs. Banks, Alexander Boyd, Thompson, Edwards, and Brown, entering their dissent.

Before proceeding to inquire into the character of said pamphlets as specified in the libel, it was, on motion, agreed to postpone this for the present, and to pass on to the proof of the other charges in the libel.

Mr. Campbell asked and obtained leave of absence.

The 2d charge in the libel, viz., "defaming and slandering church courts," was considered under its three specifications, viz: "defaming and slandering the Associate Synod"—"defaming and slandering the

Synod's commission of 1832"—and "defaming and slandering the Associate Presbytery of Cambridge," and under all these specifications, was voted proved.

The 3d charge, viz., "slandering and defaming the character of individuals," as instanced in the following individuals, viz: Rev. Messrs. James Wallace, D. Gordon, James Irvine, James Martin, Abraham Anderson, and Mr. Chauncey Webster, was voted proved.

The 4th charge, viz., "lying," on all the specifications of the libel, as far as examined, was voted proved.

The 5th charge, viz., "injurious misrepresentations of the acts of ministers and of church courts," was voted proved.

The 6th charge, viz., "publishing letters and pamphlets breathing an infidel spirit, of an infidel tendency, and containing profanations of God's holy word," was also voted proved.

Before proceeding to the remaining articles of the libel, the Synod adjourned till the usual hour to-morrow morning. Closed with prayer.

Wednesday, June 1.

The Synod met and was opened with prayer.

Members present as above, except that Mr. Stark was absent, without leave, and Mr. Wm. S. Young, ruling elder, attended in the room of James Auld. The minutes of the last sitting were read and corrected.

The committees appointed to examine the records of the Presbyteries of Cambridge, Albany, and Philadelphia, reported, and their reports were, on motion, accepted.

The report of D. Murphy, Assistant Treasurer, was read, and on motion referred to the committee on the funds.

<i>Daniel Murphy in account with Synod in Synod's fund.</i>		<i>From Philada cong. (quarterly collections)... 26 00</i>	
<i>Dr.</i>		<i>From Wm. Morris Esq. (Baltimore) donation, 50 00</i>	
To balance in treasurer's hands as per last report,.....	\$37 70		\$855 53
May 29, To cash from Unity congregation, New Athens, Harrison Co. Ohio, per Rev. J. Walker,.....	10 00	May 29, by cash paid Rev. A. Heron, Clerk of Synod,.....	\$100 00
From Mr. John Ashton, per Rev. D. Gordon, (donation),.....	7 00	Balance,.....	755 53
From Salem cong. Washington Co. N. Y. per Rev. D. Gordon,.....	5 49		\$855 53
From Bovina cong. Delaware Co. N. Y. per Rev. J. Graham,.....	19 00	<i>Daniel Murphy in account with Synod in Missionary Fund.</i>	
From Guinston and Lower Chanceford cong. York Co. Penn. per Rev. J. Adams,.....	11 00	<i>Dr.</i>	
From 1st cong. N. Y. per Mr. John Edwards,.....	57 16	To balance in hand as per last report,.....	\$49 49
From Massies Creek cong. Green Co. Ohio, per Geo. Galloway Esq.,.....	20 00	May 27, to cash from Mr. John Bishop, South Argyle,.....	5 00
From Hebron cong. Washington Co. N. Y. per Rev. A. Anderson,.....	10 64	May 27, to cash from Mr. Daniel Williamson, Putnam, Washington Co. N. Y. per Rev. A Heron,.....	5 00
From Florida cong. Shenectady Co. N. Y. per Rev. P. Campbell,.....	10 00		\$59 49
From Mr. Robert Scott's legacy Sugar Creek, Green Co. Ohio, per Rev. A. Heron,.....	500 00	<i>Daniel Murphy in account with Synod in Student's Fund.</i>	
From Xenia cong. Green Co. Ohio, per Rev. A Heron,.....	20 00	<i>Dr.</i>	
From Casar's Creek cong. Green Co. Ohio, per Rev. A. Heron,.....	10 00	To cash in hand, as per last report,.....	\$264 00
From Timber Ridge, Ebenezer and Old Providence, Roxbridge Co. Va. per Rev. H. Thompson,.....	16 60	May 28, to cash from 1 year's dividend Commercial bank stock,.....	99 00
From North Argyle cong. Washington Co. N. Y. per Mr. John Robertson,.....	9 63		\$363 00
From Cambridge cong. Washington Co. N. Y. per Mr. John Robertson,.....	12 70	<i>Daniel Murphy in account with Synod in Theological Hall Fund.</i>	
From South Argyle cong. Washington Co. N. Y. per Mr. Moses Robertson,.....	26 50	<i>Dr.</i>	
	\$783 53	May 27, to cash from inst. on Eleanor Henry's legacy, per Rev. J. P. Miller,.....	77 07
May 30, to cash from Albany cong. N. Y. per Rev. J. Martin,.....	20 00	May 21, to cash from interest on Mrs. White-side's legacy, per Rev. A. White,.....	19 00
			\$95 07
		The above is a correct report of the state of the different funds belonging to the Synod in my hands.	
		DANIEL MURPHY, Assistant Treasurer.	
		Philadelphia, June 1, 1836.	

The Synod proceeded to the business left unfinished last evening, viz., the libel against Mr. Stark, Mr. Clokey in the chair.



The 7th charge in the libel, viz., "employing scurrilous and ribaldish language," was considered and voted proved.

The Synod resumed the consideration of that part of the 1st charge in the libel, which had been postponed, being the character of the pamphlets in question, as "mendacious, calumnious, and ribaldish." The question being taken as to the fact of this being their character, was unanimously answered in the affirmative. The question was then taken on the whole of the first charge, which was voted proved.

On motion, resolved, that the 8th charge in the libel, viz., "entering a civil suit against a member of his own communion for an alledged libel on his character, without having first submitted the matter to the adjudication of the appropriate church court, be dismissed."

On motion, resolved, that a committee be appointed to bring in a report at next meeting of Synod, on the question embraced in the last article of charge. Messrs. Anderson and Miller were appointed said committee.

The final question was then taken on the whole libel as considered, viz., "Is the libel proved?" and carried in the affirmative by the following vote, viz:—

*Yeas*—Dr. Ramsay, and Messrs. Walker, Anderson, Martin, Miller, Beveridge, Smart, Graham, Gordon, Wm. Easton, B. Boyd, Adams, McGill, Hindman, Clokey, and J. Easton, ministers, and Messrs. John Robertson, Moses Robertson, Putnam, Smith, Cummings, Galloway, Geery, Hutcheson, ruling elders—24.

*Nays*—Messrs. Heron, Thompson, Banks, A. Boyd, ministers, Brown, and Edwards, ruling elders—6.

A paper, subscribed by Mr. Stark, was now handed in and read, and, on motion, referred to the committee on appeals.

The question now arising, "What censure shall be inflicted on Mr. Stark?" the following resolution was offered and adopted, by a vote of 22 to 7—a brother having been previously employed in prayer—viz:

"Resolved, That the Rev. Andrew Stark be suspended indefinitely from all the functions of the gospel ministry, and from the communion of the church of Christ; and that the Rev. A. Heron be appointed to intimate this sentence, on next Lord's day, to the First Associate Congregation of New-York."

On motion, resolved, that the Rev. J. Clokey be appointed to preach in the 1st congregation of New-York, on the 2d and 3d Sabbaths of June.

The clerk of Synod, was, on motion, instructed to give Mr. Stark official intimation of the Synod's decision in his case.

Extracts from the Minutes of Synod were craved on behalf of Mr. Stark, in relation to the case just issued. The request was granted.

The committee of appeals reported on the appeal of the Rev. Thomas Allison from a decision of the Presbytery of Chartiers, which had been referred to them. The papers connected with the appeal were read, viz: a statement respecting the facts of the case, made by the clerk of the Presbytery of Chartiers, and Mr. Allison's reasons of protest, with the Presbytery's answers. The members of the Presbytery present were heard in explanation: and a written communication from Mr. Allison was read. The members of Synod proceeded to express their views, but before going over the roll, the Synod adjourned till the usual hour, Messrs. Geery and Edwards having first obtained leave of absence for the remainder of the meeting. Closed with prayer.

*Half past 2 P. M.*

The Synod met and was opened with prayer.

Members present as above. The minutes of last sitting were read and approved.

Papers being called for, there was given in and read a petition from certain individuals in the congregation at Baltimore, praying the Synod to defer the presentation of the call from the 2d Associate Congregation of New-York, to Mr. H. H. Blair, until the Presbytery of Philadelphia have time to act on a petition now before them, for the moderation of a call in the congregation of Baltimore. Whereupon, it was, on motion, resolved, that the petitioners be informed by the clerk, that the call from New-York has been already presented and accepted.

Proceeded with the business left unfinished in the forenoon sitting, viz., the appeal of Mr. Allison. The views of the members of Synod were heard in detail, and the question put, "sustain the appeal or not," and carried "sustain," by a vote of 14 to 9. Messrs. Hindman and Heron craved their dissent to be marked from this decision.

The next meeting of Synod was appointed to be held in the city of Pittsburgh, on the 4th Wednesday of May next, at 4 o'clock P. M. Sermon at half past 7.

The motion, of which notice was given last year, as published in the minutes of Synod, viz., to set aside the rule which requires the Synod to be held alternately on the East and West of the Alleghany mountains, was proposed, and after a brief discussion, decided in the negative.

Mr. B. Boyd asked and obtained leave of absence for the remainder of the present sitting.

In order to prepare the way for the presentation of the call to Mr. Patterson, from the congregations of Sharon, Neily's Creek, Smyrna, and Little River, the following question was proposed, viz:

"Will the Synod recede from their rule on slavery?"

The question was answered in the negative. The call was then presented to Mr. Patterson and rejected.

On motion, resolved, that the minutes be published in the Religious Monitor, and that 500 extra. copies be printed. The expenses to be defrayed from the Synod's funds.

On motion, resolved, that the treasurer be ordered to pay to the Rev. Mr. Ferrier \$6, being a balance due to him for missionary service performed by the appointment of Synod.

At the suggestion of the board of trustees of the Theological Seminary, it was, on motion, resolved, that an allowance of fifty dollars be made to Mrs. Jane Carson out of the rent of the Seminary buildings due from her.

The report of the committee of Appeals, on the appeal by Mr. Anderson and others, from the decision of the Presbytery of Cambridge in the case of Dr. Bullions, was called up and read. After hearing the documents connected with the case, it was, on motion, resolved, to postpone the farther consideration of it till to-morrow morning.

On motion, resolved that the travelling expenses of Mr. Clokey to and from New-York, be defrayed out of the Synod's funds.

On motion, resolved, that the consideration of the answers to Mr. Heron's reasons of protest against the Synod's act on the publication of marriage, as also of the report on slavery lying on the table, be postponed till next meeting of Synod.

On motion, resolved, that 150 copies of the draught of the book of discipline, prepared by the committee, be published for the use of the members of Synod, the work to be issued as an extra. Monitor, in the cheapest form, and the expense of publication to be defrayed from the Synod's fund; and Messrs. Martin and Miller were appointed a committee to superintend the publication.

Messrs. Thompson and Alexander Boyd asked and obtained leave of absence for the remaining sittings of Synod.

Adjourned till the usual hour to-morrow morning. Closed with prayer.

*Thursday, June 2.*

The Synod met and was opened with prayer. Members present as above. The minutes of last sitting were read and approved.

A communication from the Rev. James Adams, relative to the book of discipline and the subject of missions, was read, and, on motion, laid on the table.

The above communication contained Mr. Adams' excuse for absence from the present meeting, which was sustained.

The committee on Mr. McAllister's communication, reported in favour of the adoption by Synod of the preamble and resolutions embraced in said communication. The report was, on motion, adopted, with the following addition, viz: "Provided, nothing herein contained shall be construed as contrary to the meaning and spirit of the will."

Whereas the late John McAllister of Philadelphia, by his last will and testament did bequeath the sum of two thousand dollars, the interest on which, during the period of five years from and after his decease to be applied to the benefit of the several Theological Seminaries, then under the care of the Associate Synod of North America for the education of students in divinity, and the said principal sum, after the expiration of the said five years, to be divided among the several theological seminaries which might then exist under the inspection of the Synod; so, however, that at least one half thereof should be applied to such seminary or seminaries as might be located to the eastward of the Alleghany mountains; And whereas the executor has expressed a willingness to pay over to the treasurer of the Synod the said legacy, notwithstanding that no eastern seminary has existed since the decease of the testator, provided a resolution should now be passed by the Synod, making provision for such future disposition of one half of the said legacy, as would be in accordance with the intention of the Testator.

*It is therefore hereby resolved,* that the interest which has accumulated to this time on the whole of the bequest, together with the one thousand dollars, being the one half of the principal shall be applied to the benefit of the Theological Seminary at Canonsburg, under the direction of the trustees thereof; and that the sum of one thousand dollars, being the remaining one half part of the said principal sum, shall be placed and continued at interest, until the Synod shall establish a Theological Seminary located to the eastward of the Alleghany mountains; and that when such a seminary shall have been established, the said sum of one thousand dollars, together with the interest which will have accrued thereon, shall be applied to the benefit of the said seminary. *Provided,* nothing herein contained shall be construed contrary to the meaning and spirit of the will.

*Resolved,* That the clerk of the Synod furnish to the executor an attested copy of the above preamble and resolution, and that they be printed in extenso in the published minutes of the Synod.

A communication from Mr. Trimble, of Indiana county, in this state, was read, relative to the distribution of the minutes of Synod, which communication was, on motion, laid on the table.

The draught of an act for a Fast, as corrected, was read, and, on motion adopted.

*Report of an Act for a Fast.*

In order that the church of Christ should have communion with God, and her members comfortable fellowship one with another, it is necessary that she should be engaged in removing the grounds of division and controversy. To gain this object, we should attend to all the ordinances of Divine appointment, and very particularly to those which serve to discover our weakness, bring our sins to remembrance, and humble us before God. By comparing our conduct with the divine law in every relation we stand, we are compelled to acknowledge guilt.

As a nation we are guilty in elevating to places of honor and trust those of our fellow-citizens who are professed enemies to God by wicked works, who evidence this by living in the world without the pale of the church, using that influence which their high stations afford in opposition to our God and his Christ.

As a nation we have not rendered to God according to his mercies; we have openly, in many instances, arrayed ourselves against him; we have in a great measure set aside the Sabbath, in not only tolerating the violation of it, but have, by statute, as in the case of carrying the mail, required it to be violated, and, moreover, we have specially to lament, that Congress has, during the present session, sat and transacted their official business on the Sabbath, in open violation of the will of all their constituents who with any consistency acknowledge the truth of divine revelation.

We are also involved in the sin of slavery, a sin deep and dreadful, whether we look at the crime itself as dissolving all the natural ties that bind man to man, wresting from the slaves their inalienable rights, or at its demoralizing effect upon society. God is calling upon us as he did upon the Jews of old, to break every yoke and let the oppressed go free; and while as citizens we are anxious for the continuation of our federal union, and the happy freedom of our nation, we lament that with the majority there is great indifference about the sin, and the want of a disposition to rid the nation of slavery, a ground of God's controversy with us, and a ground of controversy with one another, and which, if not removed, will prove our national destruction.

A spirit of insubordination continues to prevail to an alarming extent; public attempts to suppress free discussion on the dearest rights of the human family, by lawless mobs, and those winked at in many instances by civil authorities, who are bound to keep the peace; arresting the arm of public justice; abusing the persons of our fellow-citizens; barbarously murdering, and refusing to wait the process of civil law, that ordinance of God to which all have a right to appeal: a dark cloud seems to be gathering over our once happy land. Slavery, the increasing number of Roman Catholics, that have always attempted to enslave those nations over whom they gained the ascendancy, the want of confidence among the states comprising the union, and crime of every kind increasing, portend a storm that will shortly burst, unless the great PRESERVER of men will have mercy.

As members of the church of Christ we are bound to lament our backsliding state; there is evidently a departed Lord, and a departed glory. Too many have set aside divine revelation, even when they professedly acknowledge it to be the only rule of faith and practice, setting up their own religious impressions and their own feelings as the rule. Herein is the public approbation given to those religious excitements, that possess no higher authority, the praise given to those who lead the innovations of the day, the honor given to ministers for the efficiency of their labors, due to the Holy Spirit alone, and while a laudable disposition to spread the scriptures is manifested, there is evidently a great opposition to the spreading of their holy truths, and a prevalent spirit to denounce those who would make a faithful exhibition of these to the world.

As a particular branch of the church, we have much to lament. The spirit of Christ is departing, the dews of the Spirit are small and rare, threatening to leave us, as it has left other branches of the church, a barren waste. There is evidently too much indifference in teaching the particular doctrines of the church, and while we still in our public profession, acknowledge the duty of public social covenanting, we have to lament our great neglect in going forward in this duty; and as we become indifferent in maintaining the particular and distinguishing doctrines of our profession, so we have also to lament a decay in practical piety, either a neglect of duty, or deadness in their performance, and hence divine ordinances seem to produce less influence and yield less comfort, than in former times, when our fathers were more faithful in the discharge of the duties of their profession; and we further evidence our decay in practical piety, by manifesting a spirit of insubordination to our church

courts, the easy manner in which we become offended at their decisions, and the abuse too often given to the members of these courts who act faithfully in their office.

And while we thus confess our sins to God, who is merciful to forgive, we would beseech him to remove all ground of controversy, to return and visit the church, and pour out his Spirit upon her; especially that he would bless this branch of the church, and revive his work amongst us; that he would bless our Theological Hall, and enable our Professors in that institution to be faithful in the discharge of their official duties; that he would inspire the candidates for the ministry with a spirit of fidelity for the duties of the work to which they are to be called; that they may not be ashamed of the glorious gospel of Christ, nor of any of its truths; that he would bless this sinful land, arrest the progress of crime, and avert national destruction that now appears to be threatened; that he would destroy the man of sin and save the world from the power of his delusion and the influence of his destroying power, and extend the glorious gospel to all nations, that the kingdoms of this world may become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ.

The first Thursday of January next is appointed to be observed as the day of fasting.

Messrs. Anderson and D. Gordon, were appointed a committee to draught an act for a fast to be laid before Synod at its next meeting.

The committee appointed to draught a warning against Popery, presented a report, which was read, and, on motion, adopted.

[For want of room this "warning" must lie over till the next number.]

On motion, resolved that all the Ministers belonging to this Synod, be enjoined to read the above warning to their respective congregations.

The committee of appeals presented the following report on the communication of Mr. Stark, which had been referred to them, which report, was, on motion, adopted.

The committee on appeals, to which was referred a communication from the Rev. A. Stark, report the following resolutions. First; that though the communication is denominated by Mr. Stark, a protest yet it is substantially a declinature, refusing all submission to Synod in the case referred to. *Second,*

That the communication be referred to the Presbytery of Albany.

JOSEPH CLOKEY,  
JOHN WALKER,  
JOSEPH BANKS,  
BANKHEAD BOYD.

The committee of supplies reported a scale of appointments which was read, and, on motion, recommitted.

On motion, resolved, that the call for Mr. Galbraith reported by the Presbytery of Alleghany, be referred to the Presbytery of Cambridge for presentation.

On motion, resolved, that the order of the day be postponed, in order to make way for calling up the report of the committee in the case of Mr. Donaldson.

The report was read, and, on motion, adopted, as follows, viz:

The committee on appeals, to which was referred certain papers from Mr. Donaldson report. That they find the contents of these to be; first complaints against the Presbytery of Ohio, First—for rejecting his protest against their decision, refusing him redress from injustice which he alleged was done him in the final settlement of accounts between him and his late charges; and secondly, for rejecting his protest against their decision negativing a petition from himself and others praying to be organized into two new congregations secondly a petition that Synod would grant a reconsideration of the whole of his case, by impartial judges.

With respect to the complaint your committee consider the first to be groundless. There is no evidence furnished by him, from which we can infer *error* or fraud either in the congregation or Presbytery in the settlement referred to.

The second is unjust; from Mr. Donaldson own representation the meeting house of at least one of the branches proposed to be formed would be within less than four miles from the present place of worship, which is too contiguous in country situations, particularly in the case of small congregations. To these erections, the majority of the congregations from which they were to be supplied, were *opposed*; and the only reason assigned in favor of them is the want of friendship between those desiring the new congregations and those from whom they would be separated.

With respect to the prayer of Mr. Donaldson, your committee consider that after his case has been decided, first by his Presbytery, and secondly by the same Presbytery assisted by the committee appointed by Synod, and there being no evidence furnished, either of irregularity or injustice in their proceedings, that it would be wrong to revive it.

Your committee would farther report, that Mr. Donaldson be requested to discontinue all ministerial offices amongst, or in the bounds of his late charged and that the Presbytery of Ohio be directed to see that this requisition be complied with.

JOSEPH CLOKEY,  
JOHN WALKER,  
BANKHEAD BOYD.

Proceeded with the business left unfinished last evening, viz: the appeal of Mr. Anderson and others from the decision of the Presbytery of Cambridge in the case of Dr. Bullions. The appellants were heard in defence of the appeal. Before concluding the Synod adjourned till the usual hour. Closed with prayer.

*Half past 2, P. M.*

The Synod met and was opened with prayer.

Members present as above. Read the minutes of the forenoon sitting.

The Synod proceeded with the business left unfinished in the forenoon sitting, viz: the appeal in the case of Dr. Bullions. Mr. John Robertson, on behalf of the Presbytery of Cambridge, was heard, and the parties were removed. The minds of the members of Synod, were then expressed at some length. A motion was then made to the following effect, viz: "Resolved, that the proceedings of the Presbytery of Cambridge in this case be set aside, in consequence of their irregularity in, admitting a member of another Presbytery to act as a judge and vote, contrary to the acknowledged rules of Presbyterian church discipline.

"Resolved, that the Presbytery be directed to take up the case *do novo*, and to dismiss it upon Dr. Bullions disclaiming any intention to contradict the deed of the Presbytery."

From the decision adopting the above resolution, Mr. Heron craved his dissent to be marked.

Mr. John Robertson craved extracts from the minutes in this case. The request was granted.

On motion, proceeded to the election of the Board of Trustees for the Theological Seminary, and the board of last year was continued.

Proceeded to the election of a Board of Managers for the ensuing year, and Messrs. French, Walker, Clokey, Hanna, N. Scroggs, B. Boyd, and Alex. Wilson, were elected.

On motion, resolved, that the Synod enjoin it upon their Board of Managers to be particular in examining the students on the distinguishing principles of our profession.

On motion, resolved, that the Professors in the Theological Seminary be considered *ex-officio* members of the Board of Managers.

On motion, the following resolutions on Covenanting are laid on the table till next meeting of Synod.

Resolved, that no licenciate now in our church shall be ordained till he have formally sworn and subscribed our covenant bond.

Resolved, that hereafter the board of managers of the Hall shall take care that an opportunity of observing the above rule be afforded to the students at the Hall, as often as once in four years.

Resolved, that it be henceforth an undispensible rule, that no man be licensed to preach the gospel in our churches nor admitted from other churches, till he have formally sworn and subscribed our covenant bond.

On motion, resolved, that the expenses of the Western Mission, be defrayed out of the funds of Synod, and that the Presbytery of Miami be authorized to ascertain the amount, and draw on the Treasurer.

Mr. Walker was, on motion, appointed the Moderator's alternate to preach the Synodical Sermon.

On motion, resolved, that the Presbytery of Muskingum, be directed to supply Mr. Clokey's pulpit during the time that he is appointed to the city of New-York.

The committee of supplies, reported the scale of appointments as amended, which was adopted as follows, viz :

*Scale of Appointments.*

Rev. Robert Laing and Rev. Peter Bullions, in Presbytery of Albany, till next meeting of Synod.

Rev. A. Whyte, Cambridge, till next meeting.

Rev. Mr. Clarkson, Philadelphia, till next meeting.

Rev. Mr. Ferrier, Shenango, June, July; Alleghany August, September; Ohio, October, November; Muskingum, December, January; Miami, February, March; Muskingum, April; Alleghany, May.

Is. McLean, Miami, June, July; Muskingum, August, September; Shenango, October, November; Alleghany, December, January; Ohio, February, March, April; Muskingum, May.

Mr. Patterson, Philadelphia, June, July, August; Alleghany, September; Bucyrus, October, November, December; Ohio, January; Muskingum, February, March; Miami, May.

D. Thompson, Ohio, June, July; Alleghany, August; Philadelphia, September, October, November, December, January; Albany, February, March; Cambridge, April, May.

Mr. Galbraith, Cambridge, June, July, August; Albany, September, October, November; Alleghany, December, January, February, March, April; Chartiers, May.

James Dickson, Philadelphia, June, July; Carolinas, August, September, October, November, December, January; Miami, February, March; Muskingum, April, May.

Mr. Hall, Miami, June; Stamford, July, August, September, October; Albany, till next meeting.

D. Strang, Michigan, June, July, August, September; Stamford, till the next meeting.

Mr. Bruce, Ohio, August; Western Mission, September, October, November, January; Ohio, February; Shenango, March; Alleghany, April, May.

Mr Webster, Albany, August; Philadelphia, September, October, November, December; Albany, till next meeting.

Mr. McKee, Shenango, August; Muskingum, September; Chartiers, October; Philadelphia, November; Albany, December; Philadelphia, till next meeting.

John M. Scroggs, Miami, August, September, October; Muskingum, November, December; Bucyrus, January, February, March; Shenango, April; Ohio, May.

Mr. Douthet, Shenango, August; Ohio, September; Muskingum, October; Miami, November; Western Mission, December, January, February, March, April; Miami, May.

Mr. McGill, Ohio, August; Miami, September, October; Carolinas, November, December, January; Philadelphia, till next meeting.

Mr. Donaldson, Muskingum, June; Chartiers, July; Muskingum, August, September, October; Miami, November, December, January; Muskingum, February, March; Shenango, April, May.

Mr. S. Hindman's excuse for the non-fulfilment of his appointment to Michigan by the Synod at last meeting, was heard and sustained.

On motion, resolved, that the report on the subject of missions, be laid over till next meeting of Synod.

Oh motion, resolved, that the overture on a general synod and sub-synods, be printed, and referred to Presbyteries to report thereon at next meeting of Synod.

*Overture of rules for the General Synod of the Associate Presbyterian Church of North America.*

1. The General Synod shall for the present consist of all the ordained ministers belonging to the different Presbyteries and particular Synods, together with one elder from each congregation having a settled ministry. Said elders to be appointed by a regular meeting of the sessions to which they belong, and their appointment to be attested in writing by the Moderator and Clerk. A committee shall be appointed at each meeting of the General Synod, to receive their attestations who shall report the names of those regularly attested, and refer to the Synod such cases as may appear doubtful.

2. The *quorum* of the General Synod shall be twenty, of whom at least sixteen, shall be ministers.

3. The General Synod shall have power to fix the times and places of their meetings, and to transact all business properly pertaining to the supreme judicatory of the church. In particular; They shall have power to hear and decide all causes regularly brought before them by appeal, reference, or complaint. They shall have the power of passing acts affecting the general interests of the church, such as acts relating to her public profession and testimony, the questions to be put to ministers and elders at their ordination, and to preachers at license, the terms of ministerial and christian communion and the bond for covenanting.

It shall belong to them to erect Synods and Presbyteries, and to disjoin Presbyteries from Synods, and annex them to others. They shall not, however, either erect a Synod or Presbytery or disjoin or annex a Presbytery at the meeting at which it is first proposed, unless the consent of the parties interested be officially reported.

It shall also belong to the General Synod to enact rules for regulating the proceedings of the subordinate courts, and to do whatever else is competent and proper for a court having the supervision of the general interests of the church.

4. The General Synod shall direct as to the admission of young men to the study of divinity, the time and particular course of their studies, the appointment of them for trials before the different Presbyteries; and the different Presbyteries to which Probationers and ministers without charge, shall be assigned as supplies. They shall also retain the inspection and management of the different funds belonging to the Synod, and the superintendence of the Theological Hall.

5. The Moderator of the General Synod may call a *pro re natu* meeting, provided it be recommended by a regular meeting in some probable necessity; or if any thing unforeseen occur, he may call such a meeting with the advice and consent of a majority of the Synod, or of the Presbyteries, provided, such contingency occur subsequently to the meetings of the Synods. The notice of such meetings shall be published forty days previously, and official intimation shall be sent in due season to every minister.

6. No appeal shall be received from a Presbytery to the General Synod in the way of passing over the Synod of their bounds, unless the appeal has been made between the time of the meeting of the Provincial and General Synods.

7. The particular Synods shall present their books of record for review at each meeting of the General Synod. And it shall be competent to the General Synod upon the report of a committee to correct or reverse any of their decisions, which are found not in accordance with the word of God, and the standards of this church.

8. At each meeting of the General Synod, a part of the second day of their sessions shall be employed in prayer.

9. It shall be a part of their duty to appoint days of fasting, and of thanksgiving according as they shall judge themselves called in the providence of God.

*Regulations respecting particular Synods.*

1. The particular Synods shall consist of all the ministers and one elder regularly appointed by his session from each settled congregation, within such bounds as shall be prescribed by the General Synod.

2. The *quorum* of the provincial Synods shall be eight, of whom six shall be ministers: and in the case of appeals this number shall be necessary to the trial of such appeals, the parties interested not being included.

3. Business which cannot be determined by a particular Synod, because of its bearing on the general interests of the church, or the interests of some part not compre-



hended under their jurisdiction shall be referred to the General Synod, and notice of such reference shall be given to any portion of the church concerned in the case referred.

4. Where any decision of the particular Synod is considered injurious to truth or contrary to justice, any person or persons aggrieved shall have the privilege of complaining or appealing to the General Synod, and such complaints and appeals shall be judged according to the rules usually observed in such cases.

5. Particular Synods shall have the power of disjoining the congregations of any one of their Presbyteries and annexing them to others. Such decisions, however, shall be reported, to the General Synod for review, and may if it be judged proper be reversed.

6. Particular Synods may invite each other's members to sit as correspondents and if the particular Synods request it, the General Synod may appoint such correspondents to aid in any affairs of peculiar difficulty.

7. The Particular Synods shall as soon as practicable transmit any preacher or unsettled minister to the Presbytery in their own bounds, or in the bounds of another Synod in which they may have received a call or calls, and the Synod in which the Presbytery lies to which the transmission is made, shall be obligated to afford an equal portion of supply to the Presbytery or Presbyteries which might otherwise by these arrangements, lose the supply allotted them.

8. If any Synod shall refuse to comply with the petition of a Presbytery having a call in their hands for a preacher or unsettled minister, by sending him into their bounds, no steps subsequently taken towards calling said minister or preacher in the bounds of those detaining him, shall be accounted legal. The above rules shall not however, apply in cases where there are competing calls from different Presbyteries or Synods. Nor shall any thing in them be so construed as to set aside the rule requiring probationers to itinerate a year before settlement.

JAMES RAMSEY.

JAS. P. MILLER.

T. BEVERIDGE.

On motion, resolved, that the treasurer be ordered to pay to Moses Todd, \$10 for his services as sexton during the present meeting.

On motion, resolved, that the expenses of the mission to Michigan be defrayed out of the Synod's funds.

On motion, Synod went into committee of the whole on the subject of the Bible Society; Mr. Walker in the chair.

When the committee rose the following papers were reported, viz:  
The report of Mr. William S. Young, treasurer.

*Report of the Treasurer of the Bible Society of the Associate Church of North America.*

Nov. 1835, received from the Rev. Mr. Beveridge, former Treasurer, balance in his hands, . . . . .	\$127 48	of Miss Janet Malcolm, per Rev. H. Thompson, . . . . .	20 80
March, 1836, received from Miss Martha Dick, per Rev. A. J. McGill, . . . . .	6 00	June 2, received from West Hebron congregation, per Rev. Mr. Anderson, . . . . .	33 40
June 1, 1836, received from Salem congregation, N. Y. per Rev. D. Gordon, . . . . .	15 00	June 2, received from Albany congregation, per Rev. James Martin, . . . . .	18 44
Received from South Argyle congregation, N. Y. per Mr. Moses Robinson, . . . . .	20 00		
June 2, received from Baltimore congregation,			
			\$211 12
			WILLIAM S. YOUNG.

A resolution on the subject of the Bible Society, transmitted by the Presbytery of Cambridge.

*To the Associate Synod to meet in Philadelphia, May, 1836.*

It is believed that the Executive Committee of the Bible Society, appointed by Synod, have never met, nor transacted any business belonging to the appointment—that by the failure of this Synod's plan, the efforts of Presbyteries and congregations to promote the objects of the institution have been limited and paralyzed—that monies are now kept back, which, on the full operation of the Synod's plan, would come into their Society's funds. As the executive committee have, heretofore, been selected from several cities or states, they find a difficulty in meeting which will not be surmounted without some other regulations. It is, therefore, respectfully recommended to Synod, that as their Depository and Treasurer are in the city of Philadelphia, they should also appoint all the members of the Executive Committee in the same city.

By order of the Associate Presbytery of Cambridge.

A. ANDERSON

It is suggested that it would tend to promote the object in view according to the above memorial, if Synod would appoint one of the Executive Committee as chairman, and a day for their first meeting.

A. ANDERSON.

In accordance with the memorial, Mr. John R. Dickson was appointed chairman of the executive committee, and the following gentlemen were added, viz: Messrs. D. Eurphy, Robert Laird, William S. Young, and James Ferguson. The above-named committee are appointed to hold their first meeting on the first Monday of July next, at 7 o'clock P. M.

The minutes of the present sitting were read and approved, and after prayer, singing a part of the 132d Psalm, and the appropriate benediction pronounced by the Moderator, the Synod adjourned, to meet in Pittsburgh, on the fourth Wednesday of May next.

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
James Templeton, . . . . .	{ Pleasant Run, . . . . .	do, . . . . .	do, . . . . .	do	29	60
Samuel Wilson, . . . . .	Sugar Creek, . . . . .	Centreville, . . . . .	Montgomery, . . . . .	Ohio.	50	120
James Wallace, . . . . .	Xenia, . . . . .	Xenia, . . . . .	Green, . . . . .	do	72	170
A. Heron, . . . . .	{ Bellefontaine, . . . . .	Cherokee, . . . . .	Logan, . . . . .	do	25	60
James C. Bruce, . . . . .	{ Darby, . . . . .	Union, . . . . .	Union, . . . . .	do	23	60
J. M. Henderson, . . . . .	Caesar creek, . . . . .	Jamestown, . . . . .	Green, . . . . .	do	40	105
Thos. S. Kendall, . . . . .	Henderson, . . . . .	Monmouth, . . . . .	Warren, . . . . .	Illin's	58	160
	{ Carmel, . . . . .	Smockville, . . . . .	Jefferson, . . . . .	Ind.		
	{ Clarke, . . . . .	do, . . . . .	Clarke, . . . . .	do		
	{ Pistol Creek, . . . . .	Maryville, . . . . .	Blount, . . . . .	Tenn.		
	{ Big Spring, . . . . .	do, . . . . .	do, . . . . .	do	70	158
	{ Fork Creek, . . . . .	do, . . . . .	Monroe, . . . . .	do		
	Raccoon, . . . . .	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.		
Vacancies, . . . . .	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 CHARTIERS.

Ministers.	Congregations.	Nearest P. O.	Counties.	States.	Fam.	Com.
Wm. Wilson, . . . . .	{ Monteur's Run, . . . . .	Clinton, . . . . .	Alleghany, . . . . .	Penn.	40	140
Thomas Allison, . . . . .	{ Robison, . . . . .	W. Middletown, . . . . .	Washington, . . . . .	do	42	150
James Ramsay, . . . . .	{ Mt. Hope, . . . . .	do, . . . . .	do, . . . . .	do	46	114
David French, . . . . .	{ Cross Creek, . . . . .	Cannonsburgh, . . . . .	Brooke, . . . . .	Va.	26	61
Alex. Doonan, . . . . .	Chartiers, . . . . .	Washington, . . . . .	Washington, . . . . .	Penn.	122	320
Alex. Wilson, . . . . .	{ N. & S. Buffalo, . . . . .	Hickory, . . . . .	do, . . . . .	do	110	240
Wm. M. McElwee, . . . . .	{ Mt. Pleasant, . . . . .	do, . . . . .	do, . . . . .	do	105	220
J. Rodgers, . . . . .	{ Burgetstown, . . . . .	do, . . . . .	do, . . . . .	do	85	189
Bankhead Boyd, . . . . .	Peter's Creek, . . . . .	do, . . . . .	do, . . . . .	do		
T. Beveridge, . . . . .	Service & King's Creek, . . . . .	Frankfort, . . . . .	Beaver, . . . . .	do	116	264
Vacancy, . . . . .	{ Noblestown, . . . . .	do, . . . . .	Alleghany, . . . . .	do	50	
	{ Ohio, . . . . .	Economy, . . . . .	do, . . . . .	do	70	
	Pigeon Creek, . . . . .	McCullough's, . . . . .	Washington, . . . . .	do		
	Washington, . . . . .	Washington, . . . . .	Washington, . . . . .	do		
	Tumbleson's Run, . . . . .	do, . . . . .	do, . . . . .	do	31	53

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	75	120
	{ Millersburgh .....					
Thomas Hanna.....	Cadiz .....	Cadiz .....	Harrison.....	do	76	155
Daniel McLane .....	{ Bloomfield .....		Muskingum .....	do	103	221
	{ Cambridge .....	Cambridge .....	Guernsey .....	do	19	41
Joseph Clokey .....	Mount Pleasant .....	Mt. Pleasant.....	Jefferson.....	do	33	60
	{ Piney Fork .....		Jefferson.....	do	45	100
Andrew Isaac.....	Londonderry .....	Londonderry.....	Guernsey .....	do	65	160
	{ Sharon .....		Harrison.....	do	17	38
	{ Mansfield.....	Mansfield.....	Richland .....	do	25	57
Samuel Hindman.....	Clear Creek.....	do .....	do .....	do	18	41
	{ Washington .....		Marion .....	do	44	93
	{ Truro .....	Reynoldsburgh..	Franklin.....	do	28	60
David Lindsay,...	Jonathan's Creek.....	do .....	do .....	do	17	27
	{ Goshen.....		do .....	do	8	15
	{ Carmel .....		Carrollton, .....	do		
Thomas Wilson...	Sandy.....	Carrollton, .....	do .....	do		
	{ North Union.....		do .....	do		
	{ Wooster.....	Wooster, .....	Wayne .....	do		
	{ Newman's Creek.....		do .....	do		
	{ Mohican .....		do .....	do		
	{ Killbuck.....		do .....	do		
	{ McMahan's Creek.....		Belmont .....	do		
Vacancies .....	Belmont .....	do .....	do .....	do	32	60
	{ Bucyrus.....		Crawford, .....	do	45	77
	{ Clear creek.....		Guernsey.....	do		
	{ Claysville.....		do .....	do		
	{ Jacksonville.....		Wayne.....	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 Martin .....	Albany .....	Albany .....	Albany .....	do		
Peter Campbell.....	Florida .....	Schenectady .....	Schenectady..	do	70	153
John G. Smart .....	Johnstown .....	Johnstown.....	Montgomery ..	do	42	140
John Graham.....	Bovina .....	Bovina.....	Delaware.....	do	19	40
Vacancies.....	{ Troy.....	Troy.....	Rensselaer.....	N. Y.	82	158
	{ Newark.....	Newark.....	do .....	N. J.		39
	{ New York 2d .....	New York.....	New York.....	N. Y.	70	180
Without charge.						
Robert Laing.....						
P. Bullions.....						
Thomas Ferrier .....						

STATISTICAL TABLE OF THE PRESBYTERY OF ALLEGHANY.

Ministers.	Congregations.	Nearest P. O.	Counties.	States.
Robert Bruce, D. D.	Pittsburgh .....	Pittsburgh.....	Alleghany .....	Penn
	{ Rich-Hill .....		do .....	do
John Dickie .....	Kittanning .....	Kittanning.....	Armstrong .....	do
	{ Buffalo.....		do .....	do
Joseph Scroggs .....	Fairfield.....	Ligonier.....	Westmoreland ..	do
	{ Donagal.....		do .....	do
	{ Indiana.....	Indiana.....	Indiana.....	do
David Blair .....	Conemaugh.....	do .....	do .....	do
	{ Union .....		do .....	do
	{ Jefferson .....		Jefferson .....	do
James M'Carrell .....	Upper Piney .....	Strattonville.....	Armstrong .....	do
	{ Cherry-Run .....		do .....	do
	{ Concord .....		Armstrong .....	do
John Hindman .....	Glade Run.....	Glade Run.....	do .....	do
	{ Mahoning.....		Indiana.....	do
	{ Berachah .....		do .....	do
	{ Bethel.....	Murrysville.....	Alleghany .....	do
	{ Turtle Creek.....		Westmoreland ..	do
	{ Freeport.....	Freeport.....	Armstrong .....	do
Vacancies .....	Warren.....	Apollo .....	do .....	do
	{ Lower Piney.....	Kittanning .....	do .....	do
	{ Gibson's.....	Punxutawny.....	Jefferson.....	do
	{ Clearfield.....	Curwinsville.....	Clearfield.....	do

STATISTICAL TABLE OF THE PRESBYTERY OF STAMFORD.

Ministers.	Congregations.	Nearest P. O.	Counties.	States	Fam.	Com.
John Russell,....	Stamford,....	Queenston,....	.....	U. C.	35	70
James Strang,....	Dumfries,....	Galt,....	.....	do		170
	York,....	York,....	Livingston,....	N. Y.		45
Vacancies.....	Esquising,....	.....	.....	U. C.		
	London,....	.....	.....	do		

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
	West Beaver.....	do.....	do.....	do		
Elijah N. Scroggs..	West Union.....	New Lisbon.....	Columbiana,....	Ohio.	75	150
	4 Mile Square.....	do.....	do.....	do		
Dar. Goodwillie...	Poland.....	Poland.....	Trumbull.....	do	67	139
	Liberty.....	do.....	do.....	do	79	115
	Milton.....	Warren,.....	Trumbull,....	do		
Wm. Douthet.....	Palmyra,....	do.....	Carrol,.....	do	8	
	Newton,....	do.....	do.....	do	18	87
	Northfield,....	do.....	do.....	do		
Joseph Banks,....	Stow.....	do.....	do.....	do		
	Springfield.....	do.....	do.....	do		
James P. Ramsay,...	Deer Creek.....	New Bedford,...	Mercer.....	Penn.	103	210
	Yellow Creek.....	do.....	do.....	do		
Vacancies.....	Scroggsfield,...	Scroggsfield,...	Carroll,.....	Ohio.	70	150
	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.....	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		
	— Creek.....	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.	28	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 SHENANGO.

Ministers.	Congregations.	Nearest P. O.	Counties.	States.	Fam.	Com.
Daniel McLane,...	Venango.....	Hart's x roads,.	Crawford,....	Penn.	200	500
	Salem.....	do.....	do.....	do		
John France.....	Glade-Run.....	Bakerstown.....	Butler.....	do	60	200
	Mercer.....	Mercer,....	Mercer.....	do	26	83
Isaac Beggs,....	Springfield...	do.....	do.....	do	48	110
	Rocky Spring,...	do.....	do.....	do	56	125
	Coneaut.....	Meadville.....	Crawford,....	do	25	80
Matthew Snodgrass	French Creek,...	do.....	do.....	do	32	30
	Cherry Run.....	do.....	Venango,....	do	20	80
	New Castle.....	New Castle,...	Mercer,....	do	82	70
Alex. Boyd,.....	Neshannock,...	do.....	do.....	do	20	43
	Mount Prospect,.	do.....	do.....	do	25	45
William C. Pollock,	Harmony.....	Harrisville,...	Butler,....	do	80	120
	Unity.....	do.....	do.....	do	55	100

STATISTICAL TABLE OF THE PRESBYTERY OF CAMBRIDGE.

Ministers.	Congregations.	Nearest P. O.	Counties.	States.	Fam.	Com.
Alex. Bullions.....	Cambridge.....	Cambridge.....	Washington.....	N. Y.	131	366
James P. Miller.....	Argyle.....	Lake P.O. N. Y.	do.....	do	120	300
A. Gordon.....	Putnam.....	Putnam.....	do.....	do	48	105
T. Goodwillie.....	Barnet.....	Barnet.....	Caledonia.....	Vt.	80	200
Wm. Pringle.....	Ryegate.....	Ryegate.....	do.....	do	65	143
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 PHILADELPHIA.

Ministers.	Congregations.	Nearest P. O.	Counties.	States.	Fam.	Com.
John Adams,.....	Guinston,.....	.....	York,.....	Penn.	42	100
	Lower Chanceford,...	.....	do.....	do	20	50
W. Easton,.....	Octorara,.....	Coopersville,...	Lancaster,.....	do	65	65
	E. Nottingham,.....	N. Lond. x rds.,...	Chester,.....	do	57	57
F.W. McNaughton.	Muddy Run,.....	Buck,.....	Lancaster,.....	do	20	20
	Mercersburgh,.....	Mercersburgh,...	Franklin,.....	do		102
	McConnellsburgh,...	do.....	do.....	do		
A.T. McGill,.....	Carlisle,.....	Carlisle,.....	Cumberland,...	do		
	Wheatfield,.....	.....	Perry,.....	do		
John S. Easton,...	Dickinson,.....	.....	do.....	do		
	Stone Valley,.....	.....	do.....	do		
	Kishacoquillas,...	.....	do.....	do		
<i>Without charge,...</i>	Lewistown,.....	Lewistown,...	Mifflin,.....	do		
Tho. B. Clarkson,...	Baltimore,.....	Baltimore,.....	Baltimore,.....	Md.		68
Vacancies,.....	Philadelphia,.....	Philadelphia,...	Philadelphia,...	Penn.	86	173
	Huntingdon,.....	Huntingdon,...	Huntingdon,...	do		
	Belfonte,.....	Belfonte,.....	Centre,.....	do		
	Sinking Creek,.....	Potter's Mills,...	do.....	do		

SUMMARY OF THE PRECEDING TABLES.

PRESBYTERIES.	Ministers.	Congregations settled and vacant.	Families.	Communicants.
Cambridge.....	9	8	547	1431
Carolinus.....	2	20	193	436
Ohio.....		19	690	1431
Charters.....	10	16	843	1752
Miami.....	9	31	493	1164
Philadelphia.....	6	13	198	660
Alleghany.....	6	13		
Maskingum.....	9	30	665	1895
Albany.....	8	8	888	976
Shenango.....	6	14	679	1557
Stamford,.....	2	5	35	235
Ministers itinerating.....	17			
<b>Total.</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>176</b>		

*Mr. Barnes's Case.*

We learn that the appeal of Mr. Barnes from the decision of the Synod of Philadelphia, suspending him from the exercise of the ministry, on account of his errors in doctrine, has been sustained by the General Assembly, by a majority of *forty* votes. We have not yet been favored with the proceedings of the Assembly in this interesting case, but hope to lay them before our readers in our next number.

THE  
RELIGIOUS MONITOR,

AND

EVANGELICAL REPOSITORY.

---

JULY, 1836.

---

ART. I.—*Review of an Account of the Secession from the Established Church of Scotland, and of the principles of the Seceders, contained in the first and second numbers of the Biblical Repertory, for 1835.*

REV. AND DEAR BROTHER : In the communications which I have taken the liberty of sending you in time past, I have not thought proper to trouble either you or your readers with an apology. In the present instance, considering the length and character of the accompanying papers, perhaps something of this kind will be considered proper. It would have been more agreeable to me, and have appeared more consistent with candor and brotherly kindness, to have made some reply to the articles contained in the Biblical Repertory, through the medium of their own pages. But as it was understood that the plan of conducting that periodical, would render the insertion of an answer, or of any paper containing a critique upon an article of theirs, improper, there was no just alternative, but either to take no notice of their account of the Secession, or to reply to them through some other medium. I regret that in this way those who might be led into mistakes by their statements, may not have an opportunity of being undeceived ; while, on the other hand, the review will be sent to many who have not had the opportunity of seeing the article reviewed. In order to obviate as far as possible this latter inconvenience, larger extracts are made from the Repertory than would otherwise have been necessary, so that the reader may have before him, and generally in their own words, the statements of the editors. To render this communication of more general interest to your readers, I have also endeavored to connect with the review, some notice of various things besides those mentioned in the Repertory, so that the whole might form, in some measure, *A sketch of the early history of the Secession.* After all, it is not probable that this communication will much, if at all, exceed in length the articles reviewed, which extend to 76 octavo pages. I have only to add, that however imperfectly my task may be performed, it

may still be of service, if it lead to a more careful examination of the facts and doctrines brought under consideration.

Yours, very respectfully,

T. B.

The character of the advocates of a cause cannot affect its intrinsic merits, but it may do much to promote or hinder its success. If the cause of truth had been tried by the character of the church of Israel, their numerous sins and apostacies would have been sufficient to condemn it; and it would not fare better, if tried in the same way, by the history of the New Testament church, or any of its particular branches. The proud spirit of the world renders men forward to defend from every charge both themselves and the nations and societies, with which they are connected: but the spirit of the gospel will lead men freely to acknowledge their own sins, the sins of those among whom they dwell, and the sins of former generations. What churches or individuals are there, who have not cause to blush in reviewing their history, and to own much unfaithfulness and defection, and much of the spirit of the world mingling with the holiest efforts of their zeal? Yet there are many who judge of a cause, not from the direct evidence of its truth and agreement with the word of God, but from the real or supposed character of those who espouse it. Christ himself was rejected, because, not the rulers, but the common people, believed upon him; and his doctrines are often rejected for similar reasons. Men have their minds filled with prejudices against those, who appear for them, and therefore they will neither receive nor examine them. For this reason it seems proper, so far as it can be done with justice, to defend from reproach the characters of those who make a profession of the truth, and especially of those who have been faithful and eminent in maintaining it. Paul, even in writing epistles to be standing rules of faith and practice in the church, employs much of them in defending his character from unjust imputations. He knew that the truth itself could not be affected by his character, and he had self-denial sufficient to bear reproach for Christ's sake; but he also knew that the minds of men might be prejudiced, and the success of his labors hindered by the slanders propagated against him. Therefore, for the truth's sake, he insisted largely upon his own defence.

It would be looking for more than has ever been seen, or will ever occur, to expect that during more than a century, nothing has appeared in the history of the Seceders worthy of blame. The breaches, which have happened among them, clearly prove that besides those infirmities and failings from which no men are free, there must have been errors, and not slight ones, in their judicial proceedings; for, if they had all walked uprightly and according to the truth of the gospel, there could have been no occasion for their sharp contentions, and for their parting asunder. But because we are bound to acknowledge actual offences, we are not bound to submit in silence to unjust accusations. Even if ready, so far as self is concerned, to bear them without resistance, the cause of justice and truth will sometimes forbid it.

In the first and second numbers of the *Biblical Repertory*, for 1835, there have appeared two articles, chiefly relating to the Secession from the Established church of Scotland, and the principles of the Seceders. The occasion of these articles is stated to have been the publication of an "Act and Testimony," by the minority of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian church in 1834. It is justly noticed as a coincidence

somewhat remarkable, that this event took place about a century after the adoption of an "Act and Testimony" by the Seceders from the Church of Scotland, and that the reasons alledged for both deeds were similar defections of the supreme judicatories of the church.

As this account of the secession, though in some respects favorable to them as a society, is yet decidedly against their act of secession, the design of it appears to have been unfriendly to the act and testimony above-mentioned. Yet as this measure appears, contrary to the fears of some, to have been blessed as at least a temporary check to prevailing errors, it is hoped that the Repertory, so far as influenced by such a design, is not sorry that it has been defeated. And if the bearing of these articles were confined to that deed of the minority of the General Assembly, they might be permitted to pass without any particular notice. But there are things said in respect to the origin, principles and history of the Seceders, which are calculated to do injury to that society; and to confirm some common prejudices against them. And without impeaching the motives or the veracity of the editors of the Repertory, there seems room to question whether their statements are supported by satisfactory evidence. They seem to have relied too much on insufficient and partial authorities, and have thus been betrayed into the repetition of charges which have long since been disproved by the minutes of Ecclesiastical courts, and evidence of the most unquestionable character. The books which they appear to have relied on chiefly are, Sir Henry Moncrieff's life of Dr. Erskine, and, A Narrative of the proceedings of the Judicatories against Messrs. E. Erskine, W. Wilson, A. Moncrieff, and J. Fisher, not, as the Repertory states, by "a writer," but by a committee of the commission of the General Assembly. If besides these, they had examined with the same care, the writings of the opposite side, they would have been able to have written a more impartial history. As it is, truth requires that some of their statements should be tried by other authorities besides those to which they have referred.

Sir H. Moncrieff being a late writer, though not entitled to the same credit as to facts, with those who lived in the midst of the things related, it might yet be expected that he would far excel them in impartiality. And he is by no means deficient in professions of candor; but his profuse disavowal of all prejudice and partiality, is calculated to excite suspicion rather than ensure credit. And the fact that this author has travelled so much out of his way to make remarks upon the Seceders, must strengthen this unfavorable suspicion. He must have labored under some peculiar prejudice against the Seceders, when in writing the life of a man who had no particular connection or concern with them, and who did not enter on public life till many years after the secession took place, he yet turns aside from his proper business as a biographer, and employs a great part of his book in abusing that society. The degree of his impartiality is sufficiently evident from the fact, that he seldom speaks of the Seceders, but in connection with some charge of ill-nature, obstinacy, bigotry, rudeness, stupidity, low ambition, keenness, and "keenness irritated in no common degree." He ridicules the doctrine of the "divine right" of those "who have been called," as he says, "*the christian people*," to choose their own ministers, and speaks contemptuously of those of the clergy, who began to entertain "what *they considered* conscientious scruples" against the induction of a minister contrary to the will of the congregation. He calls those, who op-



posed patronage and these violent settlements, "a popular party," and represents the Seceders as the "keenest of the popular demagogues among the clergy." Yet while so severe against those, who advocated the just rights of the people, he speaks in the most favorable terms of Dr. Robertson, and those who acted with him in upholding the system of patronage, while he frequently admits that they accommodated themselves to the times, passing acts without any view to the influence of those acts on their decisions in particular cases, and yearly instructing their Commission to lay before the king and parliament "the grievance of patronage," while they were doing all in their power to establish the very system of which they professed to complain. And the reason of these proceedings is stated not to have been any change of system or principle, but only that they might not disturb the prejudices of the people. How much this author loves Presbyterianism, may be learned from his accounting for the opposition to Whitefield in Scotland, on the ground that the people were "prejudiced against him by their hereditary scruples with regard to Episcopacy." And he censures the advocates of the *divine right* of Presbytery and of Episcopacy as equally ill-tempered and bigotted. His words are: "The old Presbyterians began in the seventeenth century to torment themselves with controversies about church government, and to turn the world upside down by pleading the *divine and exclusive* authority of Presbytery in the church of Christ. The church of England soon turned the tables on the Presbyterians, and pleaded against them the divine and exclusive authority of Episcopacy, for which a certain proportion of her members have ever since strenuously contended. It is hard to tell by which of the parties the argument of *divine right* was maintained with least temper or with most bigotry." He considers that placing the authority on this footing weakens its influence, and fixes attention more on *forms* than on the substance of our faith. Appendix to the life of Dr. Erskine, p. 507.

The Narrative of the committee of the Commission which cast out the Seceders from the communion of the church, considering the agitations of the time when it was written, and the source from which it emanated, is still less entitled to implicit credit. Its partial statements, and its mutilation of the documents of church courts, in order to confirm its unfair representations, were unanswerably exposed soon after it was written, in "a Review," published by the four brethren "for their just and necessary vindication." In this Review they prove by documents attested by the clerks of the judicatories, that their case had been altogether misrepresented; and they alledge that "there is scarce any matter of fact which is not artfully disguised or misrepresented by the narrators." But more of the character of this Narrative will appear in the sequel.

The editors of the Repertory speak of their unwillingness to revive these old disputes, and though they could hardly have anticipated, that the Seceders would take in good part all that is said against them, yet the Seceders might with great propriety have held their peace, were it not that those writings, in which their principles and proceedings are defended against these misrepresentations, are not of common occurrence in this country. They have gradually ceased to look back with any particular interest upon their early history, and the disputes of that day; but their thanks may be justly due to the Repertory, should their interest be revived by means of the articles under consideration.

There are two things done in the beginning of these articles which

tend greatly to prepossess the mind of the reader against the secession, and so to prevent the just influence of facts afterwards stated. In the first place a very unfavorable view is given of the original Seceders, and especially of the Rev. Ebenezer Erskine, who had a chief influence in occasioning this breach. And in the second place a very limited view is given of the grounds of their secession. The reader, who has no information beyond what he derives from this account, will readily conclude that this separation from the Established Church was altogether owing to the inflamed passions and unreasonable obstinacy of Mr. E. Erskine and his associates. The corruptions in doctrine, and many of the tyrannical acts, of which the seceders complained, are not mentioned previously to the account of their secession, or stated as among the grounds of it, but only patronage; and the most offensive things connected with this are not noticed. The opposition to it is represented as made by a new party in the church, and upon new and untenable grounds. Then the sermon of Mr. Erskine on the 4th of June, 1732, is noticed, and characterized as "full of inflammatory declamation," and unwarrantable assertions of the *divine right* of the people to elect their own pastors. In his sermon, before the Synod of Perth and Stirling, on the following October, which occasioned the breach, he is said to have "affirmed the same doctrine in terms equally unqualified, and of equal keenness and asperity." He and his associates are represented as having their feelings exasperated by the settlement of a minister in Kinross, in which two of those, who were afterwards leaders in the secession, were deeply involved.\* The act of the assembly 1732, is described as making no material change in relation to the law of patronage. Mr. Erskine is said to have gone much farther than he was warranted to do in his opposition to this act, &c. &c. Thus, according to this "respectable writer," as he is designated in the Repertory, the foundation of the secession was laid in the ungovernable passions of weak men, inflamed partly by the unimportant changes of an act no ways unscriptural or unreasonable, and partly by personal considerations.

#### THE CHARACTER OF THE FIRST SECEDERS.

In examining these statements the first thing which appears to call for attention is the character of the first Seceders, and especially of the Rev. Ebenezer Erskine. There is, throughout these articles, hardly a favorable trait in his character presented to our view. He is represented as preaching sermons "full of inflammatory declamations," and as "laying down in broad and unqualified terms, the *divine right* of the

---

\* It would have been doing more justice, both to truth and to Sir H. Moncrieff, to have given the whole of his account of this affair, instead of selecting that part only which contains the severest reflection upon the Seceders, and leaves on the mind the impression that Mr. Ralph Erskine, (brother of Ebenezer,) and Mr. Thomas Mair, had some personal interest in the settlement. Sir H. M. states that this settlement met with great opposition both from the parishioners and the Presbytery. "The Assembly," says he, "had not only appointed the settlement of Kinross to be carried into execution with circumstances of peculiar severity, but they had prohibited the clerks from receiving any dissents from their sentence, or a protest which was offered from the bar by Mr. Ralph Erskine and others. The following assembly treated them with still greater severity. In 1733, Mr. Ralph Erskine, Mr. Mair and others, were rebuked at the bar for their determined refusal to enrol Mr. Stark then minister of Kinross, as a member of the Presbytery of Dunfermline. The assembly treated them with unmerited and useless severity; when not satisfied with having rebuked them before, they commanded them, in the high tone of Church authority, to acknowledge Mr. Stark as minister of Kinross; though after his enrolment by the assembly, they had already judicially declared their willingness to treat him as a brother." Sir H. M. says, "there was an intemperance on both sides," but according to his own showing the reason for the exasperation was on the side of the seceders. (*Appendix to life of Dr. Erskine*, pp. 444, 445.)

people at large to elect their own pastors." A horrible doctrine, indeed, with such honorable divines as "Sir Henry Moncrieff Wellwood;" but it may well occasion some surprize to find such an anti-republican, as well as anti-scriptural sentiment, quoted with implied approbation by American Presbyterians. It may be noticed, in passing, that the doctrine of Mr. Erskine and the Seceders did not include the "people at large" as entitled to vote for their pastors, unless by the people at large be meant only such as are in the communion of the church. Mr. Erskine is also described as using "keenness and asperity" in his language, "inflaming the minds of the people,—acting with unreasonable intemperance and pertinacity,—railing and declaiming against the church and his brethren." The sermons which occasioned so much noise, are said not to be "in any respect worthy the attention which was given them," and had it not been for "the inflammable matter which they contain, their defects in argument and substance would soon have consigned them to oblivion." He is said not to have possessed "a temper in the least conciliatory," to have been "perfectly inflexible;" and this obstinacy is set off to great advantage by placing in contrast with it, the mild and conciliatory course pursued towards him by the church courts. He is represented as haughty, impatient both of delay and control, and as so full of bitterness that he entertained people, even on sacramental occasions, with invectives against the church and her proceedings. He and his associates are spoken of as men who continually made their appeals to the people, and trusted to their influence with them; and their followers are spoken of as "the poor deluded people seduced to take part in this division." In a word, according to the author followed by the Repertory, the leaders of the secession were "demagogues," and agreeably to this hypothesis all their motives and proceedings are interpreted. They were both fawning and imperious, intemperate, unreasonable, obstinate, intoxicated by the admiration which they excited, bent on making and increasing a party, and they suited their principles and measures to this grand aim. Their followers are also said to have "increased beyond what either the nature of their controversy with the church, or the weight of talents of their original leaders, could have led either their friends or their opponents to anticipate."

Where there is a question about the characters of men who lived in remote times, the chief authorities must be their writings, if they have left any, and the testimony of their contemporaries. In both these respects there are abundant means for ascertaining the real character of the first Seceders. And it may be said with confidence that both the writings of these men, and the testimony of contemporaries, not excepting their enemies, prove their character to have been quite the reverse of that which is given in the Repertory. There must be some strange perversity, in the mind of that man, who could, after reading the works of the Rev. E. Erskine, deliberately pronounce them to be "weak in argument and substance," dry and uninteresting, or keen and inflammatory, for they have been represented both ways. It would also be strange if he could persuade himself that the author had been a haughty, ambitious, and imperious demagogue. These opinions of the Rev. Baronet are so peculiar to himself that they hardly need refutation. The christian public has judged with high favor of the works of this faithful and persecuted servant of Christ. His sermons have long been considered as holding rank among the foremost for

sound doctrine, energy of expression, and a spirit of sincere, scriptural and elevated devotion. The numerous impressions of his works are a plain evidence, that they have other interest to keep them from oblivion beyond the controversies in which the author was involved. They have found favor with others besides plain people, and others besides the ecclesiastical associates of the author. Bradbury among the English divines speaks highly of them in a recommendatory preface. Hervey, also, in his *Theron and Aspasio*, says, "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." Toplady in his *Diary* speaks in almost rapturous strains of the communion enjoyed with God in reading Erskine's sermons.\* Mr. Archibald Hall, of London, in his treatise on the faith of the gospel, acknowledges his vast obligations to Mr. Erskine's sermons on the Assurance of Faith, and particularly recommends them to his readers. Hannam in his *Pulpit Assistant*, has formed many of his best skeletons from the sermons of the two brothers. Dr. Erskine himself appears to have been of a very different opinion from his biographer. In a note in the first volume of his sermons, he says with his characteristic candour, "The evangelical strain of Boston of Etrick, and some of the first leaders of the secession, is indeed justly valued by many serious christians of almost all denominations." Dr. Williams in his "*Christian Preacher*" places the works of the brothers in a list of books recommended to students and preachers. "Ralph and Ebenezer Erskine's works," says he, "are voluminous, highly evangelical, the productions of minds strongly attached to truth, devotional, and zealous." And to these testimonies may be added that of Sir H. Moncrieff himself. After all the severe things which he says of the first Seceders, he admits that they acted honestly," that they were men of "worth and principle," that "many of them were not inferior to their contemporaries, and that as preachers they had popular talents, &c." How they could at the same time be honest and designing; men of worth and principle, and yet demagogues; men not inferior to their contemporaries, and who had popular talents, and yet men without weight or talents, it may not be easy to see; but the favorable testimony which necessity extorts from an enemy, may justly be regarded as of the highest value.

\* "Friday, 22.—Bought Erskine's sermons in three volumes. At night I spent three or four hours reading Erskine's sermons; particularly the following ones: 'The rent veil of the Temple;' 'The harmony of the Divine Attributes;' 'The believer exalted in imputed righteousness;' and 'Faith's plea upon God's word and covenant.' The reading of these sweet discourses was wonderfully blest 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.

"Saturday, 23.—Before I retired to my chamber I read Erskine's sermon (a matchless one it is,) entitled, 'The promising God, a performing God;' and the Lord set the seal of his Spirit upon my heart. I was enabled to mix faith with what I read; and God made it a time of love, joy, peace, and spiritual refreshment to my soul. I could look and pray to him as my covenant God in Jesus Christ, who loved me from everlasting, and will love me without end.

"Sunday, 24.—Between the morning and afternoon service, I read Erskine's sermon entitled, 'The King held in the galleries;' not without much comfort and confirmation in Christ. At night, read Erskine's sermon entitled, 'The humble soul the peculiar favorite of heaven.'

"Wednesday, 10.—The Lord was gracious to my soul this afternoon. His Spirit was the comforter, and Mr. Erskine's two sermons on 'The Rainbow of the Covenant,' were the channel through which that comfort was conveyed.

"Sunday, 17.—My cough was rather troublesome to-day. After evening service, I was much cheered and refreshed in soul while reading Mr. Erskine's sermon entitled, 'Faith's plea on God's word and covenant.'" (*Toplady's works, vol. I. pp. 37, 38, 39, 40, 77.*)

The talents and attainments of Fisher, another of the leaders of the secession, are somewhat known in this country, where his explanation of the shorter catechism has been frequently reprinted, and among the friends of evangelical doctrine is held in the highest repute as a manual for beginners; and some who look upon themselves as considerably advanced in knowledge, might advance still farther by perusing it. The works of Moncrieff and Wilson, the other two of the first four Seceders, and the works of others, who afterwards united with them, do not show them to have been destitute of weight or talent, but for soundness, faithfulness, and even talent, the brightest ornaments of the church in their day. The talents of E. Erskine, we are told by his biographers, were such as attracted crowds to his church from the distance of ten or twelve miles on ordinary occasions, and on sacramental occasions from the distance of fifty or sixty. It was customary when the sacrament of the supper was dispensed to have preaching out of doors, to accommodate those who could not obtain entrance into the church, and to have this preaching in two different places, the assembly being too great to admit of their all hearing one man. Is it not probable that a man who gained and preserved such an uncommon reputation in one place, if he had travelled about as Whitefield did, might have gained a similar reputation abroad? If he came behind him in eloquence, it can hardly be denied that he exceeded him in more substantial qualities. A saying of the Rev. Adam Gib is recorded, which may convey some idea of Mr. Erskine's manner. "Mr. Gib having asked a certain young preacher, some time after Mr. Erskine's death, whether he had ever heard him, and being answered in the negative, replied: Well, then, sir, you never heard the gospel in its majesty." His manner is described as peculiarly dignified and impressive, so as sometimes to convince and silence adversaries by a single sentence. Those who have written accounts of his life give him a character altogether different from that contained in the Repertory. They represent him, indeed, as firm in maintaining what he believed to be truth, and bold and zealous in advocating the cause of Christ and the rights of his people, but not ill-tempered or obstinate. On the contrary, they describe him as mild, humble, yielding to the utmost that a sense of duty would permit; and as exceedingly benevolent and affectionate. Extracts from his diary, in which he speaks of his public discourses and private afflictions, show him to have been a man who walked closely with God. The record of his childlike simplicity, his faith and patience under his family afflictions, and in his last illness, could hardly fail to draw tears even from the eyes of those who may have regarded him as a blind, ambitious, and furious zealot.

How the character of Mr. Erskine and his associates stood where they were best known, will appear from the petitions sent up from various sources to the Commission which suspended them. The Presbytery of Stirling, of which Mr. Erskine was a member, say in their "representation and address:" "Mr. Erskine's character is so established amongst the body of professors of this part of the church, that we believe even the authority of an Assembly condemning him, cannot lessen it; yea, the condemnation itself, in the present case, will tend to heighten it." They also add, with much good sense in relation to his alleged offence, which was "*offering to protest*," that "no supreme court either in church or state ever punished such a crime; there is no law against it." The Kirk-session of Stirling, of which Mr. Erskine

was pastor, after a high commendation of his gifts, diligence, and success, in the ministry, add, "These being all attended with a very tender walk, wise and prudent behavior, have made him most acceptable to us, and persons of all distinctions in this place, and particularly God's serious remnant in it." They also warn the Commission that such was the general confidence in the justice of Mr. Erskine's cause, that a sentence against him would have the most unhappy effects, particularly "alienating the minds and hearts of the people from that respect and affection which otherwise they owe to ministers, church judicatories, and their commissions." And they consider it probable that these effects will extend to "most of the corners of the church." The provost, bailies and town council of Stirling, testify that they had always lived in good friendship with Mr. Erskine. They say, "We find him to be a man of *peaceable* disposition of mind, and of a religious walk and conversation, and to be every way fitted and qualified for discharging the office of the ministry amongst us, and that he has accordingly discharged the same to our great satisfaction." Other similar petitions from presbyteries, sessions and town councils, either relating to individuals, or to the general merits of the case, clearly show that the first Seceders must have occupied a high place in public estimation, to excite so general and so lively an interest in their favor.

Sir H. Moncrieff is obliged to own that they were men of "worth and principle," and this admission destroys the force of the accusations with which he so unsparingly loads them; for such men could not be influenced by the low, selfish motives, to which he attributes the most of their proceedings. If they had been such worthless men as his general account would lead us to suppose, they would have been the last to leave the establishment, with its honours and advantages. If they were demagogues, they were such demagogues as Moses, who "refused to be called the son of Pharaoh's daughter, choosing rather to suffer affliction with the people of God, than to enjoy the pleasures of sin for a season, esteeming the reproach of Christ greater riches than the treasures of Egypt." If they gained the favour of the people, it was like John the Baptist, not by flattery, but by faithfulness. And if they inflamed the minds of the people, their works show that it must have been as Christ inflamed the minds of his disciples, opening up the scriptures till their hearts were made to burn within them.

Neither the writings of the Seceders, nor of most others who lived in that age, are now regarded as suitable models in respect to method and style; but those who can be satisfied with clear illustrations of the truth, and richness of thought, without the ornaments of style, will not find their time lost in perusing their works. In learning and judgment, it is confessed they come behind Owen, Charnock, and some others of the English divines; but in sound evangelical views, in practical applications, and in fervour of spirit, they equal if they do not excel them. Those who are pleased with writers of the one class, will never disdain those of the other.

**THE GROUNDS OF THE PROCESS AGAINST MR. ERSKINE AND HIS BRETHREN OF THE SECESSION.**

To form a correct opinion of the occasion, rather than of the grounds of the secession, it is necessary to explain the course of the Assembly respecting patronage, more fully than it is done in the Repertory.—They quote with apparent approbation the remarks of Sir H. Mon-

crieff in which he denies that there was any material change made by the act of 1732, and also those remarks in which he ridicules the doctrine of the *divine* right of the people to choose their own ministers. Now if there was little or no evil in patronage, and little or no change in the laws relating to it, the opposition of the seceders may justly be considered as liable to censure. But neither of these positions is true. The nature of patronage is well enough explained in the Repertory, but there is no just exhibition of the evils of it. It consists in an individual's having the right to present a minister to a vacant congregation without the choice of the people. This right may be bought and sold. It may be, and often is, vested in the hands of wicked and worthless men. Thus a power over the church in the most important of her spiritual concerns, is transferred to the world; a right is given to her enemies to rule over her. The scriptures, by sanctioning what "even nature teaches," plainly sanction the right of congregations to choose their own ministers. It would be counted an intolerable bondage, if families were obliged to receive servants thrust upon them without their consent, and in opposition to their will; and it is surely a just ground of complaint when the household of faith is oppressed by such tyranny. The passages of scripture referred to in proof of the *divine* right of the church to choose her own officers, were such as the following: Acts i. 23—26, vi. 2—7, xiv. 23; 2 Cor. viii. 19, 23; Heb. v. 4, 5; Eph. iv. 11—13. The consequences of transferring this right to others, must necessarily be the introduction of worthless men into the ministry, and such a separation of interests and affections between them and the people, as must be unfavorable to their diligence and success in pastoral duties.

But though this evil had become incorporated with the establishment, the church had it in her power to counteract it. The presentations were in the hands of patrons, but the ministers and settlements were in the hands of the church. For many years previous to the secession, she had used her power in counteracting this evil, and the oppression of it was hardly felt. No minister was settled in a parish to which he had a presentation, without the choice or concurrence of the people. But as the number of those who had obtained, or were expecting settlements by patronage, increased, they began to be anxious to free themselves from this check, and in 1732, the Assembly which had till of late uniformly opposed this system, became the advocate of patronage, and adopted the principle itself, by excluding the people from a choice of their ministers, and vesting it wholly in the elders and heritors, (landholders.) As the heritors might be more numerous than the elders, they might elect a minister, and ministers were actually elected and settled in this way in opposition both to all the elders and heads of families in the congregation. These heritors might be such as did not reside in the parish, they might belong to another communion, or to no communion; in short, they might be any thing but papists. It is evident then that this act of the Assembly, contained in it both the principle and the evil of patronage, divested of all the previous checks by which it had been guarded. It was also passed, as the Repertory notices, in an unconstitutional manner, not merely as the editors assert, because it had not been transmitted to the Presbyteries for their judgment, but because it had been transmitted to them, and their judgment was decisively against it. Twelve Presbyteries sent up instructions for amendments, some of which were in their nature subversive of the

act; thirty-one instructed against it entirely, in all forty-three; and only six were absolutely for it. Eighteen made no report on the subject. It must, therefore, be regarded as an unconstitutional act, and so null and void. How far it agreed with the principles formerly held will appear by a reference to the deeds of the church, from the most ancient times on to the time when this act was passed. The second book of discipline of the church of Scotland, was agreed upon by the General Assembly in 1578, and inserted in the registers of Assembly, 1581. It was sworn to in the national covenant, revived and ratified by the Assembly of 1638, and by many other acts of Assembly. The church government was established according to it in 1592 and 1690. A few quotations from this will show whether it was a new thing to oppose patronage, and to place this opposition on scriptural grounds. In the twelfth chapter of this book of discipline, it is said: "The liberty of the election of persons called to the ecclesiastical functions, and observed without interruption, so long as the kirk was not corrupted by Antichrist, we desire to be restored and retained within this realm. So that none be intruded upon any congregation, either by the prince, or any inferior person, without lawful election, and the assent of the people over whom the person is placed, as the practice of the apostolical and primitive kirk and good order craves. And because this order, which God's word craves, cannot stand with patronages and presentation to benefices used in the Pope's kirk, we desire all them that truly fear God, earnestly to consider, that forasmuch as the names of patronages and benefices, together with the effect thereof, have flowed from the Pope, and corruption of the canon law only, in so far as thereby any person was intended or placed over kirks having *curam animarum*, [the care of souls.] [Patronages of another kind are afterwards excepted and allowed.] And forasmuch as that manner of proceeding has no ground in the word of God, but is contrary to the same, and to the said liberty of election, they ought not to have place in this light of reformation. And therefore whosoever will embrace God's word, and desire the kingdom of his son Jesus Christ to be advanced, they will also embrace and receive that policy and order which the word of God, and upright estate of his kirk craves, otherwise it is in vain that they have professed the same."

The act then passed, which, in the Repertory, is said to have been so much the same with the act of 1732, ordains that the heritors and elders shall name and propose a minister to the congregation, to be approved or disapproved by them.

If the statements of the Repertory were correct, they would reflect much honor upon the Seceders, of which, if we inherit the spirit which they are pleased to attribute to our fathers, we might be forward to avail ourselves in these United States. They represent us to have been the first who ever appeared as the advocates of the right of the people to choose their own ministers. Our doctrine on this subject is represented as novel; the opponents of our fathers said it was novel among all the reformed churches. And when, even in this free, republican land, we hear of congregations having several hundred communicants, and yet reduced down by certain charter rules to thirty or forty voters in the election of a pastor, our brethren need not be surprised if we begin to trim over the old armour, and prepare to renew our battles against the evils of patronage.

But to return to the act of 1732: The bearing of the preceding re-



marks will be more fully seen in considering the process against Mr. Erskine. In the mean time, it is left to every reader to judge for himself, whether ministers of the gospel should have been censured for declaring publicly their disapprobation of such an act, and whether they should have been cast out of the church for refusing to repent of this freedom.

Having set aside the consent of the people as necessary, the Assembly also by subsequent measures forbade ministers to admit to communion such as refused submission to those who were intruded upon them according to the aforesaid act. They prohibited the recording of any protests or of any dissents; they even refused to read representations against their proceedings. In one instance a petition signed by forty-two ministers, in another, a petition signed by more than seventeen hundred people, could not obtain a hearing. These were surely, what all impartial persons must acknowledge them to be, high-handed and tyrannical acts. It is not on the ground of their opposition to these measures, that most people have been disposed to censure the Seceders. Even the editors of the *Repertory*, in their second article, acknowledge that they are not disposed to commence their censure of the Seceders at this point, but only where a door being left open for them they refused to return. This acknowledgement, however, is inconsistent with their previous account of the process against Mr. Erskine and his brethren, in which the weight of the blame is cast upon them. In their second article they seem to have forsaken their first guides, "the Narrative," and the "judicious Sir H. Moncrieff," and to have followed the "impartial" Willison. It is at least difficult, without supposing such a change of guides, to account for the inconsistencies which occur in their statements and judgments of the same things.

Besides the preceding remarks respecting patronage and the course pursued by the assembly in relation to it, it will be proper, also, before considering the process against Mr. Erskine, to advert to some matters which may afterwards be more fully considered, in order to show the state of things in the church of Scotland at the time of the Secession. In 1720 the Assembly had condemned various precious truths contained in a book called "*The marrow of Modern Divinity*," and thereby encouraged a strain of legal preaching prevalent at the time, which is generally acknowledged to have resembled the philosophy of the heathens more than the gospel of Christ. In 1721, a representation was made in opposition to this act by twelve ministers, and in ludicrous allusion to their number, twelve queries were proposed to them, probably without any serious expectation of an answer. But these twelve representers, among whom were Messrs. Hogg, Boston, and other eminent divines, presented an answer to the twelve queries to the Assembly of 1722. They have been frequently reprinted, and have commanded the admiration of Hervey and other distinguished men. The assembly aware of the offence which their act had given, and influenced perhaps by the clear and forcible answers returned to their queries, passed an explanatory act relating to the *Marrow*, expressed in more moderate terms than the former, but without any retraction. The twelve brethren were solemnly rebuked and admonished. They were also reviled in various publications, as men of wild and anti-nomian principles,—innovators in religion,—opposed to the Confession of Faith,—enemies to morality,—troublers of Israel,—arrogant, and seeking pre-eminence at the expense of their brethren. Similar reproaches were also cast upon them by the

dominant clergy from the pulpit, particularly in *sermons at the opening of Synods.*

Owing to the vehemence of principal Haddow of St. Andrews, the most inquisitorial proceedings were resorted to against Messrs. E. and R. Erskine, Hogg, Bathgate and Wardlaw, five of the representers. They were even urged to subscribe anew the Confession of Faith as explained by the act of 1722 in condemnation of the Marrow. In 1721 some of Mr. Erskine's discourses were complained of, and in 1725 he was arraigned before the Commission of the Assembly, by the Rev. Andrew Anderson, on the ground of complaints against seven of his sermons, some of them preached ten years before. The Rev. D. Fraser who states these things in his life of Mr. Erskine, observes that "Under these teasing circumstances he was helped to discover an invincible zeal for what he prized as divine and important truth, blended with christian meekness and candour. He was accustomed to speak of the act of 1720 as an oversight. Notwithstanding the protest which he and his brethren had taken, he forbore publicly recommending the book condemned by the Assembly; and even when he spoke favorably of it in private, he qualified his expressions by telling the people that it contained some unguarded expressions. Towards those clergymen, too, from whom he had experienced the most injurious and illiberal treatment, he manifested a gentle and forgiving spirit."

In 1729 process was instituted a second time against the Rev. John Simpson, Professor of Divinity in the University of Glasgow, for various errors, and particularly for denying the necessary existence and supreme divinity of the Son of God. The Assembly, after a discussion of eight days, merely suspended him from his office till another Assembly should see fit to take off this sentence; though it was generally expected that he would be deposed, and a majority of presbyteries had given their judgment to that effect. The Assembly, also, though repeatedly urged to it, refused to publish any explicit warning against his errors. It is necessary in examining the history of the secession to bear these things in mind. Opposition to an act of corruption or tyranny appears in a very different light when regarded as a solitary act, and when regarded as a part of a system regularly and obstinately pursued.

On the 10th of October 1732, Mr. Erskine preached the sermon at the opening of the Synod of Perth and Stirling, which occasioned the secession. The text was Ps. cxviii, 22, "The stone which the builders refused, is become the head stone of the corner." This sermon has been frequently reprinted with his other works, and separately. The passages on which the process was founded, are distinguished in most, if not all, the different editions; and any one who reads them can hardly fail to unite with the Repertory in surprise, that any church court should have deemed it necessary or expedient to notice them at all. Some of the members of the Synod having expressed their dissatisfaction with this sermon, a committee was appointed to lay before them those particulars which gave offence. This committee appointed a sub-committee to deal with Mr. Erskine, and these not succeeding, laid before the general committee notes of expressions said to have been used by him, with remarks upon the same. These the general committee transmitted to the Synod with amendments, but at the same time declaring that it was "without giving any judgment upon the remarks." These remarks were only made by Mr. Mercer, Mr. Mackie, and some

others of those who were most violent against Mr. Erskine. The Synod never adopted them; their committee did not even give judgment respecting them. This fact is sufficient to show the unfairness of the Repertory in giving an abstract of these remarks as the "actual charges" and the grounds of the censure voted against Mr. Erskine. The grounds of the Synod's censure were embraced in eight propositions, instead of the four remarks quoted by the Repertory; and though these propositions in their abstract form, do not equal justice to Mr. Erskine with the words of his sermon as published by himself, yet it may gratify the curiosity of the reader, and furnish him with authentic information as to the process, to see them. They are as follows:

"Proposition 1. He left it to the conscience of every one to judge what of these corruptions were to be found among ourselves at this day.

Prop. 2. That mistaken notions of the kingdom of Jesus Christ, was the ground of many things that were wrong among us at this day.

Prop. 3. The Jewish teachers being connected with the great, trampled upon the people as an unhallowed mob.

Prop. 4. In order to one's being accounted a builder, there were two things necessary, the call of God and the call of the church. That they who had not the call of the church, should be looked upon as thieves and robbers. And this call ought not to be by the heritors, or any other set of men, but by the whole church. And that a minister had not God's call, who had only a call from the heritors, or any other set of men.

Prop. 5. That this was a natural right that every society had, to choose servants for themselves; and that it would be accounted a great bondage and servitude upon any family, if foreigners were to choose servants for them, and that certainly the church had a power of choosing their own ministers, seeing they were the freest society upon earth.\*

Prop. 6. That after the late wonderful revolution, by which our church was delivered, it might have been expected that this church would have given some testimony against these encroachments; but that he did not remember whether they had ever made an act, asserting the headship of our Lord Jesus, since the revolution.

Prop. 7. That a cry had gone up to heaven about these things in the words of the spouse, *The watchmen that went about the city had found her, and taken away her veil from her, and smote her.* And that this cry came before the bar of the last General Assembly, but instead of redressing this and other grievances, they increased them by lodging the power of election in heritors and elders, excluding the people, whereby Christ was deeply wounded in his members. That whatever church-authority was in that act, there was nothing of the authority of the head of the church in it. That he was sure it had no foundation in scripture, where there are no distinctions in spiritual matters made betwixt the *rich man with the gold ring, in gay clothing, and the poor man.* That if Christ were personally present, (and I being here, by the appointment of the Synod in his stead) I say were Christ personally present he would say to you, *Forasmuch as ye have done it unto one of these little ones, ye have done it unto me.*

---

\* See the above sentiment beautifully illustrated in Dr. Witherspoon's "Corporation of Servants," in which the absurdity and evil of patronage are exposed with equal wit and good judgment.

Prop. 8. Ministers are not to be *dumb dogs* when their fellow builders go wrong; and tho' this will offend, yet he behaved to speak."

It may be proper to mention here in general, that Mr. Erskine was appointed by the Synod of Perth and Stirling to be rebuked for maintaining the above propositions. To this sentence he refused to submit, and appealed to the next General Assembly. In this appeal he was joined by Mr. Fisher. Messrs. Moncrieff, Wilson, Gillespie, Bowis, McIntosh, Baillie Gib, Coventrie, Brugh, Halay, Frier, Ramsey, Gow, and John Beaton, dissented, also Mr. Meik the moderator. When the cause was tried before the Assembly, the sentence of the Synod was confirmed, and Mr. Erskine was rebuked at their bar. After he was rebuked, he offered a protest, signed also by Messrs. Fisher, Wilson, and Moncrieff, purporting that he and they should still be at liberty to preach the same doctrine advanced in his sermon. This protest they refused to retract, on which account the Assembly ordered them to appear before their Commission to meet in August next, and if persisting in this refusal, they were to be suspended, and afterwards punished by higher censure, which sentences were accordingly inflicted upon them by the Commission at their meetings in August and November, and in consequence of this the protesters were obliged to make a Secession.

It is to be supposed that some of the aforementioned propositions contained things so exceptionable as to call for such censures, which, even as they stand in the Synod's deed, it is not necessary to admit; yet the church courts never made any distinction, so that their acts required Mr. Erskine, to retract all and every one of the above propositions, and not to teach the same doctrines any more. It may also be noticed that when the case came before the Assembly, they placed him under still greater difficulty as to the compatibility of submission with duty, for they not only condemned all the propositions laid before them by the Synod, but added a condemnation of Mr. Erskine's answers.

An attempt is made to take off the odium of these tyrannical proceedings, by representing the censures as founded not upon the matter contained in the sermon, but only upon Mr. Erskine's manner. In this the Repertory follows the "Narrative" already alluded to, and studies to keep this view of the case constantly before the mind of the reader. It is said that Mr. Erskine was dealt with "merely for rough language," that "he was repeatedly informed that the Synod did not censure him for holding and expressing different sentiments from themselves with respect to the act of 1732, or for expressing his opinions upon all suitable occasions in a decent and proper manner; but he was to be rebuked for exclaiming against the church, in a manner that savoured more of self-conceit and passion, than of the spirit of meekness and humility." The censure is said to have been for "railing and declaiming"—and for "indecent expressions," not for any unsoundness in doctrine. If this view of the case were correct, it only makes against the Synod, Assembly and Commission, that they proceeded so far as to rebuke a man for his *manner* of preaching, when there was nothing exceptionable in the *matter*. And that they finally cast out of their communion these four men, merely because they could not be made sensible of such a manner as was imputed to one of them.

The "Narrative of the Committee," in order to establish this plea in favour of the church judicatories, proceeded so far as to give the world the sentence against Mr. Erskine in a mutilated form. A full copy of this sentence was published by the Seceders in their defence, and it

sufficiently exposes the weakness of this plea. The first half of it is omitted in the "Narrative," for very obvious reasons. The entire act is in these words:

"Edinburgh, May 15th, 1733. The General Assembly having at a former diet, considered an appeal by Mr. Ebenezer Erskine, minister at Stirling, from a sentence of the Synod of Perth and Stirling, wherein the said Synod had found ground to censure him, and appointed him to be rebuked, on account of several indecent expressions uttered by him in a sermon preached by him before the said Synod in October last; tending to disquiet the peace of this church, and impugning several acts of Assembly and proceedings of church judicatories; and had appointed him to be admonished to behave orderly for the future. The Assembly found these expressions vented by Mr. Erskine, and contained in the minutes of the aforesaid Synod's proceedings, with the answers thereto made by him, to be offensive, and to tend to disturb the peace and good order of this church; therefore they approved the proceedings of the Synod, and appointed him to be rebuked and admonished at their own bar in order to terminate the process, which was done accordingly."

It will be seen at once that it was not mere manner and rough language, which the Synod and Assembly had in view, when they appointed Mr. Erskine to be censured for "impugning several acts of Assembly and proceedings of the church judicatories." Any one who will look at the propositions will see that the sentiments and not the words were the grounds of offence. Much more is it evident that not the manner but the matter was intended, when the Assembly was so enraged against Mr. Erskine for protesting, not for the liberty of repeating rough language, but for liberty to preach the same doctrines advanced in his sermon. If the views of the Narrative and Repertory were correct, this protest would have satisfied all. It not only contained all that Mr. Erskine craved, but conceded all that the church courts were demanding. They were for condemning the manner and allowing liberty as to the doctrine, which was all that Mr. Erskine sought. Another fact is equally unfavorable to this view of the case. Mr. Moncrieff, in his reasons of dissent from the deed of Synod finding Mr. Erskine censurable, affirms that before the vote was put, he wished an explanation as to this very point, whether the manner of expression or the matter of the sermon was the thing to be judged. "Several members of the Synod," says he, "upon this motion declared that they looked upon him as censurable not only for the manner of expression, but the matter." He and others accordingly voted that Mr. Erskine was "not censurable," considering that the vote included a censure of his doctrines, which they could not agree to condemn, though professing a willingness that he should be dealt with for expressions which might have given unintentional offence.

The four brethren, in their "Review of the Narrative," mention that the Committee of the Assembly appointed to deal with them after they had protested, "Plainly told them it was unjustifiable to speak from the pulpit against any act of assembly, or the proceedings of church judicatories; and that if they could not be silent from speaking against acts of Assembly, and the proceedings of judicatories, then they should go out of the church." This is the report of that interview published by the four brethren and never contradicted.

THE SPIRIT WITH WHICH THE PROCESS WAS CONDUCTED.

A good deal is said in the Repertory about the mild and conciliatory spirit of the church courts, by which Mr. Erskine and his associates were tried, and of the various attempts made by them to prevent the breach with which they were threatened. Some of the proofs of such a spirit are rather singular; such as, that the only sentence which the Synod thought of inflicting, was "a simple rebuke and admonition." And, again, "Mr. Erskine was assured that the admonition should be tendered in the mildest and softest terms." There is no doubt but that the judicatories were anxious to prevent a breach, which would impair the very power, which they were endeavoring to carry to such an unwarrantable extent. But the history of this event is far from showing a yielding or pacific spirit on the side of the prevailing party. Mr. Erskine in his appeal from the Synod complains, that they were biassed and embittered against him. As an instance of this he mentions, that they were proceeding to judge him "censurable before ever they allowed him to see or hear a material libel they had formed against him, [he means the paper of remarks on his sermon;] and this favour was not allowed him, when he demanded it, without a great struggle and the solemnity of a vote. And when the favor was granted, all that was allowed, was only to see the remarks in the clerk's hands, and no more time for forming answers to their long paper than from Wednesday at eleven or twelve at night, till ten of the clock on Thursday. And," says he, "when the precise hour was come, one message is sent me after another to attend the Synod, though they wanted not other business, the minutes of the last Synod not being all this time entered upon; so hot and fiery were they in the chase." So little disposition was there to do any thing like common justice, that Mr. Erskine did not fairly understand the nature of the paper in the clerk's hands, but calls the committee's remarks a "material libel;" and when it was read with his answers, he found himself under the necessity of requesting his answers to be returned for the purpose of making a large number of additions.

When he appealed from the Synod to the Assembly, not merely the two mentioned in the Repertory, but twelve ministers and two ruling elders dissented from the sentence against him. Mr. Fisher protested, not as the Repertory says, "Because the Synod refused to permit him to sit in judgment on the case of his father-in-law," for in this he acquiesced, but because he considered both Mr. Erskine and the cause of truth injured by the decision. The only dissenters present at the Assembly were Messrs. Wilson and Moncrieff. These the Assembly refused to hear. The committee of bills refused to transmit Mr. Fisher's protest and appeal, so that he also could not obtain a hearing. After sentence was passed against Mr. Erskine, he and Messrs. Wilson, Moncrieff and Fisher protested. The Assembly desired them to withdraw their paper and protest; but they refused to do so, and left it upon the table. Mr. Gib, who was present, relates, that when this letter was given in by the protesters, they retired, having no intention to pursue the affair any farther, and not anticipating any farther action of the Assembly. "The paper," says Mr. Gib, "fell over the table, and the Assembly, without taking any notice of it, proceeded to other business. In this conjuncture, a minister who was sitting beside the table, got up the paper; and having looked over it with an evident kindling in his countenance, he passionately called out for the Assembly to stop,

till they should consider the insufferable insult, which he reckoned was committed upon them in that paper. It was then read, upon which the assembly appeared all in a flame, and ordered that their officer should seek out and cite the four brethren to compare before them next forenoon." When they appeared according to this citation, they were not allowed to open their mouths in defence, either before the appointment of a committee to deal with them, or before sentence was passed against them agreeably to the report of that committee.\*

The amount of their protest was, that they should still be at liberty to preach the truth and testify against defections. The amount of the sentence against them was, that they must appear before the Commission, retract their protest, and also, "show their sorrow for their conduct and misbehavior in offering to protest, and in giving in the paper by them subscribed." In the event of their refusing, the Commission were empowered and appointed to suspend, and in the event of their obstinacy, to inflict a higher censure upon them. It might have been expected that the editors of the *Repertory*, having given their opinion freely respecting the spirit and conduct of the Seceders, would have said something of the character of this act, appointing the highest censures of the church merely for the sin of "offering to protest." But they observe, that it is their "business merely to state facts, and give a true history of all material proceedings in the case. Our readers," say they, "will judge for themselves of the wisdom and justice of the proceedings of the Assembly in this affair."

When the case of the four brethren came before the Commission, it was with great difficulty that Mr. Erskine obtained the privilege of reading a paper containing his and Mr. Fisher's answer to the requisitions of the Assembly. Messrs. Wilson and Moncrieff were refused any other than a verbal answer. Various representations from Presbyteries, Sessions, and Town Councils, were refused any hearing at all. And though some proposals were made at the meeting of the Commission in November, which had the aspect of a compromise, they were like the most of such proposals: every thing was to be conceded by the brethren, only in softer words. Two of these proposals are mentioned in the *Repertory*, to neither of which, it is said, the suspended brethren would accede. This is not correct. Objections were made to the first, which proposed to distinguish between the *matter* and *manner* of Mr. Erskine's sermon. For this reason it was not insisted on, and the brethren had no opportunity of refusing to accede to it. The second proposal only offered an explanation of the intention of the act of the last Assembly, completely at war with its evident meaning and bearing; and then the brethren were to withdraw their protest against it, and this still under the limitation of testifying against the act of 1732, only "*on all proper occasions.*"

These facts which we have thrown together, abstracted from other events connected in the history of this affair, may serve to show how far the supposed offence of the Seceders was aggravated by the mild and conciliatory spirit of those who cast them out. It will not be easy to find in the history of any other protestant church, an instance of equal tyranny in the trial of a supposed offender. But to return to the history of the proceedings against these brethren, some parts of

---

\* The above incident respecting the protest, the *Repertory* has transferred by mistake to the history of the paper of Secession.

which have been anticipated. The next thing requiring attention is the protest.

**THE PROTEST OF MR. ERSKINE AND HIS BRETHREN AGAINST THE SENTENCE OF THE ASSEMBLY.**

When the appeal of Mr. Erskine from the Synod to the General Assembly was rejected, and he had, agreeably to the sentence of the Assembly, received a rebuke, he handed a paper containing a protest signed by himself and Messrs. Wilson, Moncrieff and Fisher. As this protest was the ground of the censures subsequently inflicted, it will be proper to insert the entire paper, that the reader may have it before his eye, and be able to judge for himself whether it was a sin so aggravated to offer it, that nothing but retraction or excision from the church could wipe away the stain. The paper is as follows :

“Although I have a very great and dutiful regard to the judicatories of this church, to whom I own my subjection in the Lord; yet in respect the Assembly have found me censurable, and have tendered to me a rebuke and admonition, for things which I conceive to be agreeable unto, and founded upon the word of God, and our approved standards: I find myself obliged to protest against the foresaid censure as importing that I have in my doctrine at the opening of the Synod of Perth, October last, departed from the word of God and the foresaid standards; and that I shall be at liberty to preach the same truths of God, and to testify against the same, or like defections of this church upon all proper occasions. And I do hereby adhere unto the testimonies, which I have formerly emitted against the act of Assembly 1732, whether in the protest entered against it in open Assembly, or yet in my Synodical sermon; craving this my protest and declaration to be inserted in the records of Assembly, and that I be allowed extracts thereof.

May 14, 1733. (Signed.) EBENEZER ERSKINE.

We undersubscribing ministers, dissenters from the sentence of the Synod of Perth and Sterling, do hereby adhere to the above protestation and declaration, containing a testimony against the act of Assembly 1732, and asserting our privilege and duty to testify publicly against the same or like defections, upon all proper occasions.

(Signed.) WILLIAM WILSON.  
ALEXANDER MONCRIEFF.

I, Mr. James Fisher, Minister at Kinclaven, appellant against the sentence of the Synod of Perth in this question, although the committee of bills did not think fit to transmit my reasons of appeal, find myself obliged to adhere unto the foresaid protestation and declaration.

(Signed.) JAMES FISHER.”

The reason of the brethren's signing different papers was the different relations in which they stood to the case; Mr. Erskine being the accused, Messrs. Wilson and Moncrieff dissenters, and Mr. Fisher an appellant. The Editors of the Repertory, it may be supposed on account of their not adverting to this circumstance, tell us that the protest was signed only by Mr. Erskine at the first, and that afterwards the others who had “chosen to involve themselves in this affair,” sent in their adherence to the same. Yet they had previously stated more consistently with the truth, that upon the rebuke being administered to Mr. Erskine, these four gave in this protest subscribed by each of them. There are few things more dangerous to the historian than the ingenuity of conjecture. In various instances the editors have mistaken things



very plausible or probable for facts, where, however, the event was otherwise.

It would be tedious, and it is hoped unnecessary, to go over all the ground occupied by the Seceders in the defence of the above protest. The case is so plain that it might safely be left without comment. Yet as their refusal to submit is censured by the Repertory, it would not perhaps be decorous to say nothing. There is one question which will be found to embrace the chief merits of the case: Was it lawful for Mr. Erskine to impugn the unrighteous acts of Assembly? No one pleads that the acts complained of were lawful; the Assembly itself afterwards pronounced sentence against them as passed contrary to the standing rules of the church. They could not then have been righteous acts, even if the purport of them was good, for if we seek that which is good by unlawful means, it becomes sin. If then the acts were unlawful, and it was the right of Mr. Erskine to testify against what was unlawful, it was surely right to protest against any deed, which would deprive him of this liberty. And if it was right to protest for this liberty, it could not also be right to profess sorrow for having offered to do so. It is not the doctrine of Protestants that church courts are infallible; and if they may err, it must certainly be lawful to point out those errors. If exception be taken to Mr. Erskine's doing this in the pulpit; it may be replied, that ministers and church courts have no such peculiar prerogatives above others, that nothing is to be said against their sins. There was a peculiar propriety in Mr. Erskine's doing this when preaching particularly to an assembly of Ministers convened as a judicatory of the church. It was also the more proper to embrace this means of doing it, as strong measures had been employed to repress a testimony against defections in other ways. Protests, dissents, petitions and representations were refused. Still there had been liberty left to the pulpit. But now the spirit of tyranny began to invade even this sacred place, and ministers must not be allowed to preach against the acts and proceedings of the church, or the defections of present or former generations. Who would not prefer the liberty of Rome to such a bondage? Even though she claims infallibility, she is pleased to limit this to articles of faith; and she passes over with impunity the vigorous opposition of her members to her acts and proceedings, provided no article of faith be involved. This was precisely the liberty denied to the Seceders. They were not condemned, because they had preached against any article of the confession of faith, or any act of the church founded on the word of God, but only for opposing acts for which no higher than human authority was ever pleaded. The most strenuous advocates of patronage only asserted, that the Scriptures did not determine by whom ministers were to be elected: a sentiment which if true would reflect severely upon the Bible, but being their own admission, it was fatal to the cause of their defence, unless they chose to push their prerogatives even beyond the pretensions of the Man of sin.

It may well occasion some surprise to find free citizens of the United States, and Presbyterians, the sons of those whose blood flowed so freely for their rights as citizens and christians, speaking as if honest and honorable men should have bowed down tamely under such a yoke. It would be injurious to them, to suppose that they would in their own case agree to such a restriction of ministerial freedom, as never to express dissent from the acts of the purest church on earth. We hope

better things of many who find fault with the Seceders, than that they would not do as these men did, if placed in the same situation. Yet in the first article of the Repertory the great argument employed by the original opponents of the Seceders, is repeated with a confidence in its force, which it will be most charitable to attribute to thoughtlessness. In speaking of Mr. Erskine's protest against the sentence of the Assembly, the Editors say: "It is something entirely novel and apparently unreasonable to protest against a court, to which he had solemnly appealed for redress from a supposed injustice in an inferior judicatory &c." page 25. It is evident that no man can act righteously in resisting a just sentence; but the Repertory makes no distinction between a just and unjust sentence. The reasoning quoted in confirmation of what they say, plainly implies that Mr. Erskine should have submitted right or wrong. He was not to be "his own Supreme judge," nor to "stand to the determination of the court, only so far as it made for himself and no farther." In speaking of the sentence of the Commission it is said, "The Supreme judicatory may have judged erroneously, but with their views every principle of just subordination required, that these brethren who obstinately persisting in protesting against the judgment of the highest court, and refusing that obedience to authority, which is essential to the existence of society, should be suspended from their ministry." It will be difficult to perceive a very essential difference between this reasoning and the doctrine of passive obedience and non-resistance. Let it be supposed in order to test this reasoning that Mr. Erskine's cause was just, that he had preached the truth, but was arraigned for preaching it, and condemned. Then according to the above principles he is not to be his own judge, every principle of just subordination requires that the sentence should be enforced against him. He must own his sorrow for preaching the truth, and engage not to preach it any more. But our submission to church courts should only be *in the Lord*. So says the Bible, and the Confession to which, these men had solemnly professed their adherence; and they were bound by both to resist every doctrine, and every act of the church which was contrary to the divine will. We may submit to decisions, which are merely against us, though we think them injurious; but where decisions are against the truth, we must obey God, and not man. And it is evident that in this case the decision of the Assembly did involve an important truth; no less than the question, whether one of the most important powers of the church might not be exercised over her by her enemies.

The conduct of the Commission in proceeding to suspend and afterwards to cast out the four brethren, is vindicated, in much the same way. They obeyed their instructions. The Assembly ordered the thing to be done, therefore, though it might be sinful, it was right and necessary for the Commission to do it. Here is a little more high-churchism.

Again, the writer "of the Narrative" is quoted as reasoning forcibly against the refusal of the Seceders to submit, when he says, "as it was by the authority of the church that they were ministers, it is altogether absurd to decline this authority, and refuse submission to it. Upon these principles, every erroneous person, and immoral minister may protest against the censures of the church, and continue to exercise his ministry, and may alledge, as Mr. Erskine does, that he has a commission from God." This reasoning is truly *forcible*, in one sense of the term—so forcible that Rome binds no stronger chain upon her votaries.

Once become a minister, by the authority of a church, and it is altogether absurd not to follow her whithersoever she goes! Let her set up a Pope, prohibit the Bible, burn heretics, and bind to her infallible decrees, it is absurd for those who have received their authority from the church, "to decline this authority, and refuse submission to it."—The approbation given to such reasoning, must have been owing to superficial examination. Every unbiassed mind will regard the reasoning of Mr. Erskine, as immensely superior. That he had his commission from God, and that it was his duty to obey God rather than man.

It has always appeared difficult to ascertain what the opposers of the Seceders would have had them to do. Mr. Willison, in his testimony, acknowledges that their protest for liberty was just, and yet he disapproves of their protesting. The *Repertory* condemns the courts for rash, injudicious, and high toned measures, and yet considers it as obstinacy, rebellion and absurdity in the Seceders not to submit. Until it can be understood how the same thing can be right and wrong, it will be difficult to understand these varying decisions. It is admitted by all, whose opinions are worthy of regard, and among others, by the editors of the *Repertory*, and their authorities, that there were corruptions of an alarming character, in the church. The very fountains were polluted, when a professor of theology was teaching Arianism. It is also admitted, that there was great tyranny in the measures of the ruling party, against the people, and against those of the ministers who asserted their rights. The Seceders submitted to these things so long as they could with a good conscience. They endeavored to exonerate themselves by protesting against acts of defection in the church courts. When this door was closed against them, they contented themselves with exercising their liberty in the pulpit. They went still farther; they submitted to be censured for the use of this freedom. Mr. Erskine bowed down before an unrighteous rebuke for having delivered his master's message with faithfulness, and only protested for liberty still to preach the truth. He, and the brethren who united with him, went still farther. When their protest was rejected, they went away in silence, intending to pursue the thing no farther. But the Assembly, as if resolved to proceed to the utmost, took them up for "offering to protest," and without allowing them any hearing in the case, handed them over to a Commission, with orders to proceed to the highest censure against them, if they would not profess their sorrow for this offence. Now—this single point must decide the question of their secession.—Ought they to have retracted their protest, and professed their sorrow for offering it? In other words, ought they to have repented of having done their duty, and to have agreed not to open their mouths in justice, against any act or proceedings of the church courts, however oppressive and wicked? Their submission could amount to nothing less. And not to say any thing of the spirit of the gospel, who can think that men of honesty and honor, could have yielded to such demands, and ought to have wept as penitents over the daring presumption of asking greater liberty.

It should also be borne in mind, that these men, though finally shut out of the church, were not at all hasty to organize themselves into a separate society. They met together at the bridge of Gairney, near Kinross, Dec. 25th, 1733, and constituted themselves into a Presbytery, Mr. Ebenezer Erskine being chosen to be their mouth to the Lord in this solemn action, and consecrating them to the Lord and his church,

with much enlargement of soul. But they proceeded to no judicial deeds, in order that there might be no hindrance in their way, if a door were opened for their return to the church. Ever after they found it necessary for vindicating themselves and the truth of God, to publish a Testimony to the world. It had one feature of resemblance to the Testimony of our brethren of the General Assembly, in the United States, not noticed in this light by the Repertory. It was extra-judicial. They published it, as our brethren did theirs, not in the official character of a church court, but as individuals. They proceeded to no judicial deeds until all hope of a reconciliation was cut off. This step they first took in August, 1735, the third year of their secession. They had originally no view to this measure, and were decidedly reluctant to adopt it. But they considered themselves as led on by Providence, and shut up to this as their duty.

(To be continued.)

---

## ART. II. *Warning against Popery.*

[See Minutes of Synod in last No. P. 40.]

*The Associate Synod to the Congregations and People under her care :*

DEAR BRETHREN : When we consider the length of time which this Synod has been enabled to maintain a public, and joint judicial testimony in favor of the doctrines of the Reformation against all opposite errors, it would be ungrateful not to acknowledge the good hand of God upon us, and to ascribe glory and honor to his name, for any degree of faithfulness to which we have been enabled to attain. And while we should thank God and take courage for any success, that has attended the display of that banner for truth, which this church has been endeavoring to maintain, it is the solemn duty of the watchman upon Zion's walls to notice every appearance of danger, and give warning of its approach, whether it be against the doctrines of Faith contended for by our reforming forefathers, or that liberty, civil and religious, which is the natural and happy fruit of those doctrines. In this country we have enjoyed a great degree of inestimable liberty, in both our civil and religious rights and privileges. These are precious blessings, for which we are indebted to the God of Providence and Grace, and to him also we are accountable for the proper improvement of them. Civil and religious liberty, too, are closely, if not inseparably connected together. If our religious liberty should be lost, our civil liberty would scarcely be worth maintaining ; and if our civil liberty should be wrested from us, our religious privileges could not long remain behind. And the abuse of God's providential and gracious favors gives him just cause at this time to plead a controversy with this nation. And in his providential dispensations for some years past, God has given many fearful tokens of his displeasure. That wasting pestilence, the cholera—unusually cold, and consequently unproductive seasons—calamitous burnings in city and country, and civil dissensions of a seriously threatening character, are among these tokens ; yet the nation evidently does not lay these things to heart. Hence we have reason to fear still severer judgments. Thus God dealt of old with Egypt, and thus, too, he dealt with his own professed and covenanted people, before the Babylonish captivity, and before their utter destruction by the Romans. Who will attentively consider the present aspect of our political affairs, the predominance of party spirit, the fierce contentings of the political parties to maintain or gain power, and the reckless disregard of moral principle by many both in power and seeking it—who, we say, will consider these things and not see sufficient reason to apprehend judgments of a different character, unless prevented by a speedy national repentance and reformation ? Have we not reason to apprehend that the liberty which has been our boast, but which we have so much abused, will be taken from us—that our enemies will be permitted to triumph over us ?

As yet so far as our nation has any religious character, derived from the profession made by the people, it is Protestant. It is to Protestantism—to the principles of our holy Reformed Religion, that we are and have been indebted for the liberal principles of our political institutions. The natural, the avowed, and inveterate enemy of this religion is Popery. The exertions of the christian community throughout most protestant countries, to give a general circulation to the Holy Scriptures, and to promote a general diffusion of knowledge, have alarmed the fears of this Man of Sin, that unless these things can be counteracted, his downfall must be near. The fair face, the great natural resources, and the inviting prospects of wealth in this country, have awakened his cupidity. Thus inveterate enmity, fear and cupidity, all combine to arouse this enemy to a desperate effort against this country.

That such a united effort is now making by the rulers and friends of the Roman church can no longer be doubted by even the most sceptical, who will attend to the evidence now in various ways before the public. We would only refer you for proof to the encyclical letter of the present reigning Pope of Rome, Gregory XVI. calling upon his bishops, clergy, and people, to unite and exert their efforts to sustain and extend his power in all places, and especially in this country; to a published letter of the Bishop of Maryland, to another of the Bishop of Cincinnati, and to statements in published letters and addresses of Bishop England, all calling upon their friends in Europe for increased exertions to extend their power and influence in this country, and holding out great encouragements to such efforts. These, or extracts from them, may be found, with much more well-authenticated evidence to the same purpose, in several late publications in this country, and in the periodicals now publishing upon the subject. In addition to this the political influence of the Austrian government is directed to the same object; and immense sums of money collected by several powerful associations in Europe, some of which have been founded for this express object, are annually expended in this country, in the establishment and support of schools for the express purpose of educating the children of Protestants and others not now belonging to the church of Rome, in the doctrines of Romanism, which we need not now detain to show you are subversive of that religious and civil liberty which is our boast. The Leopold Foundation of Austria, the Society of the *Propaganda de fide* of Rome, the Penny Society of France, are sending in their thousands and hundreds of thousands of dollars annually, which are expended on the above object, and for the establishment of nunneries, and other kindred establishments which recent disclosures show to be mere brothels and sinks of iniquity. Another circumstance, which ought to awaken the apprehensions of all protestants, and the friends of liberty, civil and religious, is, the immense influx of foreign papists into this country. It is stated on good authority, that since the year 1817, from one hundred to two hundred thousand persons have arrived annually who owe and profess allegiance to the Pope of Rome. These are rapidly becoming incorporated with our body politic, and extending the influence and doctrines of the Roman Anti-christ.

These things demand the immediate attention of the friends of our holy reformed religion. We are bound to maintain and transmit unimpaired the banner of the Reformation to succeeding generations. This Synod would therefore warn the people under her inspection, and the friends of the Reformation from Popish darkness and tyranny in general, against all indifference and neutrality to this subject, and especially against all countenancing and encouraging of Popish institutions for the instruction of youth, by sending their children and wardens to Popish seminaries. This Synod would also call the attention of the ministers and preachers of the word, to the importance of pointing out in their public ministrations from the word of God, the dangers to which we are exposed from an increase of the power of this man of sin, the Roman Anti-christ; that they would make diligent use of the sword of the spirit, which is the word of God, to counteract these dangers, that thus this enemy may be destroyed by the Spirit of God's mouth and brightness of his coming, in the greater effulgence of gospel light.

This Synod would affectionately urge upon the several congregations under her inspection, the importance and duty of frequent prayer to God for the preservation of our inestimable privileges from the grasp of Popery; and that he would hasten the final overthrow of this mystery of iniquity. "How long, O Lord, holy and true, dost thou not judge and avenge our blood on them that dwell on the earth."

Respectfully submitted,

JAMES P. MILLER.  
A. ANDERSON.

ART. III. *The Christian World Unmasked.*

(Continued from page 373, Vol. XII.)

Now, Sir, we may debate the point a little. If angels lost their *first estate* by sin, (Jude 6,) it is not wonderful that man should lose it. If Adam had not lost it, would the Lord act consistently in his moral government? God must hate sin in Adam, as well as in an angel; because it is evermore that abominable thing which he loatheth, that accursed thing which his soul hateth. And his declarations concerning sin are these, which are very awful, and must be universal. *The wages of sin is death*; (Rom. vi. 23.) and *the soul that sinneth, it shall die*.—(Ezek. xviii 4, 20.) The angels sinned, and being spirits, had no earthly case, like ours, to become mortal; but they underwent a spiritual death, and became dead to God. All communion with God ceased; the heavenly image was withdrawn, and the devilish nature introduced.

Sin is just the same deadly bane to the spirit, that poison is to the body; a single dose does the business. Angels lost their *first estate* by this poison of sin; and if disobedience required a *change of state* in angels, it must require the same in man. For God acts uniformly in his moral government: he is Jehovah, and *changeth not*. (Mal. iii. 6.)

Reasons may be found, why God provides a remedy for *fallen men*, and not for *fallen angels*: but no good reason can be given why man should *keep* his first estate after sin committed. Man had a share of the devil's disobedience, and man must have a share of the devil's nature. And enough of this horrid nature is apparent in ourselves and others, to confirm the argument.

Some fancy that mortality makes the change in Adam's state; but this is not the whole nor the chief change; it does not bring the devil's nature, and make us like him. Sickness, pain and death are only parts of the curse, which respect the body: the spirit also sinned, and the spirit is afflicted with the devil's nature. Hence satan is styled *the prince of this world*, (John xiv. 30.) because he reigneth in the hearts of men. A devilish prince suits a devilish subject: like loves its like. And *the whole world* are said to *lie in the wicked one*. ἐν τῷ πονηρῷ. (1 John v. 19.)

It is not strange that some deny the fall. This is part of that spiritual blindness, which has crept upon the understanding; and is just what happens to delirious people in a fever, who fancy they are well, and mock at physic and physician. I make no doubt but the devils, through that pride which accompanieth sin, think as highly of themselves, as of the angels. And since they never can repent, they will rather charge their misery to the undeserved wrath of God, than to their own iniquity.

Every wicked temper that is found in a fiend, I can find in myself, and discern in others. And I could as soon suppose, that God created fiends, as believe that he created man in his present state. Before the fall, man was pronounced good, *very good*; but after the fall, he became bad indeed, bad enough to be called of God, the *devil's child*, and the *devil's subject*. Sure, Beelzebub must grin, to hear his vanquished subjects preach of the dignity of human nature; and if such dignity is found in the subject, how much more in the prince? He may well be honoured, like the Turk, his cousin, with the title of *sublime highness*.

Every dog that barks at me; and every horse that lifts his heel against me, proves I am a *fallen* creature. The brute creation durst

not shew an enmity before the fall nor had they any; but testified a willing homage unto Adam, by *coming for a name*. (Gen. ii. 19.) Eve no more dreads the serpent, than we dread a fly. But when man shook off allegiance from his God, the beasts by divine permission shook off allegiance too from man.

Where sin enters, pride will enter too, and supply the place of real honor; and as iniquity aboundeth, pride aboundeth also. Else, how could *sinners* boast of *dignity*, and take up mighty state, on account of verbal titles, or of transient manors, when they themselves must presently be eaten up with worms.

Thus, sir, by disobedience, Adam became both a *condemned sinner*, and an *unclean creature*. He was *dead in law* by his trespass, and *dead to God* by his sinful nature; *dead both in trespasses and sins*. The fountain being thus polluted, all its streams were filthy. For *who can bring a clean thing out of that which is unclean? Not one*. (Job xiv. 4.) Hence all are called *children of wrath by nature*, (Ephes. ii. 3.) and declared to be *dead in sins*. (Ephes. ii. 1, 5.)

Some traces of the moral law remain, producing what we call the moral sense, or conscience; and the lamp of reason burns, though with a dimmer light, yet sufficient to direct our worldly matters; but the spiritual life is quenched. We are *born of the flesh*, (John iii. 6.) born with a *carnal mind, which is at enmity with God*; (Rom. viii. 7.) and nothing suits us well, but what is pleasing to the flesh. Spiritual service is a shackle, put upon the mind; and when the heart is collared with devotion, it drudges through it very heavily, and is mighty froward in it; stops short, starts back, flies out right and left, looks an hundred ways at once, and keeps lowing for the world all the time; just like the two Philistine cows, which drew the Lord's ark to Bethshemesh; they were yoked fast together, and drew forwards, but kept lowing for their calves all the while; and though engaged in *religious draught*, both of them fell a sacrifice at Bethshemesh, were slaughtered, quartered, and consumed by fire. An awful type of the end of those, who find God's worship, not a pleasant service, but *religious draught*.—(1 Sam. vi. 10, &c.)

Now, Sir, all mankind abide in this state of death, Heathens, Jews and Christians, till they are *born of God's Spirit*, (John iii. 3, 6.) and *have his Holy Spirit dwelling in them*. (Rom. viii. 9. And during their continuance in this state, they neither are nor can be sensible of it, because it is a state of death, which seals up all *perception*. A dead soul knows no more of its dead condition, than a dead body does. Men will mistake a *decent* worship, and a *decent* conduct for the spiritual life; and will suppose that gluttons, drunkards, whoremongers, &c. are the only people in a state of *flesh*. Whereas St. Jude calls every man a *sensual man, who has not the Spirit*. (Jude 19.)

An experimental knowledge of the Holy Spirit's influence, was the Christian's touchstone in St. Paul's day; but modern gossellers have learned a pleasant trick, to have the Holy Spirit, and yet know nothing of it: and they ask a true believer scornfully, as once a taunting prophet asked Micaiah, *which way went the Spirit of God from me to speak to thee?* (1 Kings xxii. 24.) Did he pop upon you through the key-hole, or through a chink in the wall? Which way, Micaiah, was it? and then *smote him on the cheek*. See here the character of a false prophet, delineated by the Spirit of truth. He has not the Spirit of God, yet he pretends unto it by his saying, which way went the Spirit

from me? and he ridicules the Spirit's *sensible* operation, by asking scornfully, *which way* went the Spirit unto thee? Did you see him come, or *feel* him come into you, any way? Pray, what way was it? let us hear, Micaiah; and take this smite upon the cheek for your trouble. Such was the language of false prophets in old time; and where Satan rules, these taunting prophets never die. But, Sir, if you have never felt the spiritual death, I am speaking of, you are yet a *dead soul*; and will remain so, till Jesus Christ has quickened you.

For, as men cannot be *sensible* of this death, while they abide in it, so neither can they help themselves out of it. Death strips away all *power*, as well as all *perception*. A dead body may as well restore itself to life, as a dead soul. A fallen angel may as soon rekindle spiritual life, and regain his *first estate*, as a fallen man. Nothing can produce the spiritual life, and a spiritual mind resulting from it, but the Spirit of God. His breath alone brings this life, which Jesus intimates, when he *breathed* upon his disciples, and said, *receive ye the Holy Ghost*. (John xx. 22.)

Yet, while men are without this life, and walk the rounds of moral decency, they bravely talk of will and power to make themselves the sons of God; and think St. John a mere driveling, for affirming they are born, *not of the will of man, but of God*. (John i. 13.)

A real Christian, in St. Paul's account, is a *new creation*, *καὶνὴ κτίσις*; (2 Cor. v. 17.) He is *God's workmanship, created in Christ Jesus*.—(Eph. ii. 10.) And Jesus tells you, how dead souls are quickened: mark his words; They come with double seal, to show their weight and certainty. *Verily, verily, I say unto you, the hour is coming, and now is, when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God, and they that hear shall live*. (John v. 25.) Jesus is not speaking of the body's resurrection, at the judgment day, but of a resurrection which *now is*, and is *coming* every day; a resurrection of dead souls to life, not a merely moral, but a spiritual life; and a resurrection caused, not by us, but by himself, even by his *voice*. He has many voices to call dead sinners by, the voice of his word, of his servants, and his providences; but all these avail nothing, without the voice of his *Spirit*. His word is but a dead letter, without the quickening Spirit; his servants are but barking dogs, who growl, yet cannot bite, unless he set them on: and his providences are but claps of thunder, alarming for a time, yet quickly over, except he rides himself upon the storm. When he takes the work into his own hand; and the voice of his Spirit accompanies the voice of his word, or his servants, or his providences, then a sinner hears; and starts from his grave, like Lazarus, and lives. And having thus received life, he feels his condemnation and his ruined nature, and crieth after Jesus.

When the world was brought into this ruined state by sin, man could do nothing more to help himself, than the fallen angels could; and must perish everlastingly, unless the Lord prevent it. He does, and provides another covenant; the stores of which are not laid up in Adam, as before, nor in his ruined children: God does not choose to trust a bankrupt. If man could not stand upright, when set upon his legs, how shall he stand when he has none? Therefore, *help is now laid upon one who is mighty, and able to save to the uttermost*. And the Saviour thus bespeaks the ruined sinner, *Thou hast destroyed thyself, but in me is thy help*. (Hosea xiii. 9.)

However, though man fell, God was not disappointed by his fall; it was foreseen; for, *known to God are all his works from the beginning*:



(Acts xv. 18.) and, being foreseen, it was provided against in such a manner, as might exalt the riches of his grace in man's recovery. The first covenant was made with Adam, a mere man, who was the surety of it: but the surety failed, and ruined all. The second covenant was not made with the ruined sinner, a broken merchant; but with Jesus Christ, the Lord from Heaven. Jehovah says, *I give thee for a covenant*; (Isa. xliii. 6.—xlix. 8.) and of course, *Jesus is the surety of this better covenant*. (Heb. vii. 22.)

Now the business, of a surety, is to pay the *legal debts* of another.—Our legal debts are, first, *perfect obedience*, which alone can bring a *title* unto heaven; secondly, the *curse of death*, for not performing that obedience.

Jesus Christ first pays the debt of perfect obedience: and thereby, as surety redeems the heavenly title; then he takes the law-curse on himself, to free believers from it. And both these blessings are *imputed*, or charged to the account of every true believer. By the death of his surety, he is freed from condemnation; and by *his alone obedience he is made righteous*, (Rom. v. 19.) justified in the eye of the law, and obtains a legal title unto heaven.

And, sir, there is nothing monstrous in this matter, however some may please to startle at it. Human laws, every where, as well as the divine, allow of suretiship; which proves it is an equitable thing. If farmer Thomas does some common work for farmer James, the law *imputes* the work done by Thomas unto James. When a curate preaches for a weary rector; the law *imputes* the curate's mouth to the silent rector. If you was overwhelmed with debts, and a friendly surety did discharge them all; the law would *impute* this payment unto you, and acquit you of debt as effectually, as if the money had been taken from your own purse, and paid with your own hand.

Indeed, though suretiship is common among men, in debts of *money*, it is not practised in debts of *life*. For who will die for another? A rogue will not thrust his neck into the halter for a rogue; and an honest man will not choose it, nor might the state consent unto it; for honest men are scarce. But the law itself has no abhorrence of such suretiship, and would gain abundant reverence by it.

When a villian dies by the hand of justice, we attend more to the *guilt* of the sufferer, and to our own *security* by his death, than to the *honor* which the law receives by his execution. But if an upright man, and well esteemed, should freely suffer for a villian, this striking spectacle would bring much *reverence* to the law, and give it great *solemnity*.

Zaleucas, a prince of the Locrians, made a law, that every one convicted of adultery, should lose both his eyes; and it happened that his own son was convicted of the crime. The prince was not willing that the law should lose its honor, nor could the father bear to see his son quite blind. He therefore, orders one of his own eyes to be bored out, and one of his sons. Thus two eyes were given to the law, which brought it more solemnity than if the son had lost both his own. In such a case, as he passed along, many only might have cried, "there goes the blind youth, who could not let his neighbor's wife alone."—But when the aged father stirs abroad, and is seen with an eye dug out; this sight of suffering innocence strikes beholders hearts with awe, and makes them reverence the law, and dread adultery.

Pray, hold your hand a little, Doctor; every honest man will strive

to pay his debts; and if he cannot pay the whole, will make a composition, and pay what he can. Such a composition I would make for my sinful debts, and should hope to pay ten shillings in the pound, or a better penny. I am not so vain, as to reject a surety altogether, relying wholly on my own ability for payment; nor can I think myself quite insolvent. I would therefore have the old grazier and Jesus Christ jointly bound in the same bond. This would look creditable; and I could condescend to let the saviour sign his name first, though I paid full fifteen shillings in the pound. What think you of this, Doctor?

Sir, I think such a bond would dishonor Christ, and ruin you effectually. If you fancy God's authority is a trifling business, and does not need a surety to make *whole* satisfaction for sin, you would do well to consider what has happened to the fallen angels, for want of such a surety. They sinned; and the trespass, which brought on their punishment, was a single one, no doubt like Adam's. For in God's government, *the wages of every sin is death*. Yet their single trespass has cast them out of heaven, curst them with a devilish nature, and doomed them to everlasting misery.

You may thrust your name into the covenant, if you please, as a joint bondsman; but it will be at your utter peril; for the Father and the Son will both reject you with abhorrence. The Father has provided a surety for this better covenant, a *sufficient* surety, and named him *singly*, and thereby has excluded every other. And if you foist your own name into the covenant, as a joint bondsman, to discharge your debts; what is this, but reflecting on the wisdom of the Father, as if he knew not how to provide a surety; and on the power of the Son, as if he was not able to execute his office? Sir, this is horrible presumption, and will be reckoned with at a proper time. God will avenge himself of such proud adversaries.

Adam, though a mere man, was qualified, as a surety, to *pay obedience* for all in his loins: yet none but a God-man is qualified, to *make atonement* for disobedience. No created being can make satisfaction unto God for sin: the utmost he can do, is to pay his hourly debts; and if the debts are hourly paid, he is still *unprofitable*, has no merit, nor deserveth even thanks; he has only done his duty.

You have read what Jesus says; and what he says is true of *every creature*, angel or man; *when ye have done all things, which are commanded you, say, we are unprofitable servants, we have only done our duty. And does the Lord thank that servant, who has done the things that were commanded? I suppose not.* (Luke xvii. 9, 10.) You do not thank your own servant, for doing what he is commanded; and yet are more obliged to him, a million times, than your Maker is to you.—Now, Sir, if after having done all our duty, we are yet unprofitable, and unworthy of the smallest thanks; pray what room is left for merit to make atonement?

This saucy idol cannot shew its face in heaven; no angel dares to think of merit. With *two wings he flies*, to shew his swift obedience; with *two, his feet are covered*, to hide obedience from his eyes; and with *two, his face is veiled*, in token of unworthiness. Angels do not *vaunt*, as sinful mortals do, of their obedience and holiness; but with adoring wonder cry, *Holy, holy, holy, is the Lord of hosts!* (Isa. vi. 2, 3,) and pay eternal adoration to this holy *Three*, the *Holy Father, Holy Son*, and *Holy Ghost*.

Merit is the fuzz-ball, which sprouteth from a dung-hill, with a pow

dered cap ; and only garnishes the crest of sinners, who are daily doing what they ought not, or leaving undone what they ought to do. And if the real wages due to sin, is death, then a sinner's merit, and a sinner's dignity, are just of as much value, and just as great a contradiction, as a traitor's loyalty, or a whore's chastity.

If Jesus Christ is a mere creature ; though the head of all creation, and had paid most sinless obedience, he could only say at last, I have done my duty, and deserve no thanks ; I am yet unprofitable, and can plead no merit for myself, much less for others.

But if Jesus Christ is God, he is no more bound to keep the creature's law, than an earthly master is to do his servant's work. And if he pleased to take man's nature, to become man's surety ; though the human nature, being but a creature, and acting as a servant, could merit nothing ; the divine nature, joined to it by a personal union, can merit and make noble satisfaction.

The law had claims of obedience upon the human nature of Christ, because it is a creature ; but had none upon the divine ; it is the Law-giver, whose word created all things, and whose will gives law to all. Here merit, will arise, by doing that service which it was not bound to do.

If your servant does his daily work faithfully, no daily thanks are given nor expected ; he only does his duty. But if a neighbor lends an helping hand freely, he merits thanks, because the service was not due from him, but freely offered by him. We may merit from each other, but can merit nothing from the Lord, because our utmost service is ever due to him.

Thus by the obedience and death of this God-man surety, *the law was magnified and honored*, (Is. xlii. 21,) more honored, than if all the sinful race of men had fallen under his eternal curse for disobedience.

If man had paid a perfect unsinning obedience, it would have been his *title* to heaven : a title founded, not on human merit, but on the Lord's *free promise*, *This do and thou shalt live*. Without such a promise, God might have dropt his creature man into nothing, after a thousand years of complete obedience. Yes, if no promise hindered, God might drop a perfect angel into nothing ; and perhaps with more justice, than we may kill a happy fly, because of his whizzing. Such an angel lives on courtesy, and has no reason to complain, if it is withdrawn. While he pays obedience, his life abounds with comforts ; all things suited to his state are given ; but he may drop into nothing, as he was before, if the Lord pleaseth. God was under no obligation to give him life ; and without a promise, he is under none to prolong his life ; and least of all to advance an *human* creature to a *better* life.

The popish conclave has acted craftily, and more consistently than protestant divines, by inventing works of *supererogation*. For though these words are false, absurd, and blasphemous, yet being once allowed, they lay a right foundation for human merit. If man can do more than he is in duty bound to do, he may merit by such doing. And nothing now is wanted for the Pope, but a Cyclop's eye of infallibility, which any Vulcan readily will make, to determine what these works of supererogation are, and the church's coffers are loaded presently with treasure. Simeon Stylites, by perching on a pillar for a month, shall purchase pardons for a thousand adulterers and sodomites.

But, Sir, we will take leave of the Pope's eye, and proceed. Every

man has sinned, and has lost his heavenly title. A single trespass forfeits it in man or angel, and forfeits it for ever. Jesus Christ steps in, as the human surety, and pays the legal debt of *perfect obedience*, and thus *redeems* the sinner's title. Hence he is called *the Lord our righteousness*: (Jer. xxiii. 6.) Jesus says himself, *their righteousness is of me*. (Isa. liv. 17.) and the church replies, *In the Lord, have I righteousness*. (Isa. xlv. 24.) Paul says, *Christ is made to* (or rather, for) *us righteousness*; (1. Cor. 30.) and declares. We are made righteousness in him; (2. Cor. v. 21.) which he calls the righteousness of God; because it was wrought out by the God-man surety.

When John refused baptism unto Jesus he received this answer, *suffer it to be so now, for thus it becomes us to fulfil all righteousness*.—(Matt. iii. 15.) Jesus as the *holy one* of Israel, needed not the laver of baptism; but as Israel's *surety*, he did need it. It *became* him, as surety, to fulfil *all* righteousness, moral and ritual, respecting Jews and Christians. On this account, he was both circumcised and baptized, partook of the Jewish passover, and the christian eucharist, and went to the yearly feasts at Jerusalem, as the law required. If a single rite had been neglected, he would not fulfil *all* righteousness, nor could have been a legal surety. A trip in one point would have spoiled all.

But, sir, man has not only forfeited his heavenly title by sin; he has incurred a law-curse, too, the curse of eternal death. Sin has both barred heaven's gate against him, and opened hell's gate for him. Now, Jesus Christ, as man's surety, paid this legal debt too. *He made a curse for us, and redeemed us from the curse*. Gal. iii. 13.

Paul is in rapture about this love of Christ; and so is every one, who feels the blessings purchased by it. Yet how little is this love regarded by modern gossellers! Who bears a dying Saviour on his heart, and thinks or talks about him? A melancholy proof of man's fallen nature; of his deep ingratitude and folly! Sure we must outmatch a devil here: His heart would leap for joy, to hear the tidings of a surety; yet men will pass the surety by, some with no regard, and some with much contempt.

Thus Jesus sets the fallen sinner on his legs again, pays the law debt of complete obedience, to redeem our title; then takes the law-curse on himself, to free us from it.

Why, Doctor, this is charming news, indeed: but if this be all that is needful for salvation, I do not see how any can miscarry. Satan may as well bar up his gates: he will not catch a single straggler.—My neighbor *Fillpot*, who comes reeling home at night from the Chequer, stands as good a chance as the grazier who goes soberly to bed. How is this Doctor? Methinks I do not like it, that *Ned Fillpot* should stagger after me to heaven, and get perhaps as good a crown as myself. This will never do. Something surely must be wrought *in* us, as well as something done *for* us.

True, Sir, much must be wrought *in* us, not indeed to purchase salvation, which is already purchased by the surety; but to dispose and enable us to receive salvation *freely*, and behave *suitably* for it. Jesus Christ has not only redeemed us from the curse, and bought our title, but has also purchased grace to sanctify our nature, and thereby give us *meetness* for glory. This grace is always given to the heirs of glory, to prepare them for it; and the benefits of Christ's obedience in life and death are made over to them, and sealed on the conscience by the Holy Spirit. Thus they have an inward witness of de-

liverance from the curse, with a legal title unto heaven, and a gospel meetness for it. This meetness springs from regeneration, or a spiritual life begun and carried on in the soul, as a preparation for the spiritual worship of heaven. And the spiritual life differs from the merely moral one, as animal motion differs from mechanic motion, or as a man's walking differs from a clock's going. The clock may go *well*, but has not animal life; and a man may walk *well*, yet have no spiritual life.

Now, sir, observe the case of mere professors. They talk of honesty and decency, and feed upon their withered moral skeleton; but know not how to *eat the flesh and drink the blood of Christ*. An application of the gospel blessings to their heart, is neither sought nor wanted. They hear that Jesus Christ has died, and are satisfied with this report; but his blood, the virtue of it, must be sprinkled on the conscience, or it avails them nothing; will neither bring them gospel-peace nor gospel-holiness. Paul and Peter speak of the *sprinkling of this blood*; (1 Pet. i. 2. Heb. xii. 24,) and through this sprinkling, the atonement is *received* by a sinner, and his heart is sweetly drawn to love and follow Jesus. Nothing but partaking of Christ's blessings, will effectually engage the heart to Christ; then he *draws us with the cords of a man, and the love of Christ constrains us*.

All the blessings of salvation have been purchased by Jesus, and are at his disposal. He gives them when, and where, and how he pleaseth. And do not you expect, Sir, to dispose of freely, what you have bought fairly? Jesus saith, *I give eternal life unto them*; (John x. 28.) and what is freer than a *gift*? and lest you should think him an usurper, he declares, and pray observe his declaration, *all things are delivered unto me by my Father*. (Matt. xi. 27.—John iii. 35.) *All persons and all blessings, temporal and spiritual, are at my disposal*. surrendered into my hands by the Father, on account of my undertaking the work of mediator.

So Jesus reigneth, in his human nature, king supreme, disposing of all persons and all blessings, as he pleaseth; and must reign, till *all his foes are made his footstool*: then the kingdom will be administered as before, not by the hand of this God-man mediator; but God, the three one God, will be all in all. In the mean time, Jesus calls and *quickens whom he will*, (John v. 21.) gives repentance and faith, bestows pardon and justification, affords grace to sanctified believers, and perseverance to bring them safe to glory. Thus the faithful say with David, *Salvation is of the Lord*; and sing hosannahs not to their own wisdom, strength or merit, but to *God and the Lamb forever*.

Indeed, Doctor, I must cudgel you: I can hold no long. My patience is worn down to the stump, and the stump is going. What a cypher you make of the poor grazier; and what a hobby-horse of human nature? according to your account, she has no more eyes, ears or hands to help herself, than an oyster. Why, your picture of nature is so horrid black, it would even fright a chimney-sweeper! What? have I no power in myself to begin the Christian life; and when begun, no strength to carry it on? Am I in debt to Jesus Christ for every thing?

Please to drop your cudgel, Sir, and I will give an answer. A vapouring staff does not suit my fancy. You are indebted unto Christ for every good you do possess, and to yourself for all the evil you do commit. Jesus Christ is the author and finisher of every good thing in the spiritual, rational and animal life; he is alpha and omega in them all.

No animal has life till he gives it; and no animal has power, when

in life, to prolong its life a moment. It may eat and drink ; yet food and liquor are not life, but means of life. *We live not by bread alone, but by the word of God.* That word, which bringeth food, must give it blessing, and then it nourisheth.

When Christ creates an idiot, all the schools in the world cannot give him reason, because he is born without it.

And where a rational nature is given, and means used for its cultivation, still they are but means, which profit some, and help not others, though alike diligent. Every opening of the understanding, every improvement in science, and every invention in handicrafts, with all skill in working, comes *wholly* from Jesus, who is called the *light of men*, (John i. 4.) and calls himself the *light of the world*, (John viii. 12. He opens a budding understanding, as he opens a budding rose.

Whatever light men have, it proceeds from Christ *alone*. And he can give this light gradually ; or give it all at once, as he did to Adam : and as he did to Bezaleel and Aholiab, two brick-makers, who were furnished immediately with *wisdom* of heart, and *skill* of hand, for engraving, carving, embroidery, and all kind of work. (Exod. xxxv. 30.)

He can make men forget their native language, and speak divers others, in a moment, as he did at Babel : or he can make men retain their native language, and speak divers others, in a moment, as he did at Pentecost.

Courage too proceeds from Jesus. When he would exalt a nation, *fee of them shall chase an hundred* ; and when he would depress a nation, *they shall fly when none pursueth*. (Levit. xxvi. 8—17.)

Neither has a rational nature any power to preserve itself. A philosopher, engaged in study, and surrounded with literature, may turn an idiot, or fall distracted, in a moment ; and he would do so, if not supported secretly by Jesus : *his visitation preserveth our spirit*. (Job x. 12.)

Where the animal and rational nature are given, a man is yet void of life spiritual, till Jesus Christ bestows it ; as void of life spiritual, as an idiot is of life rational. And as none but Jesus could give an idiot rational life, so none but he can give a rational man spiritual life.

This life was lost at the fall, and never is recovered till Jesus quickens us. And till this life is recovered, men are only Christian ghosts, having semblance without substance, resting on a *broken* bed of duties, and will find as much relief from it, as an hungry stomach from a painted feast.

Paul, I suppose, alludes to the spiritual life, when writing to a Christian church, styled elsewhere *spiritual men* : he prays that *spirit, soul and body, may be preserved blameless* ; (1 Thess. v. 23,) which *three* portions, make up (what he calls the *ὅλον* of a Christian man, or) the *whole lot* of nature assigned him by the Lord.

When spiritual life is given, a man is *born of the Spirit*, (John iii. 6,) and finds divine communion through the Spirit ; but has no power in himself to preserve the life which is begun : no more power to continue or enlarge his spiritual life, than his rational or animal life. Means of grace must be used, but these are nothing more than means still. The support, increase and continuance of the spiritual life are *wholly* from Jesus, *in whom we live and move and have our being*.

(To be continued.)

ART. IV. *The Rev. Dr. M' Crie.*

It has become our melancholy task to notice in our pages the sudden and premature decease of this eminent and lamented minister of Christ, which took place on Wednesday, the 5th day of August, at half past twelve noon. So recent, so sudden, so totally unexpected is this alarming dispensation, that it demands an effort even yet to realize what our pen must record,—that the name which but yesterday was ranked with the most respected of the living, has now passed to its place among the illustrious dead. The principal circumstances attending this mournful event are too public to require repetition; and we have considered it sufficient to give these in the language of some excellent notices which appeared in the newspapers at the time. We shall therefore confine ourselves to such facts as may not be so generally known, and may prove interesting to our readers. The health of this distinguished man had been for a considerable time past in such a declining, or rather precarious state, as to occasion considerable anxiety to his friends. His frame, though of late apparently robust, had been for some years subjected to severe attacks of disease, particularly that acute disorder known by the name of *tic douloureux*, accompanied with *erisypelas*, which reduced his strength to such a degree as to unfit him, for a considerable time afterwards, for any exertion. His last attack of this nature was in the month of May last, when his recovery was more lingering than usual. During the summer his strength rallied so far as to enable him to undertake several long journies in different directions, and to assist at various sacraments, on which occasion he seemed in the enjoyment of good health and spirits, and discharged his duties with more than his usual vigour and acceptableness. He felt particularly anxious to visit the bereaved congregation of his lamented friend, the late Mr. Smith of Kilwinning, to whom he administered, much to their refreshment, the consolations which his own flock was so soon to require. Indeed, in the whole of this progress in visiting the churches, which was extended far beyond its usual limits, he seems to have been guided by a special Providence, and left such an impression on every congregation which enjoyed the benefit of his ministrations, that now he has been removed, they cannot help regarding his visit as a parting blessing left behind to them by this favored servant of the Lord. Ministers and people speak with one voice of the heavenly unction, the solemn pathos, and remarkable power which characterized his labors during this season, in such a way as to show that his soul was fast ripening for the rest which awaited it, and preparing to take its flight for ever from the scene of his earthly labours. The matter and the manner of his discourses could not have been made more appropriate to such a consummation, had he known assuredly that “those among whom he had gone preaching the kingdom of God should see his face no more.” “The better, even the heavenly country,”—“the city which God has prepared” for those that love him,—the love of Christ,—the duty of his people in times of trial and in the prospect of judgment—these were the topics he chiefly dwelt on, and they were urged in a strain of lofty devotion, which carried the conviction to all, that the good of souls and the glory of his Master lay nearer his heart than the rewards of literary toils, the incense of human applause, or any sublunary object whatever.

While thus actively engaged, however, in the work of his Divine Master, he received several warnings of the fatal disease by which he was soon to be removed from the service of the Church on earth. From

some internal symptoms, he had felt for some time before that his constitution was giving way, and to some of his relations and intimate friends he expressed himself persuaded (in the same way as his friend, Dr. Thomson, had done before him,) that he would *die soon and suddenly*. He complained much of his strength being overtaken, that he had *too much to do*, and frequently said that he would never be able to bring his intended Life of Calvin to a conclusion. This, however, did not seem to give him much uneasiness; he had done enough, he said, to enable another to finish it after him. On Sabbath he preached in his own pulpit twice with his usual animation. He lectured in the forenoon on John xxi. 15—18, and it is remarkable, that had he lived to officiate another Sabbath, he would in all probability have finished this book. In the afternoon he preached on that striking text, Matt. iii. 12, "Whose fan is in his hand," &c., of which all that heard it declare that a more solemn and impressive discourse they had seldom, if ever, heard from his lips. In the evening of this his last Sabbath on earth, he was remarkably cheerful, so much so as to excite the observation of his nearest friends. On Monday he was so much in his usual health, and entertained a small party of friends at dinner. On Tuesday afternoon, the 4th of August, he was seized with a sudden and severe attack of pain. From this he was relieved by medicine, and to his anxious friends expressed no fears of any immediate danger. Shortly after he fell into a slumber, which soon assumed an alarming character. He had gradually and insensibly sunk into a stupor, out of which it was found impossible to awaken him to consciousness. The disease had taken the appearance of apoplexy; and surrounded by numbers of grieving and awe-stricken friends, who had collected to witness the last moments of their beloved pastor, without a groan or struggle, his spirit entered into rest. At his death, he was in the 63d year of his age, and 40th of his ministry.

Thus has departed from us, in the full career of his usefulness, in the full possession of his mental powers, in the height of his fame, and at a period of life when he might have calculated on enjoying the fruits of his labors for some time to come,—a man whose loss the Church and the world, as well as his flock and his friends, will long have cause to deplore. We are no friends to fulsome panegyrics over the dead, and were we disposed to indulge in them on this occasion, we would be checked by remembering the extreme modesty of the deceased,—his sensitive aversion to personal adulation when alive, and his well-known repugnance to the practice of lauding departed worthies, in language which they would have shrunk from hearing applied to them in their life time. But though, in the present case, to pourtray must be to praise, and the more faithful the picture, the more must our language assume the appearance of flattery, regard for the living, as well as justice, gratitude, and respect to the memory of the dead,—and above all, the honor of the grace of God, by which *he was what he was*, (alas! that we must now speak of him in the *past tense*.) urges us to attempt, in our feeble way, to give some idea of him as a man, a minister, and a public character, leaving it to another to do justice to his life in the form of memoir.

We express only what every one that knew Dr. M' Crie must have observed, when we say, that the most striking part of his character consisted in the singular combination it presented of a variety of excellencies seldom to be met with in the same individual. In his natural disposition, there was a high-toned energy, and what in the best sense may be called *deep passion*, united with an amazing power of self-control. In-



tense feeling was doubtless the leading feature of his mind, but so completely was this held in check, so steadily was it regulated, that to many who knew him superficially, caution might seem to be the predominating trait. Nor was this moderation superinduced as an extraneous coating over the rest of his character; it formed an essential element of it, and was the fruit of that very energy of mind which required its exercise. Connected with this prominent feature, was his enlightened, and at the same time ardent and enthusiastic patriotism, his high regard for the true rights and liberties of man, civil and religious, which appeared in every part of his life, as it does in every page of his writings, and which he held with a firmness and consistency which no change of parties, no practical misapplications of his favorite principles, exemplified in the varied events which had passed before him, and in the shifting scenes of worldly politics, could shake or subdue. While on this part of his character, we cannot fail to recall the ardor and promptitude with which he appeared in behalf of the persecuted Protestants in France, and more lately in the cause of the injured Greeks. His public appearances on these occasions not more delighted than astonished those who had only heard of him as the quiet pastor, or the plodding student. All this was engrafted on sound and deep-rooted religious principle. There was a nobility of spirit about him—a high sense of integrity and independence, that may be traced in those bursts of honest and virtuous indignation with which he visited every thing like tergiversation or want of principle, and the readiness with which he appeared in vindication of injured worth, in the persons both of the living and the dead. In the case of the latter, particularly, it assumed all the attributes of a chivalrous passion; inducing him to devote his time, talents, ease, health, and life itself, to the arduous pursuit of truth through the intricate and untrodden paths of history, and to rescue from oblivion and from obloquy the names and deeds of our Scottish reformers. He could be grave without being morose,—severe, but without the least tincture of rancour or asperity. None who ever witnessed the occasional corruscations of this spirit, as exhibited in his public appearances, will forget the impression produced by the indignant rebuke, the withering sarcasm, or the stirring appeal, as they flashed from his expressive eye, and shook every fibre of his animated frame,—a natural eloquence, peculiar to himself, which seemed to rise above the ordinary efforts of elocution by spurning all its ordinary rules.

These were the obvious traits of his character which might be seen by all; the more unobtrusive and amiable qualities, for which he was not less distinguished, appeared on a closer inspection, and could only be thoroughly appreciated by long acquaintance. Of his piety, it is unnecessary to say more, than that it was not less decidedly realized in his private walk, than it breathed in his public ministrations. Of his disinterestedness it is equally needless to speak; numerous instances of it, which we cannot now specify, are engraven on the memories of many; indeed, if there was any part of his nature which he permitted to border on excess, it was this; his contempt of wealth, and of all unseemly methods of acquiring it, leading him to decline as dishonorable every thing that bore even the aspect of literary jobbing. In his private character, none who were admitted to his society need be reminded of the perfect ease, the benignity, the unceremonious cheerfulness of his manners, amounting occasionally to playfulness and pleasantry, which made him accessible to all, and inspired confidence in young and old; and many

can tell of the steadiness of his friendships, the affectionate interest with which he entered into the cases of distress submitted to him, and the readiness with which he communicated his valued counsel and advice. With such qualities, it may be conceived what he proved as a husband and a father. It would be unpardonable, however, to omit noticing two features of his private character, which secured him the respect and affection gained by his other qualities:—a singular *prudence*, which enabled him, without the aid of chicanery, or sacrificing principle to peace, to steer his way, both in public and private life, and through the most trying circumstances, with a blamelessness and inoffensiveness of deportment, seldom exemplified, and which, we truly believe, has not left him, if any thing could ever have found him, a single enemy upon earth. To the other trait we have already alluded,—his unaffected *modesty*. Of no man could it be said with such truth,—he “blushed to find it fame.” In truth, he seemed as anxious to avoid human applause as other men are to gain it. In his efforts to do so, however, there was no semblance of affectation: it was his native temper, for which he himself took no credit, and to avoid the praise of which, he would even do violence to himself; exemplifying the beautiful picture which Leighton has drawn of humility—“He would not care to do some things on purpose that might seem arrogant, to carry humility unseen, that doth so naturally delight in covering all graces, and is sorry that it cannot do so without being seen itself.”

As a preacher, his excellencies were peculiarly his own. The ground work of all his ministrations was the communication of divine *knowledge*,—particularly, the knowledge of Christ and him crucified. It was through informing the judgment, by plain but striking exhibitions of Scriptural truth, that he sought to reach the grand practical end of the Christian ministry. From the whole tone and tenor of his doctrine, the impression was practical. His mode was not to talk about the blessedness of the gospel, but by leading to its sources, to infuse it. There was no theorizing in his discourses, no attempts to shine, by striking out original views of doctrine, or startling interpretations of Scripture. In his theology, there was a catholicity which led him almost invariably, to fix on the generally received creed and commentary of the Protestant Church, and confine his ingenuity, his acuteness, and his fancy, to the task of throwing around the familiar truths of the gospel a light that seemed to render them almost palpable, and a charm approaching to that of novelty.

As a lecturer, he is acknowledged by all who heard him to have been unrivalled. Wherein the peculiar excellence of this department of his ministerial work lay, it is difficult to describe,—so entirely did it differ from the ordinary models from which we are accustomed to take our ideas of lecturing. It gives us great pleasure to understand, that the Doctor has left many of his sermons and lectures in a state ready for publication: and from these the public may soon have an opportunity of judging, though denied the high advantage of the living manner and voice of the speaker, the characteristic excellences to which we can now only allude.

Those who have heard him in prayer, will realize as if they heard him still, and will ever retain, the solemn impression produced by his manner of performing this part of divine service, while with a mind evidently wrapt up in the contemplation of the Being whom he addressed, his thoughts clothed themselves naturally without either the studied fluency

of premeditation, or the strained effort of invention, in the most striking and appropriate language, welling out from the fountain of a heart which needed no other prompting than its own devout emotions, and no other liturgy than that of the Scriptures, the reservoir whence he drew his copious and ever-varied supplies.

As a minister, the hearts of his congregation were his, and were becoming more and more so every day: his loss to them must be, in many respects, irreparable. They were justly proud of their minister; if that expression can be applied to the high value which they set on their near relation to one who, in addition to ministerial qualifications which challenged their admiration, and which had never reached a higher point in their esteem than at the period when he was removed from them, occupied so lofty a place in the estimation of the country and of the world. With him they never had occasion to disagree; and a more respectful, affectionate flock, a more happy and harmonious session, never perhaps rewarded or aided the labors of a Christian pastor. It may be proper here to correct a statement in one of the notices subjoined, that in consequence of his deposition by the religious body to which he formerly belonged, Dr. M' Crie was "thrown destitute on the world;" which may lead some to suppose that few or none of his original congregation adhered to him after that event; whereas the truth is, that the major and better part of his flock never left him. Whatever personal consequences he may himself have anticipated from the step which he took, having never appealed to the sympathy of his people by making his own case the theme of his ministrations, but having thrown himself on the care of his heavenly Master, he was agreeably relieved by the sympathy and the support of more than he ever calculated on, several of whom "remain unto this present." We must, however, decline the task of exhibiting the display of his patience in suffering, his meekness, forbearance, and forgiveness, or the wisdom, perseverance, and fidelity, with which he devoted himself to the cause in which his heart was so deeply engaged.

Faults he surely had. We have known him long, and cannot say we ever discovered them, except in, or connected with, the excess of virtues:—excessive disinterestedness—a faulty unselfishness—an inverted observation of himself, and others—turning the diminishing glass on himself, and the magnifying on others. He could feel keenly, but it was for the distresses of others; or if he was touched on his own account, it was in scorn of some imputed meanness, or implied want of confidence: if the warmth of indignant expression ever escaped from him, it was in defence of an injured friend, or the insulted dignity of truth. If any excellence seemed to prevail in his later deportment, it was that which is now perfected—a large good will to his fellow-men—an expansive charity to his fellow-Christians, which seemed, as he approached the close of his career, to assume the form of paternal impartiality, leading him to act rather as the umpire than as the partizan in their various controversies, and beautifully exhibiting "the fruit of the Spirit in all goodness."

As a literary character, it is not our province to enter on his merits; but our sketch would be deficient in faithfulness, were we to omit noticing the services he has done to the Church by his writings. It was as a historian he was distinguished while he lived, and his labors, in vindicating the religious reformation of his country, will endear his name to posterity, and perpetuate his fame and his usefulness. As the biographer of Knox and Melville, his name will go down with them to distant ages.

Dr. M' Crie selected his theme at a period when its worth and impor-

tance were not appreciated even as they are now with a magnanimity which ennobled his spirit, and often directed his regards to a suffering cause. His attention was first turned to the study of the history of the Church in his native land, by his being involved, in early life, in the controversy regarding the duties of the civil magistrate in reference to religion; and thus, to his ardent desire to satisfy his mind on a question which now threatens to shake the foundations of civil and religious society, the world owes one of the most interesting and popular biographies that have ever appeared—the life of John Knox. Many, we fear, applaud this and his following work, the *Life of Andrew Melville*, without perceiving that their main design is to assert the spirituality and independence of the Church of Christ—to show how these may be maintained compatibly with a national recognition of her rights, and support of her external fabric—and to rouse the church of Scotland, in particular to shake from her every thing inconsistent with her liberties and efficiency as a Christian establishment. The author did not anticipate the honor which his own times have conferred on him; and we will not attempt to predict the manner in which his works shall be estimated by those who will reap the more extended fruits which the application of his principles shall produce on religion and liberty. The ability, the research, wisdom, candor, fearless fortitude, unimpeached fidelity, and subduing modesty of the historian; the strain of piety and patriotism which pervades all his writings; the effects they have already produced, and those which they seem prepared to accomplish; these and many other topics must engage the pen of the biographer who offers to the world a life of the author of *Knox and Melville*.

The cotemporaries of Dr. M'Crie appear to have been unanimous in voting him the honor of Ecclesiastical Historiographer to his country. Whatever any wished to see accomplished in that line, was invariably assigned to him, and such as will take the trouble to collect from the periodicals of the day the tasks thus publicly allotted, will find employment prepared for him far more than sufficient to have occupied all his days and nights. Many have regretted that the Doctor did not, in the *Life of Boyd, Baillie, or Henderson*, carry forward the *History of the Church of Scotland*, nor can we blame any for wishing to have seen the transactions from 1638 to 1650, narrated by him who had done his work so well in the history of the first reformation. We have no doubt that with respect to the line in which he chose to direct his historical labors after the completion of the *Life of Melville*, his reasons were completely satisfying to his own mind, and that he would have made out a stronger case than any other can make for him. We may say, however, that the incredible labor to which he submitted in accomplishing his two great works—the fact that, at the close of the last of the two, he sunk down under a degree of exhaustion from which his bodily frame does not seem ever to have entirely recovered—what he accomplished in the illustration and defence of the *principles* of the Second Reformation—his works on *Italy and Spain*—and the preparations which he had made for furnishing the so much desired *Life of Calvin*—leave no room to regret the manner in which his valuable time was devoted.

Dr. M'Crie did not write for fame, and he proved it by a steadfast adherence to his great cause, in its bad as well as its good report. He was all his days a genuine Seceder, and took joyfully all the duty and all the suffering appointed to him in maintaining a consistent title to that despised name.

We are perfectly sensible that multitudes who honor his name in its alliance with those of Knox and Melville, can hardly digest its relation to that diminutive communion with which it was so long associated.—Nor are we unprepared to admit that, from his single name, that little ecclesiastical society derived nearly the whole of its worldly repute, and that they are in no small danger of grafting an unprofitable feeling of vanity on the interest which he permitted them to claim in him, and forgetting their solemn responsibility in improving for themselves and others the distinguished privileges which they enjoyed in the ministry and fellowship of so great and so good a man.

We wish, however, to think and speak of him in his relation to that great cause, which he considered, not as receiving honor from, but imparting honor to all its adherents. In his own words, we give the aspect under which he contemplated the Secession, and which bound his heart to it. "The profession of Seceders," he says in his Appendix to Sermons on Unity, "while it rests on the ground common to all true Protestants, the supreme authority of scripture, embraces the general interests of Christianity, and gives them their due place and importance. Whatever others as Christians, Protestants, or Presbyterians glory in, they vindicate as theirs too, and have embodied in their testimony.—With respect to those things by which they are distinguished in principle or in practice from other denominations of Presbyterians, and which will be called *their* peculiarities, they plead that these are either expressly warranted by the word of God and the subordinate formularies of the Church of Scotland, or follow from them as conclusions from premisses, and corollaries from geometrical axioms."

Dr. M' Crie considered the cause of the Secession as the suitable appearance of his day for the principles of the First and Second Reformation. With his convictions, he would have gloried in being found among the rank and file of its witnesses; it is left to us to view him as a man chosen of God, and singularly qualified to perform very eminent service for its preservation and maintenance. It would require pages more numerous than we can allot to the subject, to relate the labors of this, the last the world has yet seen of the great defenders of Secession principles. There are, however, monuments and trophies raised by his own hand. "The Statement," the Sermons on the Unity of the Church, with its appendix,—the Historical part of the 'Testimony of Original Seceders, and his share in framing the late "Reasons of a Fast," appointed by that body, are the records of his consistency, zeal, and ability, in behalf of an interest for which he was so willing to spend and be spent. The little community to which he was a friend so affectionate, so active, and so efficient, will feel deeply the loss they have sustained. They know that the man whom all so much loved and revered, was the most humble among them, and that, so far from presuming to dictate, it was with great difficulty he could be prevailed on to take that leading part in discussion which all were ready to yield to him, or to deliver those judgments which seldom failed to carry universal agreement.

He loved the Church of his native land; but he loved it too well to love any thing but its excellences, or to seek any thing but its good.—Many regret that he died without wearing its highest honors;—we who have seen him under many aspects, verily believe that they would have been a burden to him. He would have shed tears of joy for the recovery of the Church of Scotland to truth and public duty; but as to himself, his language would have been,—“Let thy rewards be to another.”

In connexion with this, we cannot help stating, that nothing for a long time seemed to give him more unfeigned satisfaction than to see that Church asserting her intrinsic power in the appointment of the late day of public fasting: a day which he himself celebrated by public services, which will not soon be forgotten by those who heard them.

For the length of this sketch, which has extended far beyond our original intention, we offer no apology. Our friends will excuse the feelings that have overstepped, on such an occasion, the ordinary limits of such notices. We leave them, at present, to draw in silence the moral and religious reflections which such an event is fitted to excite, and invite them meanwhile to join with us in the prayer, never more necessary than now,—“Help, Lord: for the godly man ceaseth, the faithful fail from the children of men.”—*Presbyterian Magazine.*

---

**ART. 5. *On the desecration of the Sabbath.***

At the late meeting of the General Assembly, the following report was adopted.

“The committee to whom was referred Overture No. 5, relating to the Christian Sabbath, respectfully report,

That they have given to the consideration of it all that attention which circumstances would permit, and are prepared to submit to the Assembly the results of their deliberations.

One important fact cannot be denied. The desecration of the Sabbath is certainly increasing, with fearful rapidity, in almost every part of our beloved country. A solemn and alarming crisis has already come. Unless the slumbering energies of the church are speedily aroused, to arrest the progress of this growing evil, the entire obliteration of the Sabbath will, at no distant day, be the result.

It is necessary only to look into our large cities and villages on the Sabbath; or to glance the eye along our navigable rivers, and over our beautiful lakes; or to trace the extended lines of our canals and railroads; or listen to the perpetual rumbling of loaded vehicles on all our travelled roads, in order to be convinced that Sabbath breaking has already become a sin of giant growth in our land. It is indeed a wide spread, deep seated, unblushing evil. It enters boldly into almost every commercial interest in the country; and embraces, directly or indirectly, in its broad sweep of mischief, a vast multitude of individuals, and what is still worse, an alarming proportion of these offenders belong to the church of the living God. Here is the root of the evil. The church has become a deliberate partaker in this great sin. In this way has her warning voice been well nigh silenced, her redeeming power over the community paralyzed, and the salutary restraints of a consistent example effectually vacated.

Reformation, then must begin at the house of God. If the church alone can, under God, save the Sabbath from being abolished, she must first reform her own conduct. In entering upon the work, it must not be forgotten that, in its failure or success are involved the best interests of the church, of our country, and the world.

The rest of the Sabbath is the only wise and adequate provision for the wants of the animal system. The influence of the Sabbath can

alone be relied on to sustain our free institutions, to extend the empire of law, to preserve domestic order and happiness; and to continue the bare existence of morality and religion in the world. The abandonment of the Sabbath is, therefore, nothing less than resigning all that is sacred and dear to a Christian people, for time and for eternity.

It is certain, that whatever is done to rebuke and arrest the profanation of the Sabbath, must be done *immediately*. The work of reform cannot be delayed without hazarding the irretrievable loss of all the blessings which flow from the observance of that day. The task has already become formidable and difficult. It is not, however, altogether hopeless. The Sabbath may yet be restored, and its blessings perpetuated. The church and the ministry can, under God, do all that the exigency demands.

Let this Assembly do their whole duty—lift up a voice of strength; send out a loud note of alarm; determine, in the strength of the Lord, to carry out, in their practical relations to the Sabbath, the true principles of Christian discipline; and the whole church may be cleansed, the Sabbath reinstated, and this great and guilty nation saved. Till this is done, the power of every other Christian enterprise will be circumscribed and fluctuating.

Nothing that is pure and holy can flourish without the Sabbath. The Sabbath reform is the fundamental enterprise. It is utterly vain to think of substituting any other conservative power. The question of rescuing the Sabbath from general profanation is, *absolutely*, a question of life and death, to every Christian denomination in the world. Such is the momentous nature of the subject under consideration.

Your committee rejoice that in this work, *all hearts may unite*, and every minor difference be forgotten. Here is common ground. The Sabbath of the Lord is the inheritance of all true Christians; and there is work enough for all. The church must revive her wholesome discipline—the ministry must cry aloud and spare not—the press must be enlisted, the whole community aroused—the entire instrumentality which God has prepared for preserving his own institutions, must be called forth, and kept in untiring requisition. For the purpose of enabling the General Assembly more effectually to speak their sentiments to the churches, and the nation, your committee recommend the adoption of the following resolutions:

Resolved, That the observance of the Sabbath, is indispensable to the enjoyment of civil and religious liberty; and furnishes the only security for eminent and abiding prosperity, either to the church or the nation.

That the growing desecration of the Sabbath in our country must be speedily arrested, and the habits of the community essentially reformed, or the blessings of the Sabbath, civil, social, and religious, will soon be irrevocably lost.

That in as much as the work of a general reformation belongs, under God, to the Christian church, it is the duty of the church to apply the convictions of a firm and efficient discipline, to all known violations of the Sabbath, on the part of her members.

That in as much as ministers of the gospel must act a conspicuous part in every successful effort to do away this sin, it is their solemn duty to maintain, by faithful preaching and consistent practice, the rule of entire abstinence from all profanations of the Lord's day; uniformly avoiding even the appearance of evil.

That this Assembly deem it an immorality to journey, or transact any secular business, or give and receive social visits on the Sabbath; [or to own stock in such establishments as stages, steam boats, rail roads and the like, which are employed in violation of that holy day.] [The part included in brackets above was stricken out, and the amendment proposed by Dr. Miller in the two following paragraphs was adopted:]

That in the judgment of this General Assembly, the owners of stock in the steam boats, canals, rail roads, &c. who are in the habit of violating the Sabbath, are lending their property and their influence to one of the most wide-spread, alarming, and deplorable systems of Sabbath desecration, which now grieve the hearts of the pious, and disgrace the church of God.

That it be respectfully recommended to the friends of the Lord's day, as soon as possible, to establish such means of public conveyance as shall relieve the friends of the Sabbath from the necessity under which they now labor, of travelling at any time in vehicles which habitually violate that holy day; and thus prevent them from being partakers in other men's sin's, in this respect.

That the power of the pulpit and the press must be immediately put in requisition on behalf of a dishonored Sabbath; that the magnitude and remedy of the evils, which its violation involves, may be fully understood by the whole community.

That this Assembly solemnly enjoin it upon the churches under their care to adopt, without delay, all proper measures for accomplishing a general and permanent reformation from the sin of Sabbath-breaking, and all its attendant evils.

That a committee of one from each Synod under the care of this Assembly be now appointed, to hold correspondence with ministers and churches, for the purpose of carrying out and applying the leading principles of the foregoing report and resolutions.

That the foregoing report and resolutions, be published in those newspapers, secular and religious, which are friendly to the observance of the Sabbath.

---

ART. VI. *The case of Mr. Barnes.*

We had intended to lay before our readers the whole proceedings of the late General Assembly in the above case, but being so perfectly disgusted with much of those proceedings, we shall content ourselves with publishing merely the winding up of the affair. From this our readers will see that heresy is triumphant in the Presbyterian church. Pelagianism is declared by her highest tribunal to be consistent with truth, yea, to be the truth taught in the Bible and set forth in the formularies of the Westminster divines! We have long thought that this numerous, and in many particulars, highly respectable church was "rotten to the core" in regard to doctrine, but we were not prepared to see the decision of the Synod of Philadelphia in the case of Mr. Barnes, reversed by such an overwhelming majority of the delegates of said church, in General Assembly convened. "The Presbyterian" thinks, the orthodox are on the gaining hand, and that by perseverance they will soon become triumphant in that body, and consequently that the Augean stable will soon be cleansed. We think differently, though



we hope we may be mistaken. It is the nature of leaven to leaven the whole lump. What prospect of succeeding has orthodoxy in a body, where some of those members who are loudest in its praises, are the first to compromise its interests and to shield its enemies from the wholesome exercise of discipline? Witness the time-serving policy, and we think, sinful course of Dr. Samuel Miller and some others in the case referred to. Dr. Miller was for passing a *resolution* that Mr. Barnes was guilty of publishing gross and dangerous heresy, and yet he voted to sustain his appeal! He thought that Barnes was a great heretic, but voted that he ought not to be subjected to church discipline! As long as such men have a controlling influence in the Presbyterian church, and are regarded even by the Orthodox as oracles of soundness and purity, we have no hope of any thing like a thorough and permanent reformation taking place, very soon, in that body. And there is another consideration which helps to induce this state of feeling viz. the fact that on the great practical questions which called forth the action of the late Assembly, such as the subjects of slavery, and the desecration of the Sabbath, the Orthodox generally were found on the loose side, or in other words, were opposed to that strict morality which "becometh the gospel."

The answers to the Reasons of Protest by Dr. Phillips and his associates will appear in the next number.

We need only add that, as might be expected of an Assembly that could acquit Albert Barnes of heresy, the elective affinity Presbytery of Philadelphia, which had been annihilated by the Synod of Philadelphia, has been resuscitated, only under a new name, viz. that of the Third Presbytery of Philadelphia, and with certain bounderies prescribed to it, it having been before as *boundless* as it was regardless of the interests of truth and comely order.

"The Assembly resumed and finished the calling of the roll on the case of Mr. Barnes, when Dr. Absalom Peters arose and offered the following resolutions; viz.

"1. Resolved, That the Appeal of the Rev. Albert Barnes, be, and it hereby is sustained.

"2. Resolved, That the decision of the Synod of Philadelphia, suspending the Rev. Albert Barnes from all the functions of a Gospel Minister be, and it hereby is reversed."

Dr. Hoge offered the following amendment, viz.

"That the Appeal of the Rev. Albert Barnes be sustained *in part*, and that a committee of five be appointed to bring in resolutions expressive of the sense of the House."

Dr. Skinner asked what was meant by the words "*in part*," in Dr. Hoge's amendment.

Dr. Hoge explained that by "*in part*," he meant to sustain the Appeal as far as the reversal of the sentence of suspension; but wished to leave the door open for the condemnation of his doctrines.

Dr. Skinner then replied, that he could not vote for the amendment.

Dr. Miller advocated the amendment—said he could vote for the removal of the suspension, but could not vote to approve or pass without condemnation of his doctrines. If he was driven to a vote on the resolutions of Dr. Peters, he must say, *not sustain*.

After a good deal of discussion, Mr. Nesbit offered the following substitute for the resolutions of Dr. Peters; and Dr. Hoge, for the time being, withdrew his amendment, to allow the substitute of Mr. Nesbit to be put to the house:

“Resolved, that the Appeal of the Rev. Albert Barnes be sustained, so far as it relates to that part of the definitive sentence, suspending him from all the functions of the Gospel ministry.”

The motion to postpone Dr. Peters' resolutions for the purpose of adopting the substitute of Mr. Nesbit, was put and lost.

Dr. Hoge then renewed his amendment.

Dr. Phillips then moved to postpone Dr. Peters' resolutions, for the purpose of pursuing the order laid down in the book, viz. to call the roll, and vote upon the Appeal. “Sustain or Not Sustain.” This motion was carried, the yeas and nays were called for and recorded.

The question was then taken on the Appeal of Mr. Barnes, which was Sustained. Yeas, 134; nays, 96; non-liquets, 6.

The Assembly then adjourned till to-morrow morning at 8 o'clock.

Tuesday, June 7th, 8 o'clock, A. M.

The Assembly met, and was opened with prayer.

The case of Mr. Barnes being then resumed, Dr. Miller offered the following resolution, viz :

“Resolved, That while this General Assembly has thought proper to remove the sentence of suspension under which the Rev. Mr. Barnes was placed by the Synod of Philadelphia, yet the judgment of this Assembly is, that Mr. Barnes in his *Notes on the Epistle to the Romans*, has published opinions materially at variance with the CONFESSIO OF FAITH of the PRE-BYTERIAN CHURCH, and with the WORD OF GOD; especially with regard to *original sin—the relation of man to Adam, and justification by faith in the atoning sacrifice and righteousness of the Redeemer*. The Assembly consider the manner in which Mr. Barnes has controverted the language and doctrines of our public standards as highly reprehensible, and as adapted to pervert the minds of the rising generation from the simplicity and purity of the gospel plan. And although some of the most objectionable statements and expressions which appeared in the earlier editions of the work in question, have been either removed, or so far modified or explained, as to render them more in accordance with our public formularies; still, the Assembly considers the work, even in its present amended form, as containing representations which cannot be reconciled with the letter or spirit of our public standards, and would solemnly admonish Mr. Barnes again to review this work; to modify still further the statements which have grieved his brethren, and to be more careful in time to come to study the purity and peace of the Church.”

The above resolution being seconded, Dr. Miller accompanied it with a few remarks.

Dr. Peters then rose, and moved to postpone Dr. Miller's resolution for the purpose of taking up the following, stating that it was the same which he had offered last evening, viz :

“Resolved, That the decision of the Synod of Philadelphia, suspending the Rev. Albert Barnes from all the functions proper to the Gospel ministry be, and it hereby is reversed.”

The vote was taken on this resolution, by calling the roll for the purpose of recording the *ayes* and *nays*, when it was decided in the affirmative, the vote stood as follows :

Yeas.—Messrs. Sterns, Hoyt, Fleming, Griffith, J. N. Lewis, Fellows, Edwards, Rockwell, Cannon, Pettibone, Sacket, Sweezy, B. B. Hotchkiss, Savage, Coolridge, Graves, Curtiss, Squier, Crosby, Whitaker, Stevens, Lathrop, M. Pomeroy, Cook, Reed, Town, M. Ford, D.

Platt, J. H. Hotchkin, J. Frost, N. Reynolds, Wells, Hart, Downs, Blanchard, Walker, Selden, Goodrich, Pitts, Thomson, Wing, D. Johnson, A. S. Allen, Wickham, Tuttill, Young, Nimmo, Peters, Skinner, Leavitt, Holbrook, J. Ford, E. Allen, Ward, Elison, Conger, Barton, J. M. Ogden, J. A. Johnson, Potter, Dr. S. Miller, B. Ogden, Stow, Jessup, Fitch, J. C. Parmelee, Seward, Preston, Enoch Conger, Strong, D. Miller, Talcott, Noyes, H. Kingsbury, Crosby, Cleaveland, R. Stuart, Humphrey, M'Gaffey, Beach, Geddes, Van Deman, A. Kingsbury, Amelin, J. Rankin, Galloway, Spaulding, Brainerd, Carey, Kitteridge, Martin, Lowry, Jennings, Post, Dashiell, Latty, Bergen, Lamb, Gridley, Stickell, M'Coy, Lovejoy, Kerr, Cochan, Mahan, Brown, M'Dowell, Gassell, Wharey, Armistead, J. Wilson, F. M'Farland, M'Elhenny, R. H. Henry, H. Smith, W. M. Lewis, Graham, M'Nair, M'Cutchan, D. F. Palmer, J. Smith, Montgomery, Eagleton, Cleft, Ross, Luckey, Carson, Laberee, Bradshaw, W. D. Baird, J. Allen, D. A. Smith, B. M. Palmer, Vancourt, Newton.—145.

*Nays.*—Messrs. James, Koontz, A. Platt, Downer, Hopkins, J. V. Henry, Minor, Phillips, Marshall, Lenox, M'Elroy, W. Wallace, (elder,) Seabrook, Castner, J. Campbell, Kennedy, Stinson, Henderson, Coburn, Coulter, M'Curdy, Stoneroad, Alexander, Hilands, Ray, Miller, J. Smith, Anderson, Eaton, R. Porter, W. P. Alrich, M'Farren, Valandigham, Wright, R. Johnson, Harbeson, J. Wilson, Rowland, Culbertson, Hanna, Elliott, William Wallace, R. Smith, Scovil, Swan, Bishop, Dunn, M. G. Wallace, Weaver, Donnell, Spiiman, Posey, W. L. Breckinridge, Bemiss, Curry, Price, Berryman, D. S. Todd, Williamson, T. Baird, Carothers, M'Callum, Kilpatrick, A. A. Campbell, Ingraham, S. B. Lewers, M'Clintock, J. L. R. Davis, Dunlap, Nesbit, Snowden, Pratt, J. S. Wilson, F. H. Porter, T. C. Stuart, Morrow, J. R. Hutchinson.—78.

The resolution of Dr. Miller was then taken up; when the Rev. Mr. Laberee moved that all that part of the resolution which followed the word "*resolved*," be stricken out, for the purpose of adopting the following amendment, viz:

"Resolved, That in the opinion of this Assembly, there are terms and modes of expression in the first edition of Mr. Barnes' '*Notes on the Romans*,' which are liable to misconception, and which have been misunderstood; but we are happy to find that these exceptionable expressions have generally been modified or omitted in the late editions of his book. This Assembly would therefore affectionately recommend to Mr. Barnes, in his future publications, to avoid the use of phraseology which is liable to misconception."

After considerable discussion of this amendment, in which Drs. Miller, Hoge, Peters, Mr. Jessup, Mr. Boyd, and others took a part, it was withdrawn by the mover, for the purpose of permitting the vote to be taken on the resolution of Dr. Miller unencumbered, Dr. Laberee, reserving to himself the right to offer it again, if the resolution of Dr. M. should not be carried. The vote was then taken on the resolution as offered by Dr. Miller, and was decided in the negative, Yeas 109, Nays 122, Non Liquefs 3.

Dr. Phillips gave notice in behalf of himself, and those who might choose to join with him, that he would protest against the proceedings of the General Assembly in the case of Mr. Barnes.

Dr. Hoge gave notice, in behalf of himself and those who might join with him, that he would protest against those parts of the proceedings

of the Assembly, with which he felt particularly aggrieved, in the case of Mr. Barnes.

---

*Protest against the decision in the case of Mr. Barnes.*

Dr. Phillips read the following Protest against the decision of the Assembly in the case of Mr. Barnes :

“*Whereas*, the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church did, by their vote on the 7th instant, reject a resolution disapproving some of the doctrinal statements contained in Barnes’ Notes on the Romans, which resolution, especially under the peculiar circumstances of the case, the undersigned consider of high importance to the Church with which we are connected, to the cause of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, and to the just exhibition of his grace and truth : We, whose names are subscribed, feel constrained, in the name of the Great Head of the Church, solemnly to protest against said decision, for the following reasons, viz. :

1. Because we believe that the constitutional Standards of the church, in their plain and obvious meaning, and in the sense in which they have always been received, are the rule of judgment by which all doctrinal controversies are to be decided ; that it is the duty of the church to maintain inviolate her doctrine and order, agreeably to those Standards, to bear her decided testimony against all deviations from them, and not to countenance them, even by implication ; yet, in the above decision, there was, as we believe, a departure from our constitutional rule ; a refusal to bear testimony against errors, with an implied approbation of them ; and a constructive denial, that ministers of the Gospel in the Presbyterian Church are under solemn obligations to conform in their doctrinal sentiments to our Confession of Faith and Catechisms.

2. Because the errors contemplated in the aforesaid resolution, do not consist merely, nor chiefly, in inaccurate or ambiguous expressions, and mistaken illustrations, but in sentiments and opinions respecting the great and important doctrines of the Gospel, which are inconsistent with the statement of those doctrines made in the Confession of Faith, and revealed in the Word of God. We sincerely and firmly believe that Mr. Barnes has denied, (*and that in a sneering manner,*) that Adam was the covenant head of the human race—that all mankind sinned in him as such, and were thus brought under the penalty of transgression: that Christ suffered the penalty of the law when he died for sin—and that the righteousness of Christ is imputed to believers for justification. These and similar doctrinal views, we regard as material variations from our Standards, as dangerous in themselves, and as contravening some of the leading principles of our system—such as man’s complete dependence, and the perfect harmony of justice and grace in the salvation of the sinner.

3. Because this expression of approbation of his opinions, was passed after, as we believe, it had been clearly and sufficiently proved to the Assembly, that Mr. Barnes had denied these important truths, and had expressed opinions respecting original sin, the nature of faith, and the nature of justification, which cannot be reconciled with our Standards ; and after, instead of retracting any of his doctrinal opinions, he had declared expressly before the Assembly, and published in the preface to the last edition of his Notes on the Romans, that he had not changed, but held them still, and was determined to preach them until he died.

For these reasons, and for the glory of God, that we may preserve a conscience void of offence, we request that this, our solemn protest, may be entered on the minutes of the Assembly.

Signed by 91 members.

### Notice.

We commence, with the present number, a series of papers on the early history of the Secession Church. These papers have been called forth by certain articles which appeared in the Biblical Repertory during the past year, in which the conduct and motives of the first Seceders, together with the facts connected with their case, were most grossly misrepresented. The Repertory is conducted under the supervision and control of the Professors in the Theological Seminary at Princeton, and therefore it becomes the more necessary to have its mis-statements corrected. Our correspondent has studied his subject faithfully, and appears to be perfectly familiar with the facts, which form the history of the period about which he employs his pen. His papers, we trust, will be read with great interest, and in the expectation of this, we have ventured to insert a much longer article from them than is usual in our work. The whole will probably be finished in four or five numbers more, by continuing to insert in each about the same quantity as in the present. We may embrace the present opportunity of stating, that upon examination we find, that the additional number of subscribers, which we have obtained, is not sufficient to meet the additional expenses arising from the enlargement that we have made in the size of the Monitor, and therefore we must still call upon our patrons and friends to use some further exertions, in order to increase our subscription list.

### Erratum.

In last No. page 45, the following typographical errors escaped correction: John R. Dickson, should read Joseph R. Dickson; D. Eurphy, should read D. Murphy; and appropriate benediction, should read apostolical benediction. The Statistical Table of the Presbytery of Albany, after correction, received some mishap, which renders its republication necessary.

STATISTICAL TABLE OF THE PRESBYTERY OF ALBANY.

Ministers.	Congregations.	Nearest P. O.	Counties.	States	P. am.	Com.
Andrew Stark.....	New-York 1st.....	New-York.....	New-York..	N. Y.	160	275
James Martin.....	Albany.....	Albany.....	Albany.....	do	70	163
Peter Campbell.....	Florida.....	Schenectady.....	Schenectady..	do	42	140
John G. Smart.....	Johnstown.....	Johnstown.....	Montgomery..	do	19	40
John Graham.....	Bovina.....	Bovina.....	Delaware.....		82	168
	{ Troy, ..	Troy.....	Rensselaer....	N. Y.		30
Vacancies.....	{ Newark, ..	Newark.....	N. J.			
	{ New York 2d.....	New York.....	New York.....	N. Y.	70	180
<i>Without charge.</i>						
Robert Laing.....						
P. Bullions.....						
Thomas Ferrier....						

THE  
RELIGIOUS MONITOR,

AND  
EVANGELICAL REPOSITORY.

---

AUGUST, 1836.

---

ART. I.—*Review of an Account of the Secession from the Established Church of Scotland, and of the principles of the Seceders, contained in the first and second numbers of the Biblical Repository, for 1835.*

(Continued from page 75.)

THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE COMMISSION, IN THE CASE OF THE PROTESTING BRETHREN.

The General Assembly of the church of Scotland annually appoints a committee which *usually*, not *uniformly* as the Repository supposes, consists of all the members of Assembly, with full power to decide causes, which the Assembly had not time to discuss, and which they remit to this committee, which has the name of "The Commission of the General Assembly." The Assembly adds instructions to them, to watch over every thing in which the general interest of the church appears to be concerned. The Commission has full power to decide finally in the causes remitted to them; and no appeal can be taken against their decisions. There is, however, a regulation, which provides against any supposed injustice in the sentences of the Commission, which is equivalent in its practical effects to the power of appealing. There may be a complaint at the instance either of a party, or of a member of the court, brought to the next General Assembly, against any sentence of a Commission, in which it can be stated that the Commission has exceeded its powers; and on such a complaint the Assembly may reverse or alter the sentence complained of.

The Commission has four stated meetings in the year, in May, August, November and March. The Moderator of the Assembly, on the application of a certain number of members, may call an extraordinary meeting when any unusual circumstances require it. The quorum of the Commission is thirty-one, of whom twenty-one must be ministers.—*(Appendix to the Life of Dr. Erskine, p. 487.)*

It was to a court of this description that the case of the four protesting brethren was referred by the Assembly, with positive instructions to suspend them, and afterwards to proceed to a higher censure if they refused to retract their protest, and profess their sorrow for offering it. When the four brethren appeared before the Commission in August, that court acted on the principle that they were merely to be executioners of the decrees of the Assembly. They refused to hear any petitions of others, or the representations of the brethren themselves, and insisted on a direct verbal answer as to their compliance with the order of the Assembly. It was only after about two hours pumping of Mr. Erskine, to get a direct verbal answer, that contrary to the rules of the court they reversed their own decision, and allowed him to read his own and Mr. Fisher's answer. The other two brethren who had united in a similar representation, were not allowed to read it, and stated verbally the substance of what they had prepared in writing. Their representations were afterwards published, and contain an able, and it will not be too strong language to say an unanswerable defence of their protest, and equally convincing reasons for their not withdrawing it.

Messrs. Wilson and Moncrief, after stating verbally their reasons for not complying with the demands of the Assembly, also protested:—"that any sentence of suspension, or of a higher nature, that should be inflicted upon them, should be held and reputed as *null and void* in itself; and that it should be lawful and warrantable for them to exercise their ministry as hitherto they had done, and as if no such censure had been inflicted upon them, in regard they were not convicted of departing from any of the received principles of this church, or of counteracting their ordination vows and engagements; but on the contrary were sentenced to censure by the late General Assembly, for protesting against a decision whereby injury was done to some truths of God, which they were obliged to own and confess; and whereby they were brought under *new and unwarrantable terms of ministerial communion*, inconsistent with the word of God, and their ordination vows and engagements;" as their representation more fully bears. To this protestation Messrs. Erskine and Fisher adhered.

A considerable number in the Commission were for a delay, but the majority judged the sentence of the Assembly to be peremptory; and when the vote was stated, "suspend the four protesting brethren from the exercise of the ministerial function, and all the parts thereof, or delay this affair?" it carried "suspend." From this sentence some ministers and elders, members of the Commission, dissented. The brethren being called in, the sentence was intimated to them; and accordingly the Moderator, not in the name and authority of Christ, the alone head and king of the church, but in the name and authority of the Assembly and Commission, did suspend the said brethren, *sine die*. Upon this the four brethren renewed their former protest, that this sentence should be held by them as null and void, and added that if any minister or probationer should exercise any part of their pastoral work, it should be esteemed a violent intrusion upon their ministerial labors. Several elders belonging to their congregations also protested and declared their adherence to their ministers, notwithstanding the sentence of suspension inflicted upon them. The first of these protests is signed by Wm. Ferguson, Colin Brown, David Robertson, James Davidson, Pat. Schioch, and Alexander McEuen, members of the Kirk-session of Perth, testifying their adherence to Mr. Wm. Wilson, one of their ministers,

and complaining that the petition of their Kirk-session presented to the Commission was neither read nor regarded. The second is signed by John Gibb, Wm. Allen, and Andrew Miller, members of the Kirk-session, of Sterling, protesting against the sentence suspending Mr. Ebenezer Erskine, one of their ministers, and testifying in their own name, and in the name of all who should adhere to them in the said congregation, their adherence to their minister; with a similar complaint respecting their petition. The third paper is signed by George Dran and Henry Balingal, elders in the parish of Abernethy, and George Miller and Sylvester Alexander, elders in the parish of Kinclaven; they say, "By virtue of commissions signed by the elderships of these congregations unanimously, and by a great many other inhabitants of the said parishes, appointing and empowering us to declare their and our adherence to our ministers, Messrs. Moncrieff and Fisher, in case they should be suspended, or otherwise censured by the Commission; and in their name to protest against any such sentence, and the intrusion of other ministers which may be made thereupon: We do in our own name, in the name of our constituents, and of all others in the said congregations that shall adhere to us, protest against the sentence of the Commission, depriving us of the benefit of our ministers' labors among us; and, that any other ministers exercising the pastoral office, in our respective congregations, shall be reckoned an intrusion; and thereupon, we take instruments. Signed by us at Edinburgh, Aug. 9th, 1733."

Several ministers and elders, not members of the Commission, offered a dissent from the sentence suspending the four brethren, but the moderator thought fit to interrupt their procedure by prayer.

According to the protestation of these brethren against the sentence of suspension, they continued to exercise their ministry, not in the contempt of church authority, but from a conviction of duty. They had received their commission from the head of the church, and were conscious of nothing which rendered them unfit to retain it. With them the question appeared to be the same which the Apostles put to the rulers who had commanded them not to speak at all, nor teach in the name of Jesus, "Whether it be right in the sight of God to hearken unto you more than unto God, judge ye."

When the Commission met in November following, the four brethren being cited, appeared at their bar, and offered to read a brief protestation, intimating that their appearance should not be construed as a falling from their former declaration against the validity of the act of suspension, but they were interrupted, and laid it on the table. This is the paper, the reading of which the Repertory mentions as attempted by Mr. Erskine, contrary to usage, and in the way of opposing the moderator's motion for a committee to confer with the brethren. At the first diet or session of the Commission, Nov. 14th, a committee was appointed to which the brethren appeared to have made no objection. They met with the committee in the middle of the day, who urged them to retract their protest, but offered nothing which appeared to be a satisfactory reason to the protestors. This failure was reported in the afternoon. They were asked separately, whether they had obeyed the sentence of suspension, to which they answered, that they had agreeably to their protest, regarded it as null and void. The Commission at this meeting, overcame the scruples by which they had been hindered at the last, and allowed numerous representations and letters to be read, relative to



their proceedings in the affair before them. They were thus made to hear the voice of more than half of the whole church, against the severe measures they were pursuing towards these faithful ministers of Christ. What was the general feeling, and something of the true merits of the cause, may be learned from the fact that half the Commission, both reasoned and voted against proceeding to inflict a higher censure, and it was carried against them by the casting vote of Mr. John Goldie, (or Gowdie,) the moderator, which fact, however, though undisputed, the Commission, afterwards refused to record, and the great argument of those who voted to proceed to a higher censure, was not the merits of the cause, but the authoritative deed of the assembly. It was this vote, and not the vote about loosing or deposing as the Repertory incorrectly states in which the court was equally divided. From this sentence of the Commission, several ministers and elders dissented. Messrs. Ralph Erskine and Thomas Mair, not members of the Commission, handed in a written protest in which they expressed their adherence to the representations of the four brethren. The next day, Nov. 15th, a committee was appointed to commune with the protesting brethren, before proceeding to further censure against them. The proceedings of this committee, and the inaccurate account given of them, by the Repertory, have already been noticed. It appears to be a sufficient answer once for all, to all that is said about the appointment of committees and condescension, and tenderness, and measures of conciliation on the part of the Assembly and Commission, that from first to last, no measure was proposed which did not peremptorily require the retracting of the protest, offered by the Seceders, and this, as they considered it to be an important and seasonable testimony for the truth of Christ, and the just rights of his church, they could not do.

When the committee made their report, Nov. 16th, the Commission came to their final sentence against the four brethren. The vote was put "Loose or Depose," and it carried as the minutes state, by a "great plurality," "Loose." Accordingly they proceeded to loose the relations of these men, to their respective charges, declared them no longer ministers of that church, prohibited all ministers of that church to employ them in any ministerial function, declared their churches to be vacant, and ordered due notice of these acts to be given to their respective Presbyteries, and congregations, and also to the magistrates of Perth, and Sterling, to the Sheriff-principal of Perth, and Baillie of the Regality of Abernethy. The reason of this decision being by a great plurality, was that many of the Commission, probably most of those who voted against proceeding to a higher censure, had no freedom to vote on either side of the question, "Loose or Depose." The Repertory says, "that the Commission after prayer to God, for direction, proceeded to depose these men severally from the ministry, and to loose their connexion, &c." The minutes say, the vote was against deposing. When the aforementioned sentence was passed, a protestation was given in by Mr. Gabriel Wilson, minister at Maxton, as follows:

*Edinburgh, November 16th, 1733.*

"I, Mr. Gabriel Wilson, minister at Maxton, do hereby in my own name, and in the name of all who shall adhere to me, protest against this sentence of the Commission in the case of the four brethren; and that it may be lawful for me to complain of the said sentence, and of the several acts of assembly, that have occasioned the same, to any sub-

sequent assembly of the church of Scotland : as also that it may be lawful for me, in a becoming manner, on all proper occasions, to bear testimony against the same, with all other defections and severities of this church in her sentences. And finally, that I may in the meantime, as in Providence, I shall find opportunity, hold ministerial communion with my said dear Brethren, as if no such sentence had been past against them, upon all which I take instruments in the Clerk's hands.

(Signed.)

GABRIEL WILSON.

The above protest is adhered to by us,

RALPH ERSKINE, Minister at Dunfermline,  
THOMAS MAIR, Minister at Orwell,  
JOHN MACLARINE, Minister in Edinburgh,  
JOHN CURRIE, Minister at Kingslassie  
JAS. WARDLAW, Minister at Dunfermline,  
THO. NAIRN, Minister at Abbotshall."

"All these," says the Repertory, "as a matter of course, joined the Seceding brethren." It is to be regretted, that persons who undertake to write history, should be so hasty in giving to the world as facts, things which appear evidently to be the mere result of their own conjectures. Where did they find it stated, that all these protestors joined the Seceders? If the church had acted with any consistency, they would have been obliged to do so, for if the Seceders deserved to be cast out, for their protest offered to the assembly, how much more these men who not only involved themselves in all the alleged guilt of the Seceders in resisting the acts of the assembly, but added to it such an open and decided disregard the sentence of the Commission. Yet, probable as it might seem that they would all join the Seceders, it was not the case. Mr. G. Wilson, and others of these brethren, continued in the Established church, to the day of their death. The Rev. Mr. Currie was so far from uniting with the Seceders, that he became one of their most strenuous opponents. In an "Essay on separation, or, a Vindication of the church of Scotland," he charged them with doing what they could, "to rend, ruin and occasion separation," from that church. It is frequently the case, that men see the defections which prevail, and at first make some show of opposition, yet they have not fortitude sufficient to take a decided stand against them; when this would expose them to trouble and reproach; and it is not uncommon that these same individuals fall at last, into the ranks of those whom they formerly opposed, and become the chief enemies of those whose faithfulness they cannot imitate, and therefore cannot endure. The opposition which the Seceders felt most, and from which they suffered most, was made by persons of this description. If our business were sermon-making, there might here be room for a little application.\*

When the four brethren were called in, and received intimation of the sentence of the Commission; they read, and then gave to the Clerk the following protestation :

---

\* Of the seven who protested against the sentence of the Commission, Nov., 1733, three became Seceders, Messrs. R. Erskine, Thomas Mair, and Thomas Nairn. Mr. Maclaren, of Edinburgh, died June, 1734. Mr. Wardlaw, of Dunfermline, lived till about the time that his colleague, Mr. R. Erskine and the other Seceders, were deposed, but died in the Communion of the national church. Mr. Currie became an open and violent antagonist. Mr. Gabriel Wilson, of Maxton, became independent in principle, but was connived at by the judicatories. He died 1750.—[*Fraser's Life of Erskine*, p. 419.]

“*Edinburgh, Nov. 16th, 1773.*”

“We do hereby adhere to the protestation, formerly entered before this court, both at their last meeting in August, and when we appeared first before this meeting. And further we do protest in our own name and in the name of all and every one in our respective congregations, adhering to us, that notwithstanding of this sentence past against us, our pastoral relations shall be held and reputed firm and valid. And likewise, we do protest, that notwithstanding of our being cast out from ministerial communion with the Established church of Scotland, we still hold communion with all and every one who desire with us, to adhere to the principles of the true Presbyterian, covenanted church of Scotland, in her doctrine, worship, government and discipline; and particularly with all who are groaning under the evils, and who are affected with the grievances of which we have been complaining, and who are in their several spheres wrestling against the same. But in regard, the prevailing party in this Established church, who have now cast us out of ministerial communion with them, are carrying on a course of defection from our reformed and covenanted principles; and particularly are suppressing ministerial freedom, and faithfulness in testifying against the present backslidings of the church, *and inflicting censures upon ministers for witnessing by protestations, and otherwise, against the same*: Therefore, we do for these, and many other weighty reasons, to be laid open in due time, protest that we are obliged to make a Secession from them, and that we can have no ministerial communion with them, till they see their sins and mistakes, and amend them. And in like manner we do protest, that it shall be lawful and warrantable for us to exercise the keys of doctrine, and discipline and government, according to the word of God, and confession of Faith, and the principles and constitutions of the covenanted church of Scotland, as if no such censure had been past upon upon us. Upon all which we take instruments. And we hereby appeal unto the first free, faithful and reforming General Assembly of the church of Scotland.

(Signed.)

EBENEZER ERSKINE,  
WILLIAM WILSON,  
ALEX. MONCRIEFF,  
JAMES FISHER.”

We should be very sorry to entertain any hard thoughts of our brethren of the Repertory, as if they had been designedly guilty of any injustice, yet without imputing to them any thing of this kind, we are constrained to say that in several instances, they write as if there had been a disposition to collect together most of the hard things which have been said against the Seceders, and to omit the strong points of their defence. A singular example of this kind of omission, occurs in their publication of the above paper, for which it is difficult to account on principles favorable to their impartiality. In the middle of this paper and in the most important part of it, where the brethren are giving the reasons of their Secession, there occurs an “&c.” One would naturally suppose that here, there had been a long string of unimportant things omitted, for the sake brevity. It will probably, however, occasion some surprise to the candid reader, to be told that the part omitted does not much exceed a single line, and that it contains the main and ultimate ground of the Secession. The part omitted, has been distinguished in the preceding copy of the paper, by italics. It is a complaint

against the church, for "inflicting censures upon ministers, for witnessing by protestations and otherwise," against the backslidings, of which they had previously complained. These brethren always insisted on their earnest desire to continue in the church, provided they were allowed this liberty. It was the refusal to allow it, which shut them up to Secession, and this is the matter which in that important document, the Repertory has covered up so carefully with an "et cetera."

An immediate attempt is also made to divert the attention of the reader from the odium which must naturally attach itself to the Established church for casting out these faithful men in such a tyrannical manner. They are charged with having done the same thing against the judicatory which had passed sentence against them. Of course they showed equal ambition of power, and equal malevolence, and they were guilty of an absurdity, not chargeable on the Commission, for they attempted to excommunicate those whom they had no power to try, and did this without any form of trial. It is said "Mr. Erskine and his associates were determined to be even with the Commission, by whom they were separated from communion in the Established church of Scotland; for, in this last paper they fairly excommunicated the ruling party in the said church, from all communion with themselves." This charge appears to be founded on the declaration made by them in their paper of Secession, that they could have no ministerial communion with the ruling party, till they should see their sins and mistakes, and amend them. But it is a very different thing to assert a difficulty about communing with others, and to exclude them from the church. The Seceders still decline communion with many, without regarding it as an act of excommunication, either from the church at large, or from themselves as a branch of it. It is probable that at least some of the general Assembly would use the same language as the Seceders, respecting Romanists, Quakers, Unitarians, and Universalists. They would say, we can have no communion with them till they see their mistakes, and amend them. Yet they would think it an uncharitable construction of such a refusal, to say that this was an excommunication of these sects. The Seceders were more liberal in their views, when some of them first arrived in this country, and were attacked by the Presbytery of New-Castle, one of the first Presbyteries of the Society, now known as the General Assembly of the Presbyterian church, in the United States. That Presbytery not only declined all communion with the first Seceder emigrants, but warned their people not to attend upon the ministrations of their preachers. Yet the Seceders never complained of this as an act of excommunication, though they may think they have just reason to complain, that those who refused all communion with them, and never recalled this judicial deed should now condemn those, against whom it was passed, for declining their communion.

Nothing presents others to us in a less honorable light, than the feeble exertions of impotent malice, and it is doubtful whether any thing could have been imagined more suitable to prevent the respect of the reader for the firm and dignified course of the Seceders, his pity for their sufferings or his indignation against their oppressors, than giving this view of their behavior immediately after inserting this paper of Secession. If men judged of religions as they judge of civil things, the above declaration of Secession, from one of the Established churches of Britain, would be placed side by side with our declaration of a Seces-

sion from the civil authority of that kingdom. The resistance of tyranny in the one case, would be honored, as in the other. And the names of Erskine and Washington would be associated in history as the bold champions of the rights and independence of the people, the one in the church, the other in the state. It would be extremely difficult to form a defence of our declaration of independence which would not in the spirit of it be equally good, as an apology for the Secession. But unhappily the firmness, courage, and independence which men esteem in civil characters, are often branded as obstinacy, rashness and bigotry, when manifested in the cause of Christ. A pliant temper, which bends to circumstances, falls in with the spirit of the age, yields to tyranny, or misrule according as the one or the other prevails; and keeps in peace with all, but with truth, and a good conscience is with most men in the highest esteem. Immediately after the above charge, a singular disavowal, and a more singular insinuation are added, which we give in the words of the Repertory.

"It is not our purpose at present, to pass any judgment upon the course of these men [the Seceders]; or to consider whether the principles upon which they acted are not subversive of all ecclesiastical control and government." If we might take the liberty of stating our views of the candor exhibited in the above paragraph, by answering it according to its own spirit we would say: "It is not our purpose at present, to pass any judgment upon this disavowal of the Repertory, or to inquire whether they had not clearly declared their judgment already, and based it upon principles completely subversive of all truth and liberty in the church of Christ."

The above act of Secession, was not from the church, but from the "Prevailing party," in the judicatories of the church, and it was with this party alone, that the brethren declared they could have no farther "ministerial communion." Mr. Gib observes in a note, page 35, vol. 1st, of his Display, that "Ministerial communion was maintained betwixt these four brethren and several ministers of the Established church, for some years, till it gradually ceased, betwixt the publication of the Judicial Testimony, and the Declinature."

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE SECEDERS, SUBSEQUENT TO THEIR SECESSION,  
TILL THE PUBLICATION OF THEIR FIRST TESTIMONY.**

The Repertory says, that the four brethren, "being condemned by the highest judicatory of the church, were not slow in appealing to the people in vindication of the course which they had pursued. Their first publication was a Historical View of the church of Scotland, both in her reforming and declining periods, to which was appended, 'Reasons by the Protesting Ministers, for their Secession from the prevailing party, in the Established church.'"

This statement is not of material consequence in itself, but like a multitude of things already noticed, it shows how badly those who made it, were qualified to write a history of the Secession. Though the above paragraph appears as if it were giving the title and contents of some book, it is difficult to ascertain what book is intended. The Rev. Mr. Gib, who professes in his Display of the Secession, to give a list of all the books and pamphlets, published by the first Seceders with a reference to their Secession, makes no mention of this "Historical view of the church of Scotland,"—with the appendix above noticed. It is

probable that the book referred to, is what is generally termed "The extrajudicial Testimony." If so, the statements made respecting it, are altogether inaccurate. Before the Secession had taken place, the Seceders, or some one in their behalf, had published "The true state of the process against Mr. Ebenezer Erskine, setting forth the proceedings of the Synod of Perth and Sterling, against him, and the act of the late assembly, concerning him and some other ministers adhering to his Protest &c., Edinburgh, 1733." To this book, reference has been frequently made in the foregoing remarks. The same year was also published, "The Representations" of the four brethren "to the Commission of the late General Assembly." The first book published after their Secession was "A review of the Narrative" so often erroneously cited in the Repertory as the work of an individual, instead of a committee of the Commission of the General Assembly. This was published in 1734, as Mr. Gib says, in March of that year, of course it was four months after the Secession. The extrajudicial Testimony, is dated the same year, but was published according to the forecited authority, in May, six months after the Secession. It was not, therefore, "Their first publication." The title of this book is, "A Testimony to the doctrine, worship, government and discipline of the church of Scotland: or Reasons (by the four brethren,) for their protestation, entered before the Commission of the General Assembly, Nov., 1733, upon the intimation of a sentence of the said Commission, loosing their relation to their respective Parishes, &c." The introduction contains "a short narrative of the proceedings of the several judicatories against the four protesting ministers. The first section consists of some historical observations on the state of the church of Scotland, both in her reforming and declining periods. But this part which we would infer from the Repertory, comprised the body of the book, extends only to 16 pages.— The second section which they characterize as an appendix, contains "Reasons by the protesting brethren for their Secession from the prevailing party in the Established church." This extends to 60 pages, and is the main part of the book. Two more short sections follow, containing "reasons for the validity of their pastoral relations to their respective congregations," and, "for their exercising the keys of government and discipline." There does not appear to have been any appendix connected with this work. It is a pity to take up time in correcting such mistakes, but a greater pity that occasion is given for this by those who make them.

The four brethren gave in their paper of Secession, on the 10th of November; on the 6th of December following, they constituted themselves into a Presbytery, afterwards known by the name of the "Associate Presbytery." This took place as has been mentioned, at Gairney-bridge, near Kinross. The whole of the preceding, and a great part of this day, were spent by them in prayer and conference. Messrs. Ralph Erskine and Thomas Mair, were present on this occasion, but not as constituent members of the Presbytery. To this measure, the four brethren were shut up in the Providence of God, that they might still exercise all the parts of their ministry, according to the Presbyterian form; that they might have a more special claim to the promise of the divine presence among them; that they might maintain proper order among themselves; that they might be in a better capacity for affording relief to the oppressed heritage of God through the land; and that they

might lift up a *judicial* as well as a doctrinal of testimony for Scotland's covenanted reformation, and against defections from the same.

The two books already noticed, viz., *The Review*, and the *Extrajudicial Testimony*, were published by committees of their number, in March and May of the next year (1734). This Testimony, about six months after publication, was examined in Presbytery, and as their minutes bear, was approved as their Testimony, and as seasonably published.

The special design of this Testimony, was to give reasons for their Secession. It is difficult to do justice to these reasons in an abridgment containing the general grounds of complaint, without many of the particular facts, by which the different allegations are substantiated. But from a reference to what has been already stated, several of these facts may be readily perceived, a few others shall be introduced.

After stating that their Secession was not from the church of Scotland; to the confession, the Covenanted Presbyterian church-government, the discipline and worship of which they still adhered; nor from any in that church, who were also adhering to these, they go on to state as grounds of Secession:

1. The opposition made to the Presbyterian form of government by the prevailing party. Under this head, they mention the disregard of what is called the barrier law, or rule that all important measures should be transmitted to Presbyteries for their judgment, before they were adopted by the Assembly. This rule, they show, had been quite disregarded in the passing of acts, without or against the judgment of the Presbyteries. They mention also, the violent settlement of ministers over dissenting and reclaiming congregations, and the exclusion from communion of all who had not freedom to submit to such ministers, and of all ministers who would admit such to communion without the consent of the incumbent, that is, the minister violently intruded upon the congregation. They also notice the arbitrary proceedings of the church courts against themselves for preaching against these innovations and corruptions. They further complain of the Commissions of the Assembly, as clothed with unwarrantable authority, and extending their powers beyond that of the Assembly itself, particularly by invading the rights of the Presbyteries, (which say they are radical judicatories); to take trial of the gifts of young men, and to settle them contrary unto the declared mind, both of the Presbyteries, in which, and of the Parishes over which they are settled. They proceed to give an account of the way in which this was done, from which we may learn, that the credit of inventing Affinity-Presbyteries, is not due to the present age. The same reasons which now exist, had led men formerly to resort to this expedient, only the Affinity-Presbyteries of Scotland, were temporary in duration. When there was a difficulty about the trial, or settlement of a presentee, on account of the opposition of the Presbytery and congregation, the Commission erected, for the time being, an Affinity-Presbytery, called a committee. These were "select or picked men," ready to do, in all things, the bidding of their Superiors, and to these they gave the power of trial and ordination, so that they could introduce ministers into Presbyteries, and settle them over congregations, through all parts of the land. This court had no location, but was without bounds or limits, and the Seceders declared that they would prefer the fourteen diocesan bishops with which England sought

to favor them, and who would have overthrown Presbyterianism from principle, to the Commission whose quorum was thirty-one, and their committee of three or four traveling through the land to break down Presbyterianism, under the Presbyterian mask. The view of the power of Presbyteries maintained by the Seceders, is expressed in the following words, "The authoritative mission of men unto the work and office of the holy ministry, by the trial of the gifts and qualifications; and the setting of them apart to that sacred office by prayer and imposition of hands, belongs unto a constituted Presbytery. It is also, a received principle amongst us, that the power of Superior courts over a Presbytery is not a privative, but cumulative power and authority; that is neither Synods nor Assemblies, nor their Commissions can deprive Presbyteries of their inherent rights and privileges which belong to them, &c." They were evidently of the same mind with those of our brethren in the General Assembly of the United States, who contend that the Superior court has no right to usurp to itself that exercise of authority which belongs to the inferior. A Synod ought not to ordain or settle a minister in a Presbytery, nor should an Assembly make a Presbytery for a Synod. Each court should act in its own proper sphere, and not invade that of the others.

2. The second ground of Secession was, corruption in doctrine; and measures tending to corrupt "doctrine in our excellent Confession of Faith." Under this head, they notice the errors of Messrs. Simpson and Campbell, and the sinful lenity employed towards them. They go on to say as to the general state of the church:

"Although this church owns the Westminster Confession of Faith, and all entering the ministry, are obliged to subscribe it as the Confession of their Faith; yet how little of that scheme and order of doctrine is taught at this day; particularly by many preachers and ministers that have lately entered into the church, while there is as little of Christ to be found in most of their discourses, as in Plato's or Seneca's morals? And if he be at all preached, he is preached as the pattern, not of Gospel holiness, but of abstract morality; at best as the author of a new Gospel-law, enjoining faith, repentance and new obedience, as the conditions of a new covenant, and of a sinner's justification before God. People are generally pressed to the practice of duty, as if their abilities for obedience at the creation, were not entirely lost by the fall of Adam. Though man be naturally married to the law as a covenant, and be seeking life and righteousness upon the footing of his own obedience, yet how little care is taken to preach the law in its spirituality, extent and severity, condemning every man to death, and the curse who continues not in all things written in the book of the law to do them, in order to discover the depravation of nature, and the utter impotence of fallen man to please God, by his obedience? How little digging into the cursed root of original sin, imputed and inherent, or laying open the deceitfulness and desperate wickedness of the heart, that so sinners may be brought off from the covenant of works, to Him who is the alone foundation that God hath laid in Zion, and who is become the end of the law for righteousness, to every one who believeth? And, though they profess to own and acknowledge the inviolable and perpetual obligation of the righteous and holy law of God, upon the regenerate, as well as the unregenerate, which we believe and hold as a most firm and certain truth, yet how little are the duties of obedience to it, preached in a gospel way? How little are they enforced from gospel motives, or pressed for



gospel ends and purposes? How little is the necessity of a vital union to Christ discovered, in order to our yielding acceptable obedience to the law? How little of free justification by the imputed righteousness of Christ is taught, or of the gospel mystery of sanctification, as inseparably connected with justification, and maintained and carried on by a life of faith on the Son of God, who is made of God unto us, not only righteousness, but sanctification? These and the like supernatural mysteries, are in a great measure exploded and discarded by our modish haranguers, and a dry, sapless and lifeless desecrating upon the moral virtues, has been introduced in their room; by which means, they who have their senses exercised to discern good and evil, are set a wandering for the bread of their souls where they can have it, and others who have their ears tickled with an empty sound of words, are left to perish for lack of the knowledge of the gospel, and of the way of salvation by Christ in a covenant of grace."

These brethren also complained that all efforts to obtain a testimony of the Assembly, against these corruptions, had proved ineffectual.—The advocates of these errors, were the favorites of the Assembly, while the hue and cry was every where raised against those who faithfully maintained the doctrine of the standards, as enemies, and as men of dangerous and divisive principles.

3. The third ground of Secession alleged, is the imposition of sinful and unwarrantable terms of communion, by restraining ministerial freedom and faithfulness in testifying against defections. The act of the Assembly, in respect to Mr. Erskine, plainly intimated that as he was censured, so all others would be held as censurable for impugning the act of 1732, or any other acts of the church Courts, however sinful or unwarrantable. This restriction they show to be contrary to the word of God, to former acts of the Church, "censuring ministers for their silence, and for not speaking of the corruptions of the times," and also contrary to their ordination vows and engagements.

4. The fourth ground of the Secession mentioned, is that "these corrupt courses are carried on with a high hand, notwithstanding that the ordinary means have been used to reclaim them, and to stop the current of the present defections." Representations by Synods, Presbyteries, and by numerous ministers and members of the church, were not only disregarded, but refused so much as a hearing; and this, though the prevailing party had owned such representations as the proper means to be used.

5. The fifth and last ground of Secession mentioned, is that "a proper testimony against the defections of the prevailing party could no longer be kept up in the way of ministerial communion with them." This they establish, by referring to the course which had been pursued towards them in censuring them for testifying against defections, refusing them liberty to protest, and finally casting them out, so that there was no alternative but to cease from any testimony, or to continue it in the way of separation. They anticipate the charge of schism, but show that it was justly chargeable on those who excluded them, and not on them who had continued in the church so long as their enemies would allow them.

The above is only an abstract of the reasons assigned by the brethren for their separation from the Established Church, and it ought to be kept in view to do them justice, that they did not look on any one of these things separately, but upon them all combined as justifying their

separation, particularly in connexion with the fact that their separation was made necessary. "Therefore," say they, "it is not only warrantable for us, but we are laid under a necessity to lift up a testimony in a way of Secession from them [those who cast them out] and against the present current of defection, that we may not partake with them in their sins, and may do what in us lies to transmit unto succeeding generations, these valuable truths which have been handed down to us by the contendings and wrestlings of a great cloud of witnesses in Scotland, since the dawning of reformation light amongst us."

PROCEEDINGS OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY, SUBSEQUENT  
TO THE SECESSION.

The General Assembly which met in 1734, the next year after the Secession, finding that they had carried things to a great extreme, and endangered the very authority, which they were so anxious to maintain, passed a number of acts to favor the return of the Seceders to their communion. The most important of these, was, with a little abridgment in the following words :

*"At Edinburgh, May 14, 1734.*

"The General Assembly, considering the evil of divisions and animosities in the Church, where there is unanimity on fundamental points, and particularly the lamentable consequences which have followed, and may yet follow the separation of Masters Ebenezer Erskine, William Wilson, Alexander Moncrieff, and James Fisher, from this church and judicatories thereof; and judging it their duty, to endeavor by all just and proper means ——— to restore harmony and brotherly love, ———; therefore, the General Assembly, without further inquiring into the occasion or steps of proceeding, either on the part of the said brethren, or by the several judicatories under whose consideration, their case has been, which may have produced that unhappy separation; but resolving that all questions upon these heads shall forever hereafter, be comfortably removed, have empowered, and hereby do empower the Synod of Perth and Stirling,—upon such application made to them as they shall judge proper, to take the case of the said four brethren, as it now stands under their consideration, with full power to proceed, and do therein, as they shall find most justifiable and expedient for restoring the peace and preserving the authority of this church, and for promoting the edification of the body of Christ, and particularly for uniting the said four brethren, to the communion of this church, and restoring them to their respective ministerial charges; but with this express direction, that the said Synod shall not take upon them to judge of the legality or formality of the former proceedings of the church-judicatories, in relation to this affair, or either to approve or censure the same."

Agreeably to the above act, the Synod of Perth and Stirling, on the 2d July, 1734, having met by appointment of the Assembly, did in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, with one voice and consent, take off the sentences, pronounced by the Commission against the four brethren, and restored them to ministerial communion with the church, and to their several charges. But whether they felt galled that they, having commenced the war against them, were obliged to pronounce this sentence in their favor, or were influenced by other considerations it is difficult to say, yet they hardly kept within the bounds prescribed by the Assembly, in adding to their act, the following recommendation and warning. 'And the Synod do recommend to these four Reverend

brethren to carry towards the Lord's servants their brethren, ministers of this church, [that is, the intruders.] and their respective flocks and charges, as ministers of Christ and his Gospel, ought to do, in all time coming."—"And the Synod take this opportunity to warn all the people in this province [*that is the congregations of intruders,*] to beware of every thing which may have a tendency to obstruct the good ends of this act, and what the late General Assembly had so much at heart, viz., the peace and union of this church, by doing what may encourage division or weaken the hands of the Lord's servants [*the intruders,*] set over them."

Besides the preceding act of Assembly, another was passed by them, having also for its ostensible object, the reconciliation of the four brethren to the church, or perhaps more properly, it was designed as a vindication of the former Assembly, on which the preceding act might otherwise seem to cast some reflection. It is in the following words :

*"At Edinburgh, May 14th, 1734.*

"The General Assembly of the church of Scotland, considering that some are under apprehensions, that by the act of Assembly, 1733, concerning Mr. Erskine, &c., ministers of this church are laid under greater restraints as to ministerial freedom, than they were by the rules of this church, before the said act was past; therefore they do for the satisfaction of all, hereby declare, that due and regular ministerial freedom is still left entire to all ministers, and that the same was not, nor shall be held, nor understood to be any wise impaired or restrained by the late Assembly's decision in that particular process."

The Assembly also rescinded the act of 1730, prohibiting the recording of reasons of dissent, and the act of 1732, concerning the method of planting vacant churches, and both for the same reason, "because they were not made according to former acts, and were found to be hurtful to this church."

These proceedings appear to be somewhat favourable to the return of the Seceders. The Repertory says that the brethren thus gained a complete victory. But why did they not return? Their answer to this is, that they had gone too far, their cause was popular, they had formed a party, and it was too late to retreat. They say that "they immediately published a paper, containing at large their reasons for not returning to the communion of the Established church." *Immediately*, is a term somewhat indefinite, but there seems no just reason in a case of this kind, to employ it, when it was about a year after these acts of the Assembly before the Seceders published the aforementioned reasons. Even if wrong, they were not hasty in making up their minds.

In the absence of all proof of such unworthy motives as are attributed to these brethren, it would have appeared more charitable to suppose them influenced by such as they professed. They took into consideration the opportunity afforded them of returning to the church, "they met frequently to consider what was their duty in the present juncture," they acknowledged that several grounds of their Secession were removed. They commended the church for what they regarded as the spirit of reformation, appearing in the judicatories, and they gave thanks to God for these favorable signs. They testify frequently their ardent desire of being reunited to the church, and evidently write as persons indulging this pleasing hope. And to bring about this desirable end, they state some grounds of difficulty and propose these to the Assembly in the most christian spirit, adding what things, if also done, would remove all hindrances out of the way.

In their reasons, published May, 1735, they refer back to the grounds of their Secession, to show how far these were removed, and how far they still remained. Their first ground of Secession related to the opposition, made to their Presbyterian constitution. They own that the first branch of their complaint under this head, was removed by the rescinding of the acts of 1730, and 1732; though they object to the reasons assigned for rescinding them, that these refer only to the manner in which the acts were passed and not at all to the sinfulness of the acts themselves. They also object that nothing efficient is done to keep out intruders, and that the deeds of the church, compelling the people to submit to intruders, were left in force as precedents. They complain that nothing had been done to remove their complaints about the toleration of doctrines contrary to the word of God and their Confession of Faith. There had been no proper censure of such as were unsound, and no testimony of the Assembly against prevailing errors.

As to the last ground of Secession which was the restraint of ministerial freedom and faithfulness in testifying against defections, they observe that this was the first and more immediate point on which their Secession turned, and they proceed to inquire particularly what the Assembly had done to remove it. They consider justly that the sentence of the Assembly had not only, not repealed the act of 1733, against the four brethren, but had recognized it as valid and just. It did not need the judgment and approbation of the Synod of Perth and Stirling to give it force, so that the injunction not to meddle with it, was fairly sustaining the integrity of the act, only for reasons of expediency the brethren were to be relieved from its effects. As a man sentenced to punishment may be relieved from the penalty while still left under the odium of his crime, so these brethren were to be restored, out of pity to the distracted church, while the act plainly implied that they deserved the censures inflicted, and nothing to the contrary must be allowed in the act of restoration. Again, in this act the reason of restoring the four brethren, is the lamentable consequences which have followed and may follow their separation. Now this plainly implies, that, but for these they might have been left under the operation of the act, and that when these consequences were not apprehended, it would be proper enough to exercise the same authority again in restraining ministerial liberty. It is also, evident that while there is in the act a yielding in words, there is an obstinacy about things. It begins in the following words of which only an abridgment was before given :

“The General Assembly considering the great hurt and prejudice that hath at all times arisen and must yet arise to the church, from divisions and animosities creeping in and taking root among the members thereof, notwithstanding of their unanimity in sentiments upon material and fundamental points, which more nearly concern the promoting the interest of our blessed Lord and Saviour, the establishing the peace of the church, and the advancement of practical godliness and true religion, within the bounds of it, and particularly the lamentable consequences of the late separation, &c.” This implies that the points of difference between the Assembly and the Seceders were not fundamental, but small and trifling things, that they had no just grounds of Secession, that they were the authors of the divisions and animosities by which the peace of the church had been disturbed. In short if we might venture to assign motives, we would say that the intention of this act appears to have been merely to make the cause of the Seceders less popular, by presenting

## 1.2 *Of the Secession from the Established Church of Scotland.*

to them an overture of peace, which if accepted, they would be obliged virtually to take the shame of all the disturbance to themselves, and by which if rejected, they would appear more liable to the charge of schism. It is not to be supposed that those who were so ready to cast them out, desired their return out of any regard to them. It is hardly probable that they anticipated it. And the subsequent history of the Assembly shows that there was even less of the spirit of reformation at work than the Seceders were so ready to imagine.

The act of the Synod, of Perth and Stirling, in restoring the Seceders, is of the same spirit with the act of the Assembly, only it appears much more manifest. When it is considered that intruders were numerous in the bounds of this Synod, and that it was especially in their bounds that disturbances had been occasioned by people's seeking refuge from intruders by attending on neighboring ministers whom they regarded as faithful, it is easy to comprehend the recommendations and injunctions appended to the Synod's act. The Seceders had never refused communion, even in their act of Secession with any ministers of the church who were faithful; what then is meant by the recommendation to them cited above, but that they must "in all time coming" do as they had not done in time past; they must recognize the intruders as "the Lord's Servants and ministers of the church," and they must not administer sealing ordinances to any of the flocks of these hirelings, who fled to them for the bread of life? And what is the import of the warning to the people, but that those who were under the intruders must submit to them?

The act respecting ministerial freedom, is both in the letter and spirit of it, a vindication of the act respecting Mr. Erskine and his brethren, for it declares in so many words, that "*due and regular ministerial freedom was not* anywise impaired or restrained by the Assembly's decision in that particular process."

There is no reason to accuse the Seceders of captiousness respecting these acts. Their publication respecting them, rather shows that they were nearly caught by the snare. They write as men, full of hope that their difficulties would soon be settled, and with this view, they add, after their statement of objections, a proposal of what would satisfy them; and if there had been any proper degree of sincerity in the Assembly, the justness and propriety of their proposal would have been readily admitted, and the whole controversy speedily terminated.

The substance of their proposal to the Assembly, was embraced in six things. 1. That a seasonable warning should be emitted against infidelity and gross errors prevailing at the time, and that those who either were, or might be convicted of holding errors, should be censured according to the degree of their offences. 2. That the act of Assembly, 1733, against Mr. Erskine and his brethren, should be rescinded, with all the subsequent proceedings against them, and that the act of 1648, for "censuring of ministers for silence, and for not speaking against the corruptions of the times," should be revived. 3. That the act of Assembly, 1733, concerning some brethren in the Presbytery of Dunfermline, be also rescinded, and the dispensation of sealing ordinances allowed to those who have not freedom to submit to the ministry of intruders. 4. That probationers shall forfeit their licence, and ministers be suspended, and if obstinate deposed, if they accept of presentations; and that no one shall be settled in any congregation, without the call and consent of the majority of that congregation, who are admitted to full com-

munion; and that there be no preference of votes on account of any worldly consideration. 5. That Presbyteries be enjoined to use care in the licence of young men, not only to inquire into their literature, but also their acquaintance with the power of godliness, and the work of the Spirit upon their own souls; and that they admit none to trials, but such as are known to be of sound principles, of a good report, of a sober, grave, prudent and pious behaviour, and other qualifications required by the scriptures, and many acts of Assembly. 6. That in the grounds of a national fast, there should be an acknowledgement of the great guilt of the land in having gone on in a course of backsliding, contrary to the word of God, and the obligations of their covenants.

They did not propose these things as embracing all the evils of which they complained, but only the things necessary to prepare the way for their return. "If," say they, "the above things were done, we might have the comfortable prospect of a pleasant and desirable unity, and harmony with our brethren in concurring with them according to our weak measure in all other necessary steps towards a further reformation."

After all that is said and quoted with marks of approbation in the first article of the Repertory, most evidently exhibiting the conduct of Mr. Erskine and his brethren, as highly censurable from the first, though the church courts were not altogether to be excused, it is a little surprising to find in the second article the following decision as to the merits of the whole case. "We cannot vindicate the harshness of Mr. Ebenezer Erskine's denunciations, but when we now read his offensive sermons, which occasioned so much agitation, and so wide a breach, we are surprised that any church court should have deemed it necessary, or expedient to notice them at all. We agree, therefore, with the Seceders, in their Testimony, that church authority was wound up too high; that the censure of Mr. Erskine for testifying against existing evils, was a dangerous and unwarrantable proceeding, and that the whole process was conducted injudiciously. The point at which we are disposed to commence our censure of Mr. Erskine and his associates, is the time when the door of reconciliation was opened wide, and they were earnestly entreated to return to the bosom of the church. This invitation many of their friends then, were of opinion, they ought to have embraced; and all impartial persons now must think the same."—[*Repertory*, vol. VII. pp. 218, 219.]

Considering the views which the editors had been led to entertain of the facts relating to the Secession, this decision is not only very liberal, but betrays an excess of candour, and such an excess that they do not long retain it. In the next paragraph, they go on to find fault with the Assembly of 1734 for having done not only every thing which they could do, but more than they ought to have done to heal the breach, and reconcile to the church the Seceding brethren. "Our meaning," say they, "is, that their concessions were too great, and that they were wrong in removing the censures of the church from these brethren, before they had any assurance that they were disposed to yield." Their meaning then must be that it was wrong in the Assembly to correct what they have admitted to be their "dangerous and unwarrantable proceedings." That it was wrong to reverse a censure which they acknowledge was not deserved: and that it was right to delay doing justice, and freeing themselves from sin, until assured that those oppressed by their unrighteous acts were disposed to yield.

They say the Seceders had no desire to re-enter the church which they had left. If not, the honest statement of their difficulties, and the fair proposals which they made to the Assembly, the profession of an earnest desire of reunion and care to avoid every thing which would be a bar in the way of it, were all acts of the most consummate hypocrisy : and the character which the Repertory gives of these men, is altogether too favorable. They had their complaints, and the Repertory thinks if these had been removed, they would have found others. But they do not insist on the redress of all their grievances, but if certain evils which they specify, were removed, they were ready to return and co-operate with their brethren in effecting the removal of others. The chief thing, it is said, at which they aimed in publishing their reasons of non-accession, was to make an impression on the public. Have other publishers no aim to make such impressions ? Were these charges against the Seceders, designed to lie hid, or to produce no impression on those who should read them ? Or ought Seceders alone to have no regard to public opinion, no desire to defend themselves ? But it is painful to follow out so much impeachment of motives, and so many imputations of low and ambitious designs brought forward under the profession of moderation, candor and charity.

The time when the brethren chose to give publicity to these reasons, rather shows that their design was to make an impression on the Assembly. These reasons of their non-accession, and the proposal of what would satisfy them were published immediately before the meeting of the Assembly, May, 1735 ; and they waited with anxiety to see whether that Assembly would continue the work of reformation which seemed to have been commenced in 1734, and whether they would accede to what they proposed. They were, however, disappointed in their hopes. Even the Repertory is obliged to own, that though the Assemblies of 1735 and 1736, passed some good acts, several cases occurred in which ministers were settled in Parishes, contrary to the wishes of the majority, and they might have added, ministers enrolled in Presbyteries contrary to the will of the members. "In the case of professor Campbell," it is also said, "they were thought by the Seceders to have treated his errors with too much lenity." The acts, however, they think, "furnish evidence that the majority of the Assembly were strictly orthodox, and therefore good men should have been reluctant to separate from a church so sound in the faith." It is probable, however, that paper-orthodoxy was not in high repute among the Seceders ; that they looked more at the application of acts, than at the acts themselves. And such was their view of the determined course of backsliding, on which the church appeared to be bent that they gave up all hope of any present restoration consistent with fidelity in the cause of truth.

The four brethren held eleven presbyterial meetings for mutual advice, and for asking counsel of the Lord, before they proceeded to any judicial acts. This step they first took at their twelfth meeting, Aug. 21, 1735, after having spent the preceeding day in fasting and prayer. At this meeting they appointed a committee to prepare a Judicial Testimony. This was approved and enacted December, 1736, at their twenty-fourth meeting, and published, not as the Repertory says, in 1736, but in March, 1737. Between the time of enacting and publishing it, Messrs. Ralph Erskine and Thomas Mair having formally declined the Communion of the Established church acceded to the

brethren on the ground of this Testimony, which they had read and approved. Their papers declining the Established church and declaring their adherence to the Seceders were published with this Testimony.

[To be continued.]

---

ART. II. *The Scripture mode of Baptism.*

MR. EDITOR:

Dear Sir.—The person benefits society but little, however effectually he may show that one doctrine or theory is wrong, if he does not bring forward and establish some truth. I hope that in my two former papers and the communication of your other correspondent, on the same subject, sufficient evidence has been brought, to show that from any thing we have revealed in the scriptures of truth, it does not appear that immersion can be the scriptural mode of administering the ordinance of baptism. That if this is or was the mode intended by the Holy Spirit, both the original penmen and our translators of the Bible, have utterly failed in showing it. But the scriptures, as written by the original penmen, employed by the Holy Spirit, are our only unerring standard of faith and practice; and we believe that our English version is on the main an accurate and faithful translation of the original. That it is so, we have the concurrent testimony of all branches and denominations of the Protestant church. On this authority, then, we have arrived at the conclusion that it never was the mind of the Holy Spirit, that immersion, dipping, or plunging wholly under water, should be the mode of Baptism, or is essential to its right administration. But yet it is to the scriptures, we must look for instruction respecting the right mode of administering this ordinance, which is one of positive institution. The light of nature can give us no instruction concerning it. To the Law and Testimony then, we must look, and these must we follow. And with these as our rule, and humbly and reverently seeking the Divine Spirit as our guide, we hope to come to the mind of the Spirit on this important point. In pursuing this enquiry, as much of the controversy respecting the mode, has turned on the meaning of the word baptize, I shall first endeavor to ascertain and show its meaning in sacred use.

1. The import of the word *baptize*. This is the word which is used to signify the *mode* of baptism; viz. the manner in which water is to be used. Respecting the use of water in the right administering of this ordinance, there is no question. The advocates of infant baptism, who usually administer the ordinance by *sprinkling* or *pouring* the water on the person to be baptized, have not generally attached so much importance to the mode or form; thinking that it is not so much the obedience in the form, as the obedience of the heart in the thing done, that is acceptable of God. They have generally admitted that water applied in any way in the name of Father, Son and Holy Spirit, by a proper minister, to a proper subject, is valid baptism. Hence they have recognized the administration of baptism by Baptists as the ordinance of God. But to proceed to the meaning of the word.

1. We find the word used by our Lord himself, on that very solemn and important occasion, when the disciples were assembled to witness his as-



cension, and consequently in his last personal interview with them. Acts i. 5, Jesus said "John truly baptized with water, but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost, not many days hence." And John had said before of Jesus, that he should baptize with the Holy Ghost. Matthew iii. 11. Now both John and our Saviour must have used the word in the same sense; Jesus appears evidently to refer to the same thing, of which John spoke; for his promise was a renewal, not merely of the promise proclaimed by John, but also of all those promises in the whole word of God, which ascribed the bestowing of the Holy Spirit to the Messiah. These will aid in ascertaining the meaning of the word *baptize*. Isa. 44. 3. "I will pour my spirit upon thy seed." Joel ii. 28. "I will pour out my spirit upon all flesh." Isa. xxxii. 15. "Until the spirit be poured upon us from on high." Now these are a few of the many passages, which might be quoted, that speak of the bestowing, giving or sending of the Holy Spirit. This is the same thing of which both Jesus and John spoke in the texts quoted above, (see Peter's application, Acts ii. 16.); and should we not then understand the words used in the same sense? Most certainly, we should. Do we hear in these passages, any thing that would convey the idea, that the persons who receive the Holy Ghost, must be dipped, plunged or immersed in him? Certainly not. Or can we suppose without a violation of common sense that the disciples, who were told by Jesus, that they should be baptized with the Holy Ghost, not many days hence, expected to be immersed, plunged or dipped in the Holy Spirit in order to the accomplishment of this promise? This admits of but one answer. But then the fact of the accomplishment of this promise, which is particularly recorded, places the matter beyond doubt; and perfectly accords with the language used in the passages quoted from the Old Testament. The manner in which the Holy Spirit was bestowed on the occasion referred to, we have recorded, Acts ii, 3, 4. "And there appeared unto them cloven tongues, like as of fire, and it sat upon each of them, and they were filled with the Holy Ghost." This was then the manner or mode in which Christ *baptized* with the Holy Spirit and with fire, according to John the Baptist. The visible or external emblem of the Holy Spirit, was "the cloven tongues, like as of fire" And this was poured, or according to Acts xi. 15. *fell* upon the disciples. Thus then we have ascertained the meaning of the word *baptize*, when applied to Christ's baptism; and from the way in which John's baptizing, and Christ's are spoken of together, we must necessarily conclude that the word signifies the same thing, when applied to either. Hence, we see that the word *baptize*, at least in two instances, viz., when it signifies Christ's baptizing with the Holy Spirit, and John the Baptist's baptizing, it does not signify to *plunge*, *dip* or *immerse*. To apply the word in the latter sense, literally, to Christ's baptism, would be impossible, and figuratively, it would be absurd.

We may then from the foregoing reasoning, see that the main argument of the Baptists is unfounded, viz. "that the word *baptize* always means to immerse, and never to pour or sprinkle, and consequently that there is but one mode, as there is but one meaning." They admit that if it can be proved, that it ever means to *pour* or *sprinkle*, that their argument on this point falls to the ground.

But further, when Peter was rehearsing to the Apostles and brethren at Jerusalem, an account of his visit to Caesarea and preaching in the house of Cornelius, he says, Acts xi. 15, 16. "When I began to speak

the Holy Ghost fell on them, as on us at the beginning, then I remembered the word of the Lord, how he said, John indeed baptized with water; but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost." Now I would ask what possible resemblance could there be between the *falling* of the Holy Spirit or his emblem upon an assembly and baptizing, if it necessarily and exclusively signifies the dipping or plunging of persons under water, that the former should call up the remembrance of the latter? But supposing baptism to be administered, *not by letting the person to be baptized fall under the water*, but by letting water fall or descend upon him by sprinkling or pouring, after the manner of rain or dew, as the Holy Spirit and his blessings are often represented in the scripture language;\* then would it be altogether natural, that Peter's seeing the Holy Spirit falling upon the assembly, should call up to his remembrance the promise of *baptizing* with the Holy Ghost.

It must then be evident that God's mode of baptizing *with* the Holy Spirit is *by pouring*, or letting *fall*, (according to the passages referred to at the foot of the page,) as rain or dew falls. And need our opponents be told how that is? But Baptists admit, yea, they plead that there is but *one mode*, as there is but "*one baptism*." Then it follows, that either they are wrong in pleading for *one mode*, or that immersion or dipping, is not that mode. Because the mode used by God, is not immersion. But have we any good reason to believe that John baptized in a different manner, as intended to convey the idea of a different mode, when he said I come baptizing *with water*, (John 1. 32.) and the Son of God baptizeth *with* the Holy Ghost. Both truly baptized. Are we to suppose they did it differently? If they did, there are two modes and two meanings to Baptize. The one that John gives—the other given by God. God's is pouring. Which is safest for us to take?

But again, if a particular mode is essential to the right administration of this ordinance, as Baptists say it is; and there is but 'One baptism,' Eph. iv. 5. then we must conclude that but one mode is recognized and taught in the word, and by the Spirit of God; and that one baptism includes the baptism by the Holy Spirit, mentioned 1. Cor. xii. 13. "For by one Spirit we are all baptized into one body." This one baptism is in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit. It must embrace also the mode of the three—for they agree in one. From Math. iii. 11, and other passages above quoted, it must be evident that the Father's mode is by pouring, the Son's and Spirit's must be the same. And if the Apostles had Christ's presence with them in the administration of this ordinance, as he promised, Matth. xxviii. 19, 20, may we not safely conclude, their mode would be the same. And would not this be a safe one for us all to follow?

But let us enquire a little further into the meaning of the word baptize, as used in the sacred scriptures; this will be a safer and a better way of ascertaining its true signification, than by consulting all the dictionaries and lexicons, ever compiled by the ingenuity or skill of man. The word is used in other places in the Bible in reference to water baptism.

1. Cor. x. 2, presents an example. "They (the Israelites,) were all baptized unto Moses, in the sea and in the cloud." Baptists say that "they had the waters on each side, which stood up as a wall, higher than they, and the cloud over them, so that they were as persons im-

\* Ps. 72. 6. Isa. 44. 3, 55. 10. Hosea 14. 5. Heb. 6. 7.

mersed in and covered with waters; and very fitly represented the ordinance of baptism, as performed by immersion," or "the cloud's being before and behind them, so that they were completely surrounded by water." [Gill on the place.] But still this resemblance falls far short of their own definition of immersion, which requires the whole body to be sunk entirely under water. Now the Israelites, did not sink as a heavy weight, either into the sea or into the cloud. The account we have of the event, in Exod. xiv, and which must be our key to the true meaning of the word *baptize* in the place, represents the "sea as a wall on either side." v. 22. The cloud went before them. The Israelites become alarmed at the close pursuit of the Egyptians. God caused the pillar of the cloud to go from before their face, and to stand behind them. The cloud then, according to this account, supposing it to be water, could only wet a side at a time—this would still fall far short of total immersion.

Further there were upwards of six hundred and twenty thousand Israelites in this company. How did those in the middle get under the water? Which must have been the case if the word *baptize* in the passage under consideration means total immersion. For it is the meaning of the word, as used by the Holy Spirit, that we are now endeavoring to ascertain. If the word must mean the sinking of the whole body entirely under water, (which, Baptists hold, is essential to Baptism,) how did the Israelites get under water? Can a person be immersed on dry ground? Surely Baptists will say, No! the thing is impossible. Then there could be no immersion here; for it is said expressly, Exod. xiv. 16. "The Children of Israel shall go on dry ground." v. 21. "The sea was made dry land." v. 29. "The children of Israel walked upon dry land in the midst of the sea." Here is then, a real difficulty for Baptists,—according to their mode, they cannot baptize on dry ground. But with those who sprinkle or pour, this is no difficulty.—They can baptize on dry ground. They believe that it rained upon the Israelites, while the cloud was passing over them, according to Ps. 77, 17, where David says expressly, speaking of this very event, "The clouds poured out rain." The only kind of rain which does not wet the ground, is what we call a sprinkle. Here then, God's mode of baptizing with water, is by *sprinkling*. Baptists say, there is but one mode, and it really seems so; for whether God baptizes with the Spirit or with water, he pours out, or sprinkles, but does not immerse. His is a baptism on dry ground, which according to the Baptists' mode and meaning of the word, is impossible. It is to be kept in mind, that this is the language of the New Testament. And Paul was directed to call this baptizing, (for the express purpose of showing that the sacraments of the Jews were types of ours.) by the same Spirit that directed Moses and David to record the events. We are seeking for the Bible meaning of the word *baptize*. We see inspired Moses and David, Peter and Paul, and the prophets explaining it as a pouring, or sprinkling. Thus we find that both in the Old and New Testament language, the word *baptize* is used to signify, pouring out, sprinkling. All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is all profitable for doctrine and instruction. And it has decided that the word does not always mean total immersion.

We might refer to many other instances in which the word is used, where it cannot mean immersion, as plead for and practised by Baptists in the administration of baptism. We might show the same thing

respecting the word *bapto*, the root from which *baptizo*, baptize, is derived, which in the Greek bible is twice used to express the manner or mode in which king Nebuchadnezar's body was *wet* with the dew of heaven. Daniel iv. 30. v. 21. An examination of the derivative name *baptismos baptism*, would confirm the same thing. If we should appeal to the poets, orators, and historians of antiquity, masters of the Greek language, we would be at no loss to find abundant proof of these words being used in a similar sense. If we should appeal to human authority, we could appeal to none higher than Dr. Owen, who says—"That *no one* instance can be given in scripture, in which the word, which we render baptize, does *necessarilly* signify either to dip or plunge," and this can be confirmed by the acknowledgment of eminent Baptists. But I do not think it necessary to appeal to human, while we have an abundance of scripture authority to settle the true meaning of the word, which is far better authority. I presume sufficient has been said respecting the meaning of this word. I am persuaded that the more we search the scriptures, the stronger will be the proof, that the word *baptize*, and the mode of baptism, as used in the sacred writings, has a reference to the applying of the element or sign to the body, by pouring or springling—and not applying the body to the element by plunging or immersion.

J. P. M.

P. S. As leisure may permit, I may furnish you with the illustration of two or three arguments more. The present has a reference only, as you will perceive, to the meaning of the word baptize.

---

ART. III. *Address by the Associate Presbytery of Cambridge, to the People under their cure, on the subject of the Bible Society.*

The following Address by the Associate Presbytery of Cambridge, to the people under their care, on the subject of the Bible Society, was ordered to be sent for publication in the Religious Monitor. It is, hereby accordingly sent, with the request that it be published. It was adopted in March last, but by an oversight, its transmission has been delayed till this time. I hope you will publish it as soon as practicable.

Yours, &amp;c.

A. ANDERSON.

REV. JAMES MARTIN, Ed. Rel. Mon.

The Associate Synod, at its meeting in 1831, adopted rules and regulations for procuring and distributing copies of the Holy scriptures, with the Psalms in metre. The Synod, in those rules, desires "the session of every congregation, to take measures as soon as practicable, to raise monies, either by annual collections in the congregation, or by subscriptions from church-members and others, or by both these methods, or by any other, which may seem best calculated to promote the object in view." The Presbytery finding that all the congregations within their bounds have not complied with the recommendations of the Synod, beg leave to address them on this important measure.

Dear Brethren—The immense importance of this subject, deserves and demands your most serious consideration. The Holy Scriptures are a gracious revelation from the God of Heaven, and contain the words of eternal life. Many millions of the human race are perishing

for lack of the *Holy Scriptures*, which are able to make them wise to salvation, through faith that is in Jesus Christ. We can bestow upon them no better boon than the bible. They can receive no greater gift from us than the word of God, which is indispensably necessary to the salvation of their souls. We live in a time in which copies of the scriptures can be easily and indefinitely multiplied, and the price of a single copy of the bible is so small that it would procure food and raiment for the body but for a very few days. There is a laudable endeavor in many parts of the christian world, to distribute the bread and water of life to the immortal souls of perishing sinners, by an extensive circulation of the holy scriptures, afforded at as low a price as possible, or furnished gratuitously. The special object of the Synod is the distribution of the scriptures with the Psalms in metre. It is a part of our profession that none other than the scripture psalmody ought to be used in the worship of God. The distribution of the scriptures with the scripture psalms, in metre, is not professedly done by any Bible Society with which we are acquainted. By accomplishing this measure we distribute nothing but the word of God, but we distribute it in such a manner, as that those who receive it, may not only read the written revelation of God's will, but from that sacred record sing the songs of Zion, celebrating the praises of the God of all grace for the precious blessings of a spiritual and everlasting salvation. "Let the word of Christ dwell in you richly in all wisdom; teaching and admonishing one another in psalms and hymns, and spiritual songs, singing with grace, and making melody in your hearts to the Lord. And whatsoever ye do in word or deed, do all in the name of the Lord Jesus, giving thanks to God and the Father by him." This is a most honorable, useful and important work of christian charity, and we ought to consider it not only a duty, but a privilege to be liberal, prompt and active in it. It is one of the best means of *doing good to all, especially to the household of faith*. To quicken you in this good work, consider the following passages of the bible itself. "The Lord thy God, he it is that giveth thee power to get wealth. The silver is mine, and the gold is mine, saith the Lord of hosts. Honor the Lord with thy substance and with the first fruits of all thine increase, so shall thy barns be filled with plenty, and thy presses shall burst out with new wine.—Withhold not good from them to whom it is due, when it is in the power of thine hand to do it. Give to him that needeth—give alms of such things as ye have—give and it shall be given to you—good measure, pressed down, and shaken together, and running over, shall men give into your bosom:—cast thy bread upon the waters, for thou shalt find it after many days—there is that scattereth and yet increaseth; and there is that withholdeth more than is meet, but it tendeth to poverty. The liberal soul shall be made fat, and he that watereth shall be watered also himself.—The bountiful eye shall be blessed, for he giveth of his bread to the poor.—Remember the words of the Lord Jesus, how he said, it is more blessed to give than to receive.—To do good and to communicate forget not, for with such sacrifices God is well pleased."

Let us therefore, dear brethren, engage in this blessed work of benevolence, praying that the word of God may grow mightily, till all the earth be filled with the knowledge of the Lord, and until, from the uttermost parts of the earth, shall be heard songs, even glory to the righteous God, when they shall lift up the voice and sing for the majesty of the Lord.

ART. IV. *The Christian World Unmasked.*

(Continued from page 81.)

Why, Doctor, you talk most amazingly of Jesus Christ: I never heard the like before. Some people only vamp him up as a prophet, and trample on his blood: and some, who like to live as they list, shew a Jewish heart, and call him an imposter; but you make him God Almighty, our Creator and Preserver and Redeemer. Truly, I would give him all his due, but must have his honors fetched from the holy Bible, and not from human brains. My besom sweeps away all cobwebs, whether spun by a spider or the doctor. Give me some fair and plain account of Jesus Christ from the scripture: I love the Bible, and can credit what it says.

Now you talk like a man, Sir: when you lifted up your staff before, I began to think of packing up my alls. A cudgel is too hard an argument for me. But since you ask for the Bible, I am well content to stay, and tell you what it says of Jesus Christ. Before he had a human nature, he created all things by his divine power, all matter, and all animals, and all spirits human or angelic. St. John says, *All things were made by him*: (John i. 3.) and Paul enlarges on St. John's words, saying, *All things were created by him, that are in heaven and that are in earth, visible and invisible*; all things were created by him, and for him; that is, by his power, and for his glory. (Colos. i. 16.) Where his Godhead is equally proclaimed, by his creating power, and by creating all things for his glory. Now, Sir, if Jesus Christ created all things, he cannot be a creature; otherwise he must create himself, and so have had existence, before he had a being.

Paul goes on and says, *Jesus Christ is before all things*. (Colos. i 17.) Grammar rules required him to say, *Jesus was* before all things; but he breaks his well known grammar rules, and says, *he is* before all things, to shew his eternal unchangeable existence: and Jesus did the same, when he said, *Before Abraham was, I am*.

Paul adds further, *By him* all things do consist, (Colos. i. 17.) *all things*, material, human, or angelic (*συνέστηκε*) are held together, stand fast, and sustained by him. And again, *Jesus upholdeth* all things by the word of his power. (Heb. i. 3.)

Paul sufficiently declares the divinity of Christ, by calling him *the express image of his Father's person*. (Heb. i. 3.) As the impression of a seal on wax exactly answers to the seal itself, line for line, and is the express image of the seal; even so is the Son the express image of the Father. Whatever line of divinity is drawn on the Father, the same is impressed on the Son. Whatever wisdom, power, justice, truth, patience, kindness, mercy, &c., are found in the Father, the same must be found *equally* in the Son, else he is not the *express* image of the Father's person. If any attribute is in the Father, which is not in the Son; or is possessed more perfectly by the Father than the Son, then the Son is not the *express* image of the Father.

Paul asserts, that *all the fullness of the Godhead dwelt in Christ bodily*: (Colos. ii. 9.) that is the divine nature of Jesus, containing *all the fullness of the Godhead*, dwelt in his body, and inhabited it as a temple: just as the shechina, or glorious presence of God, inhabited the holy of holies in the first Jerusalem temple; which temple was a type of the body of Christ.

Jesus saith, *All things whatsoever the Father hath* (ἐχει, possesseth) *are mine*, do belong to me also. (John xvi. 15.)

Again he saith, *I and the Father are one*, (ἐν ἑσμεν) not one person, but one thing, one nature, one substance, one essence. (John x. 30.)

He further affirms, *No one knoweth the Son but the Father, neither knoweth any one the Father but the Son*. (Matt. xi. 27.) The divine understanding of the Son and the Father are equal and reciprocal, alike infinite in both. Our translation is often faulty in rendering εἰς no man, and τις any man, instead of no one and any one.

On these accounts, Jesus declares, *Whoso hath seen me hath seen the Father*. (John xiv. 9.) My divine nature expressly bears the essential image of the Father; and as God-man, I am his *manifestative* image, a visible representative of Jehovah, displaying his divine perfections in such a manner by my words and works, that whoso seeth me, hath in effect seen the Father. Nothing more is found in him than in myself: *whatever he possesseth I possess*.

The Father himself speaking to the Son, saith, *Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever*. (Heb. i. 8.) And could the Son speak to the Father in more lofty language?

John calls him absolutely *God, who made the worlds*: (John i. 2, 3.) the *true God*: (1 John v. 20.) and extols his love to mankind, by saying, *Hereby perceive we the love of God, because he laid down his life for us*. (1 John iii. 16.)

Paul says, *He was God manifested in the flesh*, (1 Tim. iii. 16.) and affirms that *according to the flesh*, or his human nature, he sprung from the fathers of the Jewish nation; but in his other nature, was *God over all, blessed for ever*; and ratifies the assertion by a solemn *Amen*. (Rom. ix. 5.)

Thomas calls him *my Lord, and my God*; and is commended for his faith; but others are commended more, who should thus believe on him, though they have not seen him. (John xx. 28.)

Isaiah calls him, *The mighty God*: (Isa. ix. 6.) *a just God, and a Saviour*, who says, *Look unto me and be saved*. (Isa. xlv. 22, 23. Phil. ii. 10.)

Jude calls him, the *only wise God, our Saviour*, (Jude 25.) And he is called the *only wise God*, not to exclude the Father and the Spirit from an equal share of divinity, but to exclude every one, *who is not by nature God*. (Gal. iv. 8.) So when Jesus saith, *no one knoweth the Father, but the Son*; he does not mean to exclude the Holy Ghost, who is by nature God; *for the Spirit searcheth all things, yea the deep things of God*. (1 Cor. ii. 10.) And in this sense we say to Christ, in our communion service, "Thou *only* art holy," not intending to exclude the Father and the Spirit from this holiness, but every one who is not by nature God.

*Jehovah* is the incommunicable name of the true God, denoting his everlasting permanent existence: and God declareth this by calling himself *I am*, which expresseth the meaning of *Jehovah*. (Exod. iii. 14.) Now the psalmist affirms that the name *Jehovah* belongs to none but the true God, saying, *Thou whose name alone is Jehovah, art the most high over all the earth*: (Psal. lxxxiii. 18.) yet this name is given unto Christ in the Old Testament; I mention only one place out of many, *This is his name, whereby he shall be called, the Lord* (in the Hebrew, *Jehovah*) *our righteousness*. (Jerem. xxiii. 6.)

Jesus takes to himself the incommunicable name, saying, *Before Abra*

ham was, I am ; and thereby intimates to the Jews, that he was the very I AM, who spoke to Moses at the bush ; the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, who brought the Israelites out of Egypt gave them his law at Sinai, and led them by his cloud, and fed them with his manna, in the wilderness.

Paul tells you, that the God, the I AM, who was tempted by the Israelites in the wilderness, was Christ ; *neither let us tempt Christ, as some of them also tempted, and were destroyed by serpents.* (1 Cor. x. 9.)

John ascribes eternal existence unto Christ, saying, *The life was manifested, and we have seen it, and shewn unto you that eternal life, which was with the Father, and was manifested unto us.* (1 John i. 2.) Well Sir, are you growing weary of this scripture evidence ?

No, no, Doctor, you have me fast by the ears ; I love scripture much, but hate your logic ; for I have suffered by it. Last Shrove-tide I was riding to a market, and overtook a very spruce fellow, who quickly let me know he was a philosopher. I can, he said, dispute upon a broomstick for half a day together : I can take any side of any question, and prove it first very right, and then mighty wrong : I can fix an ass so equally between two hay-bottles, that though he is hungry, and placed within due reach of both, he shall taste of neither. I offered to lay him half a crown, that the ass would fairly eat up both the bottles, if convenient time was granted. No, he replied, the ass will not ; and I shall prove he cannot. Nay, then said I, it is no common ass, if he will not eat good hay ; it must be some human ass, like yourself, Sir, and so I jogged on, and left him. Indeed these broomstick disputers had almost choused me out of Christ's divinity. Go on, Doctor, I am not weary, but am all attention.

Sir, I obey your orders cheerfully ; it is a favorite subject, and concerns me much. If Jesus Christ is not truly God, he cannot save me : no atonement can be made by his death. Neither need he come from heaven, merely as a prophet, to instruct me. He might have taught me just the same things by the mouth of Paul or Peter, as by his own mouth : and they might have confirmed the truth by their death, as well as himself. But they could make no atonement on a cross for sin ; none but a real God-man can do this. And now, Sir I proceed.

God claims divine worship, as due only to himself : *Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve.* (Matt iv. 10.) And Paul makes idolatry to consist, in paying service or worship to *them that are not gods by nature.* (Gal. iv. 8.) If therefore Jesus Christ is not God by nature, he ought not to be worshipped. Yet when the Father brought his Son into the world, he said *Let all the angels of God worship him.* (Heb. i. 6.) And that multitude of heavenly host, which brought the shepherds tidings of a Saviour, no doubt did worship him accordingly.

Many patients that came to Jesus for a cure, did *worship* him, and without a reprimand for so doing.

All his disciples *worshipped* him very solemnly at his ascension. (Luke xxiv. 52.)

All angels and glorified saints pay him *worship* in heaven, saying, *Worthy is the Lamb, that was slain, to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honor, and glory, and blessing !* (Rev. v. 11. 12.) What a number of words are heaped together, in order to express the highest worship and the deepest adoration ! Yet lofty men can not submit to *worship* Jesus, though the angels do it joyfully.



Again; *Every creature in heaven, on earth, and under the earth, say, blessing, and honor, and glory, and power, be to him that sitteth on the throne, and to the Lamb, for ever and ever.* (Rev. v. 13.) Every creature is here represented as paying, and every creature will at length be forced to pay, this homage and worship *equally* to the Father and the Lamb; which yet never would be paid, unless Christ was truly God. For thus the Lord declares, *I am Jehovah, that is my name; and my glory will I not give to another*, that is to any other who is not Jehovah. (Isa. xliii. 8.) But Jesus Christ's name is Jehovah too, and therefore he shares equal glory with the Father.

Jesus, as Jehovah, is the object of prayer. The Apostles say, *Lord increase our faith.* (Luke xvii. 5.)

All petitioners who applied to Christ for help, presented their prayer to him, and expected help wholly from him; excepting Martha, who is gently reproved for not doing so. Martha says, *I know that whatsoever thou wilt ask of God, he will give it thee.* (John xi. 22.) Jesus tells her, *I am the resurrection and the life; he that believeth on me, though he were dead, yet shall he live.* (Verse 25.) You talk of God's giving me whatsoever I ask: but know assuredly, that I have life in myself, and raise a soul or body unto life, when I please.

Stephen says, *Lord lay not this sin to their charge*: and commends his departing soul, as true believers do, into the hands of Jesus. (Acts vii. 59, 60.) And who, but Jehovah, is worthy of, and sufficient for such a trust?

Paul, in a prayer, put the Son's name before the Father's, *May our Lord Jesus Christ himself, and God even our Father—comfort your hearts, and stablish you in every good word and work.* (2 Thess. ii. 16, 17.)

In the New Testament, Christians are thus described, *They call upon the name of Jesus Christ.* (1 Cor. i. 2.—Acts ix. 14, 21.) This was an outward distinguishing mark of Christians in the Apostle's day, but some lewd professors in our day esteem it the brand of idolators.

It is the Father's will, *that all should honor the Son, even as they honor the Father*; should pay the same adoration and worship to the Son, in his human nature, as they pay it to the Father. The *human nature*, taken by the Son, veiled his divinity; and might seem a bar against divine worship. Therefore a command is given, first, that all the *angels* should worship him at his incarnation; and then, *that all men should honor the Son, even as they honor the Father.* The union of the two natures shall be no bar against divine worship. And every one, who withholdeth this honor from the Son, does withhold it from the Father, and dishonor him. For *he, that honoreth not the Son, honoreth not the Father, who hath sent him.* (John v. 23.)

When you direct a prayer unto Jesus, you need no one to introduce you, but may go *directly* to him now, as they did aforetime when he was on earth. As a man, he receives the address of men; and as God, he is worthy of them, and abundantly able to supply all wants. But when you pray to the Father or the Holy Spirit, that is, to the Godhead absolutely, then you must go through the Mediator, as the only ground of your acceptance.

We are baptized *equally* in the name of the Father, and the Son; and thereby make *equal* profession of faith, worship and obedience to them both. But if Jesus Christ is not Jehovah, raise him up as high as the shoulder of an Arian can lift him, he is still much more beneath the

Father, than a worm is beneath himself. For there can be no proportion between finite and infinite. Therefore if Jesus Christ is not Jehovah, to couple him with the Father in the same baptismal dedication, is a thousand times more unseemly, than to harness a snail and an elephant together. And what is said of the Son in this article, equally respects the Holy Ghost.

Jesus Christ is appointed the judge of quick and dead; but how can he execute the office, unless he is Jehovah? His eye must survey every moment all the actions, words and thoughts that are passing every where throughout the earth; and his memory must retain distinctly all the amazing number of actions, words and thoughts, that will have passed from the world's creation to its dissolution. If but a single wickedness, committed in a sinner's bosom, escapes him; or but a single *cup of cold water, given unto any in the name of a disciple*, is forgotten; he cannot judge right judgment. Now, if you think a creature's comprehension can survey and retain all these things; (and modern faith, though straining at a Bible-gnat, will swallow down an hundred camels) still I ask, how can Jesus know the hearts of men, unless he is Jehovah? This prerogative belongs to God *alone*.

Solomon prays in this manner, *Jehovah, Cod of Israel, thou, even thou only, knowest the hearts of all the children of men.* (1 Kings viii. 23, 39.) And Jehovah says of himself *I search the heart, and try the reins.* (Jer. xvii. 10.)

Now Jesus does the same; therefore he is Jehovah, and qualified to be a judge. He shewed, while on earth, that *he knew what was in man*, (John ii. 24, 25); he *knew their thoughts*; (Matt. xii. 25); disclosed the inward *reasonings of their hearts*; (Mark ii. 8); and declares concerning himself, *that all the churches shall know, that I am he, who search the reins and heart*: and being able to do this, he is qualified for judge, and therefore adds, *I will give to every one of you according to your works.* (Rev. ii. 23.)

[To be continued.]

#### ART. V. *London Anniversaries.*

(From the London Correspondent of the N. Y. Commercial Advertiser.)

*General Assembly of the Church of Scotland's Foreign Missions.*

This meeting was held on Tuesday evening, May 10th, at Exeter Hall, chiefly to give an opportunity of making known the operations of the General Assembly of Scotland in the cause of Foreign Missions. That body, some few years ago, undertook the work of Foreign Missions in its ecclesiastical capacity, and though they have not yet accomplished a great deal, yet they have made a good beginning, and their prospects are very encouraging. This meeting allowed a full development of their views, as well as a statement of their success. The Marquis of Breadalbane presided, and addresses were made by the Hon. Mr. Pringle, M. P., the Rev. Dr. Duff, and one or two others. The meeting was chiefly interesting on account of the very long and able speech of Dr. Duff, who gave a most interesting account of the state of things existing in India, and especially in Calcutta, brought about by the education of the Hindoo youth in the literary systems of European knowledge; the open infidelity and neglect of all religion which that instruction leads to when dissociated from Christianity, as has been shown

in the case of the Hindoo College, maintained by the English government; and of the success which has attended the institution that has been established by the Assembly's Missionaries, in which more than 500 Hindoo youth are now receiving instruction in divine and human knowledge.

---

*Irish Evangelical Society.*

This society held its annual meeting at the same time, at Finsbury Chapel. Thomas Walker presided, and the report was read by the Rev. Arthur Tidman, Secretary of the society. This association is confined chiefly to the Congregationalists, as the Hibernian Society is to the members of the established church. The annual meetings are usually extremely interesting. It is a powerful auxiliary in the work of evangelizing Ireland. During the past year, it employed fifty ministers, evangelists and exhorters or Bible readers and expounders. Its receipts were about £3000, and its expenditures were the same.—Interesting addresses were delivered at this meeting by the Rev. John Sibree, Rev. John Burnet, Rev. Dr. Morrison, Rev. E. H. Nolan, Rev. William Owen, &c.

---

*British and Foreign Bible Society.*

The thirty-second annual meeting of this noble Society was held on Wednesday the 4th day of May, at Exeter Hall. The attendance was of course, as great as the Hall would allow. Lord Bexly presided and opened the meeting with an address, which I could not hear, inasmuch as his lordship speaks in a very low voice. The report was read by the Rev. Messrs Brandram and Brown, two of the Society's Secretaries.

This great Society still marches onward in its benevolent work. During the last year it issued from its depository 558,842 copies of the sacred Scriptures, or portions of them; making a total of 9,751,792 since its organization. This does not include the Bibles printed by other Societies, which may even have been aided by this Society. The report gave a very cheering survey of the progress of the Bible cause in all parts of the world. The Society is about to send out an agent to China, to devote himself to the work of distributing the sacred Scriptures in that important part of the world.

The receipts last year were £80,819 8s, 7d, and the expenditures £107,487 19s, 7d.

Addresses were made at this meeting by the Bp. of Winchester, Lord Glenelg, Rev. Robert J. Breckinridge, of Baltimore, Rev. Dr. John Pye Smith, Rev. Mr. Jackson, of New York. Rev. Mr. Shaw, of South Africa, Josiah Foster, Rev. Mr. Ackworth, Rev. Dr. Longly, (one of the new bishops,) and two or three others. Many of these addresses were excellent, particularly that of Lord Glenelg, (lately Mr. Charles Grant,) who is a much more forcible speaker than I had expected to find him. The speeches of the American delegates were substantial, forcible, and well delivered. They will appear well also, when printed.

---

*Religious Tract Society.*

This Society celebrated its thirty-seventh Anniversary on Friday evening, May 6th, at Exeter Hall. The meeting was very well atten-

ded. Samuel Hoare, Esq., the Treasurer, presided. The Report was read by Mr. Jones, one of the Secretaries.

This Society exerts a vast influence. Its total receipts last year were £63,034 13s. 3d., of which £54,686 18s. 11d., were from the sales of its publications, and the remainder from donations.

Its publications last year 15,914,146; making a total, since its formation, of about 235,000,000, in more than eighty languages.

The report gave an encouraging view of the progress of the Tract cause in every part of the world, and took a most respectful notice of the proceedings of the American Tract Society. It appears that the London Society extended aid during the year to Tract Societies in almost every part of the world, and especially to the various Missions supported by Evangelical Societies.

Addresses were made at this meeting by the Rev. Baptiste Noel, Rev. Mr. Grimshawe, Rev. Dr. Burder, Rev. H. Townley, Rev. Wm. Jackson, of New York, Rev. J. Cumming, Rev. Mr. Sibthorpe, and others. Mr. Jackson was a delegate from the American Tract Society.

---

*Sunday School Union.*

The annual meeting of this Society took place at Exeter Hall, Thursday evening, May 5th, Edward Baines, Esq. M. P. presided, and opened the meeting with an address. After the singing of an appropriate anthem, the report was read by Mr. Lloyd, one of the secretaries of the Society.

The report took a full survey of the Sunday School cause throughout the whole world, and gave a flattering notice of the American and other Sunday School Unions in the United States, embracing a million of scholars and teachers. It stated the number of Sunday Schools in England and Wales at 16,858, and the number of scholars at 1,548,890. The receipts of the Society for the last year, from donations, were £675 19s. 1d., and the expenditures were £542 19s. 2½d., leaving a balance of £133 19s. 10½d.

Addresses were delivered at this meeting by the Earl of Roden, who is not only a friend of Sunday Schools, but also a teacher and an active labourer in this cause, and also president of the Sunday School Society of Ireland; Rev. Arthur Tidman, Secretary of the Irish Evangelical Society; Rev. John Leifchild, Rev. Charles Stovel, Rev. Dr. Morrison, and several others. The speeches of the Earl of Roden, Mr. Tidman, Leifchild, and Mr. Stovel, were very good indeed; those of the others were not extraordinary. Mr. Leifchild is probably the most popular speaker at these public meetings that is to be found in London. He is not a man of profound learning, nor of brilliant imagination, nor of great refinement. But yet there is so much of *heart* about all that he says, such an easy flow of language, united with a benignant countenance and a commanding person, and a silvery-toned voice, that it is impossible to hear him without being greatly interested in what he says.

---

*London Society for promoting Christianity among the Jews.*

This society held its annual meeting on Friday the 6th inst. at Exeter Hall. Sir Thomas Baring, Bart. presided. An interesting report was read by one of the Secretaries of the Society.

The receipts of the society for the last year were £14,395.

The report gave an encouraging account of the operations of the Society. Its success, I apprehend, is much more considerable than most people imagine. In various places in Prussia, Poland, &c. quite a considerable number of Jews have embraced Christianity. In Berlin there are 700 baptized Jews. In Tunis the agent of the society has lately distributed more than 600 copies of the Hebrew Scriptures. Addresses were made at this meeting by the Rev. Edward Bickerstith, who is well known in the United States, by his writings, and several other gentlemen.

---

*London Hibernian Society.*

The thirtieth annual meeting of this Society was held at Exeter Hall, on Saturday, the 7th of May. The Rt. Hon. Lord Teignmouth, one of the Vice Presidents of the Society, presided in the absence of the Marquis of Cholmondeley, who is the President. The report was read by one of the Secretaries.

This is, in my opinion, one of the most important Societies in Great Britain. The object of the institution is to give a Scriptural education to the people of Ireland. More than 600,000 persons have been taught in its schools. It has now 1962 Sunday, day, and adult schools, and 116,323 scholars.

Of its schools—1011 are day-schools, 536 Sunday-schools, 407 adult-schools.

182 new schools were established last year, 115 schools ceased, 40 through opposition, and the others from want of funds; 17 schools have been the actual increase.

Nearly 40,000 children of Catholic parents attend these schools, and are instructed in the Scriptures. The Society has distributed 369,800 copies of the word of God among its schools since its organization. The receipts last year were £10,412 9s. 10½d., including £1000 which were borrowed. The expenditures were £9835 5s. 10d.

The speakers of this meeting were the Right Hon. Lord Montsford, the Dean of Armagh, Rev. Peter Roe, of Kilkenny, Rev. Mr. Cumming, Rev. Mr. Seymour, and one or two others.

Several of these speeches were very interesting. That of the Dean of Armagh bore the most delightful testimony to the progress of Evangelical piety in the Established church in Ireland, not only among the ministers, but also among the people. The addresses, of Messrs. Cumming and Seymour, were quite violent against the Catholics, and somewhat political, so much so that great opposition was made by some gentlemen who were present, and the Chairman had to insist upon the speakers avoiding such topics. I know not when I have seen a more exciting meeting.

I ought to add that this is not the only Society which is laboring to extend Scriptural education in Ireland. What is called the Kildare Place Society, which is Protestant and employs religious teachers and uses the Bible as a school book, has more than 1000 schools, and more than 100,000 scholars in Ireland, and has undoubtedly done great good in that country. In addition to this the national schools use the scriptures or selections from them. And still more, the Sunday-school Society of Ireland has many schools under its care, in which the Holy Scriptures are carefully taught to the children.

---

*Protestant Association.*

This Association, whose object is to maintain the doctrines and prin-

ciples of the Reformation in opposition to Romanism, held its meeting on Wednesday, the 11th of May, at Exeter Hall. This association has been formed mainly to promote the reading of the sacred Scriptures. It is not sectarian in its character. The Marquis of Winchelsea presided, and addresses were made by the Duke of Newcastle, Lord Roden, Henry Pownell, Esq., M. P., Captain Gordon, Mr. Blanchard and several others. There was a delightful spirit prevailing at this meeting. Nothing was said to which any sect of Protestants could object. It was a meeting, the object of which seemed to be to secure the faithful perusal and study of the word of God, as the best, the true antidote for the poison of Romanism.

The following is the substance of Captain Gordon's speech, or report :

Captain Gordon then rose, and after observing that they had arrived at that stage of the proceedings when, according to the usual practice of public meetings, the Secretary of the Society was accustomed to read the report of its success for the past year, remarked, that as the present was the first anniversary, the meeting would perhaps accept of him in lieu of a report, and allow him as briefly as the subject would admit of to explain the objects and the intensions of the Protestant Association. (Hear.) Before he did this, however, he would first allude to the breaking up of the Orange Society. Orange Lodges, the legislature had declared to be inexpedient, and he would not detain the meeting by entering into a discussion of the principles of a body whose only fault appeared to him to be over zeal, (cheers,) but he insisted that some Society, representing the principles of Protestantism, and yet distinct from the Orange Society, was absolutely necessary to the interest of the professors of that holy religion. (Hear, hear.) The Protestant Association was established in June last, but it was considered too late in the year to hold a public meeting in support of it. It was necessary that it was in some respects different from the Society for promoting religious principles of the reformation. That Society proceeded upon the principle of "divide and conquer," and opposed the doctrines of the Protestants to the doctrines of the Papists, but the object of this Association was to oppose a whole Protestantism to a whole Popery. It is a well known fact that Popery was a political as well as a religious system, (hear,) and it was therefore essential that it should be politically as well as religiously opposed. (Hear.) A course of that sort was quite as necessary as the simple opposition of Protestant truth to Popish error. The Church of Rome had used every influence, both spiritual and political, to regain the position which she had lost at the Reformation. The gallant Captain then exhibited to the meeting a map of England and Scotland on a large scale, which was marked with black spots or crosses in every place where a Roman Catholic chapel or college had been established in these countries.

The number of those colleges and chapels had been registered by the Reformation Society, and in one county alone (Lancashire) they amounted to eighty-seven, and in another (Inverness) to seventeen. In 1796 there were not twenty Catholic chapels in England and Scotland; at the present time they amounted to upward of five hundred (hear); there were forty more, the building of which had commenced since the map he held in his hand was drawn up, and it appeared from a statement in the Dublin Review, a publication, the sole object of which was to assist Mr. O'Connell's line of policy (hear), that forty more were in contemplation, so that they might be said to amount to a total of *five hun-*

*dred and eighty* in England and Scotland alone. In the former of those kingdoms there were nine Roman Catholic colleges, and in the latter one. To these were attached schools, and the Sisters of Charity, as they were called, were daily to be found at the bedside of the sick and the dying—(hear). He would not enter into very full details on the present occasion, but he was prepared to prove that there were shoals of unprotected and unfortified Protestants caught in the Roman Catholic net in our large towns, and even in our small country parishes. The Roman Catholic machinery was working to the conversion, or rather perversion of thousands of poor uneducated Protestants, in a manner the most deplorable and fatal. But Popery was not only doing this, but what was worse than any thing he had yet stated was the fact, that the professors of that religion had entered into an alliance with another class of persons who were at the very antipodes of a belief in its tenets—(hear, hear.) Liberalism was the link which unfortunately had connected the professors of the pure faith with the professors of no faith. Popery and liberalism were playing a deep and a dangerous game. Popery extinguished reason and liberalism deified it—(hear.) Let the effects of Popery in Spain, in Italy, in Belgium, be looked at. In those countries she had become predominant, because there had been no Protestantism to oppose her. He would detail the progress of an anti-Protestant legislature under the influence of Liberalism. By what was called the Quebec Act, in 1774, Catholicism was established in Lower Canada, and from that moment the Protestant was no longer essentially the established religion of the British dominions. Since this unhappy concession the college of Maynooth was founded (hear,) and it was an institution of which it might truly be said, that it was founded for the purpose of educating a priesthood to teach idolatry. The next fatal step was the measure of 1829, miscalled the Catholic Emancipation Bill. (Great cheering.) By that concession the principle was admitted, that the Roman Catholic religion was as beneficial to a state as the Protestant. Next came the new system of national education, so eminently adapted to extinguish the light of Protestantism throughout Ireland. Before that system prevailed, every Society which professed to give wholesome religious instruction to the people of that country was making the most cheering progress. By the return of the commission appointed by the House of Commons to inquire into the state of Irish education, it was found that 600,000 children were enjoying the blessings of education, of whom 400,000 were being educated upon the principle of being instructed in the whole and unmutilated Bible. (Hear.) The new system was gradually drawing them off from such a plan, and mixing up with their education the heresies of Catholicism and Peter Dens. Even in the bill renewing the East India charter, Mr. O'Connell had contrived to have introduced a clause expressly favorable to the Catholic faith. The public treasury was employed, in many instances, in supporting that religion, and the people of this country were daily contributing by that means toward its general establishment. He had been taught to believe that what was morally wrong could not be politically right, and upon that ground, as well as upon others he had stated, and having explained the principles on which the Protestant Association was founded, he felt himself justified in advocating to the utmost the cause it professed to maintain, and to call on all present to give it their cordial and hearty support. (Great cheering.)

*London Missionary Society.*

The fortieth annual meeting of this important Missionary Society was held on Thursday, the 12th of May, at Exeter Hall, Thomas Wilson, Esq., the Treasurer of the Society, presided. The report, or, rather, an abstract of it, was read by the Rev. Mr. Ellis. It gave a very interesting account of the Society's missions in India; in South Africa; in the Society, or South Sea Islands, and in the West Indies.

The following is a brief summary :—272 stations; 111 missionaries; 28 European assistants; 195 native assistants; 74 churches; more than 5000 communicants; 448 schools; 29,600 scholars; 15 printing establishments; 163,297 books issued last year.

Receipts last year, £55,865 2s. 11d., including £3000 from the government for the erection of schools in the West Indies. The expenditures were £60,627 8s. 5d.

Addresses at this meeting were made by the Rev. Messrs. Campbell and Williams, missionaries, and the Rev. Messrs. Townley and Grey, of Edinburgh, James, of Birmingham, and the Rev. John Leifchild.

The speeches of Messrs. Campbell, Williams, James, and Leifchild, were of thrilling interest. Indeed that of Mr. James, was one of the very best that I have heard on such occasions. Nor was Mr. Leifchild's much inferior. He was called upon by the people, at the close of the meeting, to speak, and though he did so without premeditation, he did it admirably. There was a deep feeling of interest manifested, in this vast meeting, and more than one thousand pounds sterling were subscribed or collected. It was indeed, a noble meeting, and for a noble cause.

*Naval and Military Bible Society.*

This is the oldest Bible Society in England, and, in the world, if we except Franklin's Bible Institution at Halle, which was, in some respects, a real Bible Society. It held its fifty-sixth annual meeting at Freemason's Hall. The Marquis of Cholmondeley presided,

The receipts of this Society for last year, were about £2,500, and its expenditure about the same. It has put into circulation 300,000 copies of the word of God since its formation. The speakers at this meeting were Mr. Plumtre, M. P.; Mr. Tolly; Captain Maude, R. N.; Capt. Pakenham, R. N.; Captain Elliott, R. N.; Rev. Pcter Roe; Rev. William Clayton, and the Rev. Mr. Grimshawe.

*British Reformation Society.*

The annual meeting of this Society was held at Exeter Hall, on Friday, the 13th of May. Mr. George Finch, in the absence of Lord Ashley, presided.

The object of this meeting is to oppose Romanism in all its shapes and operations. The report was read by the Rev. Mr. Seymour. The Society has circulated 400,000 Tracts, and employed a large number of Bible-readers in Ireland, who have experienced no little persecution from the Catholic priests.

Addresses were delivered by Captain Gordon, Rev. Mr. Seymour, Rev. Dr. Halloway, Rev. Mr. Murray, Dean of Armagh, Rev. Edward Tottenham, and others.

The meeting was a highly excited one. Several Catholics tried to interrupt it, but were soon put down. Many of the facts which were



stated by Captain Gordon and others, were exceedingly important; but they were similar to those which were stated at the meeting of the Protestant Association, which have already been given.

---

*Protestant Society for the Protection of Religious Liberty.*

This Society is often called John Wilks' Society, for he is its Secretary and founder. Lord Errington, presided. The meeting was held on Saturday, the 14th of May, at the City of London Tavern. In the absence of Mr. Wilks, who was prevented by sickness from attending the meeting, his son read a brief report.

This Society was formed for the protection of the rights and property of the Dissenters, of every name, and has made its influence felt far and wide, by its powerful and successful efforts to restrain the Established Church within the boundaries of the law.

It has also done much to promote the reform which is now going on in this country.

The meeting was addressed by the Rev. Messrs. Morrell, Drs. Morrison and Cox, Dr. Brown, Josiah Conder, and several others. It was an interesting meeting, though less so than the one which occurred at the same place last year.

This Society has no small task yet before it. For, I will venture to predict that the Dissenters will not get all their grievances redressed for many a day to come. Oppression dies hard.

---

*The City Mission.*

This is the title of a new Society, which was formed last winter, thro' the efforts of Mr. Nasmith, and is organized on the plan of the many associations of the same sort, which that excellent gentleman organized in the United States, a few years since. Fowell Buxton, Esq., M. P. presided.

This Society is but just organized. Of course, its report rather stated its plans and objects, than its achievements. It is in the hands mainly, I should judge, of the evangelical members of the Established church, though it is not sectarian.

Addresses were made by Sir Andrew Agnew, Hon. Mr. Johnson, Mr. Deer, the Hon. and Rev. Baptist Noel, Rev. John Leifchild, and several other gentlemen.

---

*Voluntary Church Society.*

This society held its annual meeting on the evening of the same day, at Finsbury Chapel. Edward Baines, Esq., M. P., presided. The report was read by one of the Secretaries.

The object of this society is to show that the voluntary principle is the best in supporting churches. It draws its most powerful arguments from America. It is always an interesting meeting.

It was addressed on this occasion, by the Rev. John Burnet, Rev. Mr. Woodward, Rev. Dr. Matheson, Dr. Brown, Mr. Brown, and the Rev. Mr. Sibree.

---

*British and Foreign Temperance Society.*

This Society held its annual meeting at Exeter Hall, on Tuesday the 17th instant. The Bishop of Chester presided and opened the meeting with an address. The report was read by one the Secretaries. It

was far from being such a document as Dr. Edwards produces. It is stated that there are 630 Temperance societies in England and Wales, which embrace 200,000 members. The number for Ireland and Scotland were not given. The progress of the cause in the British colonies was represented as very good.

The addresses at this meeting were made by the Rt. Hon. Lord Teignmouth, a Mr. Montague, the Rev. Hugh Stowell, Rev. George Evans John Hawkins, the Manchester blacksmith, George Thompson, from America, (the apostle of abolition,) Mr. Buckingham, and one or two others. Most of these speeches were very good. I was sorry not to have heard the Rev. Mr. Breckinridge at this meeting.

---

*Home Missionary Society.*<sup>1</sup>

The annual meeting of this society was held in the evening of the same day, at Exeter Hall, Thomas Thompson, Esq., presided. The report was read by the Rev. Mr. Henry.

This society is labouring to build up churches in England and Wales chiefly. It sends forth some eighty or ninety evangelists and preachers, who go into the most destitute parts, and endeavour to bring men to the knowledge of the gospel. It is in the bands of the dissenters. It has done much good, but probably is not conducted with as much energy as is demanded. The receipts do not exceed £4000 or £5000 per annum.

---

*British and Foreign School Society.*

The 31st anniversary of this society was celebrated on Monday the 9th instant, at Exeter Hall. As usual, this was a crowded and interesting meeting. Lord Morpeth, secretary for Ireland, in his majesty's present ministry, presided, opened the meeting with a very sensible speech, and I may add a *manly* one, though his lordship has very much the appearance of an overgrown boy. He is, however, a very clever man, as our English friends say, and is greatly respected. He is a son, I believe, of the Earl of Carlisle. A note from the Duke of Bedford, president of the society, expressing his regret that his many infirmities prevented his attending the meeting and taking the chair. His grace, however, sent £100 to the meeting, as an expression of his undiminished interest in the society.

The report was read by the excellent and amiable secretary, Henry Dunn, Esq. It was a good one, as all who know this worthy delightful specimen of an English Christian gentleman would expect.

The object of this important institution is to promote the daily Scriptural instruction of the poor of every denomination. Its operations, though chiefly directed to meet the wants of the home population, have extended to the colonies and to foreign countries. The society has a fine model school in Borough Road, London, where 1200 teachers have been trained up and sent forth, who have instructed more than a million of children. The system of the society has been introduced and largely promoted in the East and West Indies, Canada, Greece, Africa, on the Continent of Europe, and in North and South America. The receipts of the society for the last year were about £3330, and its expenditures were £3631 15s. 10d.

Interesting addresses were delivered at this meeting by Sir C. E. Smith, Bart. J. J. Briscoe, Esq., Rev. R. W. Hamilton, Rev. Sander-

son Robins, Rev. Henry Wilks, Rev. Robert J. Breckinridge, of America, and several other gentlemen. But my time will not allow me to take any notice of their remarks. The meeting was very interesting, and some of the speeches uncommonly good. That of Mr. Breckinridge was excellent, and well received. Mr. Robins also delivered an admirable address.

---

ART. VI. *Anniversaries in Paris.*

(From the Paris Correspondent of the Boston Recorder.)

*Paris, April 25th. 1836.*

This has been a joyous week to the little band of evangelical Christians in Paris, as well as to many from various parts of France. It has been the season of the anniversaries of the religious societies of Paris, and of France—for many of them are national in their character.

---

*Prayer Meeting*

This interesting season was opened on Monday evening by a delightful prayer meeting in behalf of the meetings which were about to take place. The Saloon, or place of meeting, in the Rue Taitbout, was well filled, including both galleries. The Rev. Mr. Grand Pierie presided. Several appropriate chapters were read, hymns were sung, and three or four fervent prayers were offered up by Mr. Grand Pierre, and pastors from the Departments, of whom not less than thirty or forty were present. It was a most pleasant and profitable preparation for the important services which were to follow.

---

*Tract Society.*

Tuesday evening, the Paris Tract Society held its 14th annual meeting. The venerable Professor Stapfer presided. This excellent and learned man was formerly Professor of Philosophy in the Academy, or University, as we should call it, of Berne, in Switzerland. For several years he has retired from public life on account of his infirm health. His pen has, however, been often employed for the purpose of combating error, especially on moral and religious subjects. At the opening of the meeting to which I have just referred, he delivered, or rather read, a very able and highly interesting essay on the importance of disseminating religious knowledge, and especially on the advantages which the French language and the Paris press afford for this great object. This address, like all the others which Professor Stapfer has delivered on similar occasions, partook largely of a philosophical spirit. He is altogether a very interesting man. And what is very striking to a stranger, is his very simple, humble, and childlike deportment.

The Report of the Society was read by Mr. Henry Lutteroth. It stated among other things, that the society, last year, distributed more than half a million of Tracts; making the entire number distributed, since the formation of the society, upwards of four millions. Many facts were stated to show that the blessing of God had rested upon the labors of his people in this department of the work of evangelizing France. But what most of all interested my mind was, the fact, that the society has published eleven excellent Tracts in the Spanish language, and that many thousand copies of them had entered Spain by means of the

Spanish refugees, whom the unhappy civil war which is raging in that unfortunate country, has driven into France at different times during the last year. May the Lord bless these efforts to introduce into that benighted land a few seeds of divine truth. The society has also published fourteen German Tracts, whilst its French series has been increased to one hundred and fourteen, exclusive of some broad sheets.

After the reading of the report, addresses were made by the Rev. Dr. Malan of Geneva, the Rev. Mr. Froissard, Mr. Scherer, a young lawyer, and one or two other persons. Taken altogether, this meeting was an interesting one, and demonstrated clearly that the interest which is taken in the Tract cause in France is progressive.

---

*Protestant Bible Society.*

On Wednesday, at 12 o'clock, the Paris Protestant Bible Society held its annual meeting in the Oratoire, which is the largest Protestant place of worship in Paris. Mr. Guizot, the late Minister of Public Instruction, presided and opened the meeting with a very interesting address. I had never before heard Mr. Guizot speak, and was therefore exceedingly pleased to see him in the chair when I entered. But he had not spoken long, before I ceased to wonder why he has made so much noise in France. He is unquestionably one of the greatest men in this country. He is not much above fifty years of age, possesses a good voice, has a fine face, and a most graceful manner of speaking. It is admitted on all hands, that he was the very soul of the late Cabinet, and indeed that he has exerted a greater influence on the politics of France than any other man since the death of Perier. Mr. Guizot is a Protestant, decided and firm. And although he may not be a truly converted man, his religious doctrines are orthodox and mature. His speech on this occasion was altogether the best that I have ever heard at such times. He portrayed in a striking manner the fact that the improvements of the last 50 or 60 years, of which we are so ready to boast, relate chiefly to the things of this world; to matter, and not the spirit; to the things of time, and not those of eternity. They relate to the arts, the politics, to jurisprudence, &c., whilst the immaterial world has been comparatively neglected. At least, this has been emphatically so in France. In speaking of Christianity, he always represented it as a religion which saves, which purifies the soul, and fits it for heaven. It was a striking fact, that the discourse of Mr. Guizot was much more spiritual and elevating than those of several ministers of the gospel who addressed the meeting. They were, however, mostly of the "liberal," or heterodox portion of the Protestant National Church.

After the address of Mr. G. the report was read by the Rev. Mr. Montaudon, the Secretary of the society. This society, you are aware, labors chiefly for the benefit of the Protestants. Its income last year was more than 18,000 francs, or about \$3500. It has put into circulation a considerable number of Bibles since its commencement. It has directed much of its attention to supplying the catechumens of the church with the New Testament, and each couple at their marriage with a Bible.

After the reading of the report, the meeting was addressed by the Rev. M. Coquerel, and other gentlemen, and the entire meeting was more interesting than I had expected to find it.

---

*Evangelical Society.*

Wednesday night, the Evangelical Society held its third annual mee-

ting in the Chapel in the Rue Taitbout. Admiral Ver Huell, one of the Peers of France, presided. This excellent man is one of the veterans of the French navy, and has been much distinguished for his courage and firmness. This was particularly displayed in his refusal to surrender the French fleet which he commanded in 1814, at Antwerp, and which he did not give up for some days after Bonaparte had signed the articles of abdication.

After a very interesting address from the good old admiral, the report was read by Messrs. De Presseuse and F. Monod. It was a long and interesting document, giving minute information respecting the society, and its operations during the past year: from which it appeared that the society employed during that period thirteen ministers, five evangelists, five teachers, and seven colporteurs. It has also maintained three or four young men who are preparing for the work of the Lord. It has, in addition, hired, or assisted in hiring or building, several chapels and places of worship, and put into circulation several thousand copies of the sacred scriptures, and some sixty or seventy thousand tracts. It is manifest that this interesting society is advancing well, and bids fair to be a great blessing to France. Its course is truly liberal. It seeks to gather congregations, and place over them evangelical pastors, without interfering with the question of church and state, and avoiding as far as can be, every thing which might create unnecessary opposition.

After the reading of the report, addresses were made by the Rev. Messrs. Adolphus Monod, of Lyons, Morache, of St. Dennis, Baird, from America, Vivien, of Versailles, and one or two other persons. I wish I could find time and space for some of the facts which were detailed in these addresses. That of Mr. Monod was exceedingly interesting. His history of a laborer, of the name of Ferdinand, at Lyons, his conversion, his present activity in the cause of Christ, &c. was extremely interesting. I think that this meeting was eminently calculated to do good. There was more said that came up to my ideas of what ought to be done in France, than in any other meeting which I have attended. It seemed like being in an American meeting to hear of the duty of ministers laboring for the conversion of young men, and parents devoting their children to God with all the soul, in the hope that He would prepare them by his grace, to go forth as laborers in this great field, where the harvest is so great, and the laborers so few. A very kind and grateful acknowledgement was made in the report, of the liberal aid received from the American Home Missionary Society, amounting to 15,000 francs.

---

*[French and Foreign Bible Society.]*

On Friday at 12 o'clock, the French and Foreign Bible Society, held its third annual meeting. Professor Stapfer presided, and read a long and very philosophical address on the character and prospects of the age. It was an address full of interest, but which I have not time to attempt to analyze. The report was then read by Mr. H. Lutterworth, one of the Secretaries of the society. It was an excellent one, and replete with the most interesting details. After giving a general view of what is doing to promote the circulation of the Bible throughout the world, in the course of which he bestowed a full and well-merited eulogy on the British and Foreign, and the American Bible Societies, he

gave a full account of the operations of the French and Foreign Bible Society during the third year of its existence. The substance of that statement was, that the society last year, printed the Bible in four different forms, three of which are from stereotype plates, and the New Testament in seven different forms and languages, six of which were from stereotype plates. The receipts of the society were upwards of forty three thousand francs, and its expenditure more than sixty-nine thousand, leaving the treasury, which had something like twenty-five thousand francs in hand at the beginning of the year, more than ten thousand francs in debt.

It was delightful to hear that the society had done something towards getting the Bible into Italy, and still more into Spain, and that it had been able to procure stereotype plates from the Spanish New Testament, through the liberal donation which it had secured for that specific object, from the American Bible Society. The society is also going on with the work of procuring a supply of Bibles for the Germanic population of ancient Alsace, as well as getting out Bibles of better quality in French. And I may here add, though it is not an enterprize of the Bible Society, that a Concordance for the Bible in French, is now in the press, and advancing as rapidly as the case admits. It will be a very complete and valuable work, and the first of the kind, I believe, in that language.

After the reading of the report, excellent addresses were delivered by the Rev. Messrs. Pellet, Adolphus Monod, Grand Pierre, and others. These addresses were listened to with great attention. That of Mr. Monod was rich in facts, showing the importance of distributing the Bible. If it be possible, I will send you a portion of his, relating to a woman in the neighborhood of Lyons, who not long since, became converted to God through the influence of the Bible, and whose case, taken altogether, is one of the most striking which I have ever heard. Many of the facts related by the other speakers, were very interesting. Mr. Grand Pierre proposed the formation of Bible Societies for seamen, and Mr. Waddington proposed that the attention of the society should be turned to the army, and that there should be an effort made to supply the soldiers with the word of God.

You will be gratified to learn that the society seriously contemplates undertaking the work of supplying every family in Paris with a Bible, that is willing to receive it. I was much pleased to see this subject brought forward in the annual report. May it soon be commenced! It will be a difficult work most certainly, and one far beyond the means of the Society: but the Lord will provide the means. I rejoice to see this movement in France.

And here I cannot help remarking, that every good cause is rapidly on the advance. All societies are making progress, and especially the evangelical and Bible Societies whose incomes have almost been doubled during the past year, while those of the Tract and Foreign Missionary Societies have also increased. And what is still more important, there has been a wonderful increase of deep piety of faith, and zeal, displayed in the meetings this year, which prove the presence and blessings of God the Spirit.

---

— Death of M. Monod, Sen.]

I am sorry to add that the Rev. M. Monod, sen. departed this life du

ring this season of Anniversaries. He died on Friday. He was the President of the Consistory of the Reformed Church of Paris, and the father of three excellent sons in the ministry and of a fourth who is preparing for that office. His funeral has taken place to-day. May the Lord raise up many faithful servants, to take the place of those whom he is from time to time removing!

---

ART. 5. *Miscellany.*

**THE ASSEMBLY'S NARRATIVE.**—The following is extracted from the General Assembly's "Narrative of the state of religion within the bounds of the Presbyterian Church in the United States, for the year ending May, 1836."

"Revivals of religion have always been regarded with interest by the church, as furnishing delightful evidence of the gracious presence of that Spirit, whose office is both to comfort and sanctify. Reports have been received from about 100 of 127 presbyteries belonging to the Presbyterian church in the United States. Of these, one presbytery (Ontario) report revivals in 9 churches under their care; one presbytery (Rochester) 7; three, Geneva, Ottawa and N. York Third, report 4 revivals; two report 3 revivals; nine report 2 revivals; seventeen mention 1 church within their bounds as blessed with the special influences of the Spirit; and 60 presbyteries report *no revival* in a single congregation within their bounds. From these facts the Assembly cannot resist the melancholy conviction, that the last year has been one in which the churches have been deserted by the Divine Spirit to a degree unexampled in our former history. Sixty-nine churches within our whole bounds have been distinctly stated to have enjoyed a season of refreshing from the presence of the Lord; so that, making a liberal allowance for imperfection in the reports, less than 100 churches out of 2800 have enjoyed revivals, of greater or less extent during the year."

"Former Assemblies have regarded with interest and pleasure the progress of temperance in our land. This noble cause has made cheering progress in times past; and we regard much of the ground thus won from the enemy as safe. But let us not be flushed by past achievements, so as to forget present danger. We would not disguise from the churches that 26 presbyteries have reported it stationary or declining, while 25 only have given us information of an outward progress in this cause so vital to the best interests of man. We are persuaded that in this warfare the best weapons are "Light and Love;" and we would lift our warning voice against the spirit of harsh and unkind denunciation, which has to some extent prevailed in regard to this matter. While the Christian temper is preserved, and none of the ordinances of the church brought into jeopardy, we would bid God speed to all laborers in this cause, notwithstanding differences of views as to the wisest measures to promote it."

**THE CHURCH IN HOLLAND.**—"We learn," says a writer in the Western Presbyterian Herald, "from the Edinburgh Presbyterian Review, which draws its information from the (*Evangelische Kirche-Zeitung*) Evangelical Church Gazette of Berlin, that a secession has recently commenced in the Reformed Church of Holland arising out of the laxi-

ty which has for some time prevailed in it, as to requiring from entrants to the ministry, a *declaration of adherence to the confession of the church*. In 1816 a formula was adopted, allowing great latitude to such as do not hold the doctrines of the standards—a sort of ‘*for substance*’ document as we suppose. In consequence of some proceedings with reference to this laxity, DeCock, one of their ministers, who, among a number of others, had become alarmed at the progress of error, was suspended in 1834. The contest proceeded, accompanied as is usual with intense feelings. Sometime after his suspension, De Cock fixed a laudatory preface to a book which exposed the errors contained in the latest edition of the Synod’s Hymn Book, and which condemned them in terms of considerable severity. For this act his classis deposed him.

The General Synod of 1834 was urged to give an authoritative interpretation of the formulary of 1816. It declined this, but cautioned ministers to abstain from every thing which might in any way throw suspicion on the purity of their creed—and enjoined the church courts to “watch with double heed” all impulses of restless and secret disturbers, or open accusers without sufficient grounds. This half-way measure produced no effect. Nobody knew what was meant by purity of creed, and the edict seems to have been issued against those alone who were contending against the theology which had polluted the Church. Several able ‘old schoolmen,’ as we may call them, took the field against this deliverance of the Synod, and the errors of doctrine and discipline which were ruining the church. Memorials were prepared and presented to the Synod of 1835, requesting them authoritatively to decide, that the formulary of 1816 “binds the preacher to teach, and to uphold the distinguishing doctrines of a Reformed church, as contained in the commonly received confessions of the (Dutch) church, and acknowledged therein as agreeing with the word of God.” The General Synod “honored the conviction, and recognized the good intentions” of the memorialists, but refused to comply with their request, on the ground of inexpediency, impracticability, and incompetency.

It is supposed that this determination of the Synod will lead to very extensive and very important consequences. A few churches have seceded, and it is expected that a general separation will take place between the parties, as soon as it can be ascertained that the State government will recognize the seceders as an ecclesiastical community.”

**JOHN BUNYAN AND THE BISHOP.**—John Bunyan, who, as most people know, was pastor of the Baptist church at Bedford, was much in the habit of preaching in the surrounding villages, frequently walking, with a staff in his hand, many miles within a week for that purpose. In his itinerant excursions he was often met by the Bishop of Peterborough riding in his carriage. The Bishop’s coachman, who was a Dissenter, and sometimes heard Bunyan preach, had made such representations of his wonderful talents, as excited his Lordship’s curiosity; he consequently ordered the man, the next time he met Mr. B., to let him know. The coachman in a short time met Mr. B. on the high-road, and, as he was desired, stopped the carriage, intimating to his master that that was Mr. Bunyan, and to Mr. B. that his Lordship wished to speak to him. The Bishop, from his carriage window, then addressed the Nonconformist. “Mr. Bunyan, I understand you are very clever at interpreting difficult passages of Scripture: what do you think is the meaning of St. Paul, when he says to Timothy—“The cloak that I left



at Troas with Carpus, when thou comest bring with thee, and the books, but especially the parchments?" "Why, my Lord," said Bunyan, "the passage is simple enough. Paul was a travelling preacher: Timothy was a primitive Bishop. In those days it was customary for Bishops to wait on travelling preachers; Paul therefore instructs Timothy to look after his baggage, and to bring it with him when he comes. Times are altered since then. Now, Bishops ride, and travelling preachers walk." The Bishop threw himself back in his carriage, cried "Humph," and ordered the coachman to drive on.—*London Patriot*.

**THE RECHABITES.**—The Rev. Joseph Wolff says: On my arrival at Mesopotamia, some Jews that I saw there, pointed me to one of the ancient Rechabites. He stood before me, wild, like an Arab, holding the bridle of his horse in his hand. I showed him the Bible in Hebrew and Arabic, which he was much rejoiced to see, as he could read both languages, but had no knowledge of the New Testament. After having proclaimed to him the tidings of salvation, and made him a present of the Hebrew and Arabic Bibles and Testaments, I asked him, "Whose descendant are you?"

"Mousa," said he, boisterously, "is my name, and I will show you who were my ancestors;" on which he immediately began to read from the 5th to the 11th verses of Jeremiah xxxv.

"Where do you reside?" said I.

Turning to Genesis x. 27, he replied, "At Hadoram, now called Simar by the Arabs; at Uzal, now called Sanan by the Arabs;" and again referring to the same chapter, verse 30th, he continued, "At Mesha, now called Mecca, in the deserts around those places. We drink no wine and plant no vineyard, and sow no seed! and live in tents, as Jonadab, our father, commanded us: Hoba was our father too. Come to us, and you will find us sixty thousand in number; and you see thus the prophecy has been fulfilled. 'Therefore, thus saith the Lord of Hosts, the God of Israel, Jonadab, the son of Rechab, shall not want a man to stand before me for ever;' " and saying this, Mousa, the Rechabite, mounted his horse, and fled away, and left behind a host of evidence in favor of the sacred writ.—*London Visitor*.

**INTERESTING CIRCUMSTANCE.**—At the late annual meeting of the London Society for the promotion of Christianity among the Jews, the following statement was made by the Rev. Daniel Wilson, or derived from communications received from his father, the Bishop of Calcutta.

In the visit of the Bishop to some of the Syrian Churches in his very extensive diocese, he had come to a place called Quoquin on the coast of Malabar, where he met and was received by settlements of black and white Jews. The black Jews traced their origin to the dispersion, and the white, he said, he supposed were the descendants of Jews and some half-caste tribe. These Jews received him with the greatest respect on his entrance to the town—they lined both sides of the way with lighted torches in their hands. Knowing the object of his journey they requested him to deliver them an address or exhortation, which was a singular request from persons of their creed to a Christian bishop. Finding that there was no difficulty attending the matter he did address them, and went on to prove that Christ the Redeemer, whom they had rejected was the true and promised Messiah. To show this he dwelt upon the prophecy of Daniel as to the seventy weeks; he also quoted to them

the prophecy of Heggai; he also explained to them, that though now dispersed for the rejection of Christ, that the time would come when they would be restored to God's favor, for which he quoted the prophecies of Zechariah. The Jews who listened to him throughout with the most profound attention, thanked him most cordially when he had concluded. They withdrew the veil and showed him their Hebrew Bible. They then prayed for him by name, and that he might be successful in the labor of love which was the object of his journey. This singular and interesting circumstance, taken in connexion with the statements in the report, showed that there was a movement among the Jews themselves, evincing an earnest desire to search the Gospel of Christ.

**MARTIN LUTHER'S WILL.**—Not far from the time that Martin Luther died, he left the following in his last will and testament:—"O Lord God, I thank thee that thou hast so ordered it that I should be a poor man on earth. I never owned a house or one foot of land on earth. Thou hast given me a wife and four children; these I will to thee and to thy care. Take them as thine, be thou a judge to the fatherless and widow. I will my spirit to God who gave it to be kept safe until the resurrection of the just. O take me and do that to me and for me that shall be for thy glory, and thy great name shall have all the praise through Jesus Christ, Amen."

**MORE CATHOLIC PRIESTS.**—We learn from the *N. Y. Daily Adv.*, that in the ship *Francis Depau*, arrived on Wednesday evening, from Havre, came passengers, Bishop Bute of Indiana, and *nineteen* Catholic ecclesiastics, all for the western country.

**THE VICES OF EUROPE FLOODING AMERICA.**—In two days of last month, there arrived in this port from Europe, no less than *two thousand eight hundred and thirty-seven* emigrants, three-fourths of whom are probably Catholics. Those who enquire into the causes of the increasing profligacy of our cities for a few years, will readily see one principal cause to be the unprecedented emigration from countries more licentious than ours. Thus the vices of Europe, as well as its people, are flooding America, and threatening to destroy in our government and country, all that is fair and lovely and of good report. With the increasing profligacy of our citizens and this influx of foreign vices, what must soon become of the state of morals among us, if nothing is done to stay back the tide of pollution that is sweeping over the land? Every man can answer. Who then that cares for the morals and welfare of his country, should feel himself excused from acting in the cause of moral reforms.—[*N. Y. Jour. of Morals.*]

---

#### ART. VI. Notices.

*Answers to Reasons of Protest in the case Mr. Barnes.*

We promised in our last to lay these Answers before our readers. But upon more mature reflection, we have concluded that it would in no way subserve the interests of religion, to pollute our pages with such a tissue of prevarication, deception, and bare-faced dishonesty. Dr. Skinner was the Chairman of the Committee that framed these answers, and it is understood that he was the author of them; but it is a great pity that the General Assembly should have manifested so much

“recklessness and effrontery,” to use the language of the PRESBYTERIAN, as to adopt them. But it is to be expected that those who teach or who favor error, will be *dishonest*. Every man who “handles the word of God deceitfully,” will not in other things show much regard to truth and honesty. One is almost tempted to smile (but it is rather a matter for mourning) at the ingenuity that would attempt to reconcile Barnes’ *errors and conceits* with the word of God and the Confession of Faith! And yet this is attempted in the answers referred to. Let the following extract suffice as a specimen of the whole performance.—“In respect to the fifth charge, Mr. Barnes no where denies, much less sneers at the idea, that Adam was the covenant and federal head of his posterity. On the contrary, though he employs not those terms, he does, in other language, teach the same truths, which are taught by this phraseology.” On this reckless assertion the Presbyterian very justly remarks—“We wonder at this assertion—surely the writers of it could never have read Mr. Barnes’ book; for he there not only expressly denies the propriety of styling Adam a representative or federal head, but he denies the fact of a covenant. He affirms that Adam could not have represented his race, because their consent had not been obtained, and he declares in so many words, “the Bible does not teach that they acted in him or by him; or that he acted for them.” As to his sneering, it is proved by his contemptuous allusion to the language of our confession, when he says, “What idea is conveyed to men of common understanding by the expression ‘they sinned in him?’” If Mr. Barnes’ language does not fully and unequivocally deny the doctrine of the covenant of works, the language of Socinus never brought into question the divinity of our Lord. He not only rejects all the common language on this subject, but he unambiguously denies the doctrine itself.”

---

*Associate Synod's Bible Society.*

Some inconvenience has hitherto arisen from the appointment of persons, residing in different and distant places, to constitute the Executive Committee of our Bible Society. And no doubt the operations of the Synod in this noble cause have been somewhat impeded from this fact: but to remedy this defect, the Synod at its late meeting appointed none on that committee but residents of Philadelphia. And it is with pleasure, we lay before our readers the following communication from the Chairman of said Committee; and we sincerely hope, that this matter will be duly considered by the whole associate church. We trust that the address of the Presbytery of Cambridge, on this subject, which we have been providentially called on to publish in the present number, will be regarded as though addressed to the whole church. Let the question be considered, whether we as a church are doing our *whole duty* in the matter of the distribution of the Holy Scriptures?

“DEAR SIR—

The Executive Committee of the Bible Society, appointed by the Synod, for the present year, have been called together and organized.

They are now ready, and desirous to receive from Presbyteries, Congregations or individuals, communications relative to their duties as a Committee. All additions to the funds of the Society, and all requisitions for Bibles, describing size, quantity, &c. may be directed to the Treasurer, Mr. William S. Young, 173 Race-street Philadelphia.

The Committee would solicit aid and encouragement from the Asso.

ciate Church, that they may be furnished with means and opportunity for usefulness, in procuring and distributing the Holy Scriptures, to those in our communion, or others destitute of and willing to receive them.

Dear Sir—The Committee have to request you to publish in the Monitor the substance of the above, making such alterations, amendments, or additions as you may deem proper, and oblige the Committee.

JOS. R. DICKSON, *Chairman.*

*Philadelphia, July 20th, 1836.*

---

*Obituary.*

Died suddenly, on board of one of the packet boats, shortly after passing Brockport, on her eastward trip, John Law, Esq. of Salem, Washington co. N. Y., on the 15th ult, in the 63rd year of his age.

Death is indeed the common and inevitable lot of all mortals. Even a heathen seemed impressed with the reflection, that "The way of death must once be trod by all;" and "death knocks withequal indifference at the hovels of the poor and the palaces of kings."\*

But to the christian it is a most pleasing and comfortable reflection that "the bounds of his habitation," and all the circumstances of his birth and death were fixed by his heavenly father. "In his hands thy breath is, and his are all thy ways." "The righteous and the wise and their works, are in the hand of God." Whatever his station in life may be, he has an earnest of a great inheritance—a crown of glory. He is enabled to bear up with fortitude under all the trials and sufferings of this present life, when he remembers the promise, "For so an entrance shall be ministered to you abundantly, into the kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ." But though he enter "the land flowing with milk and honey," yet his entrance must be through "the valley of the shadow of death." The king of terrors is the messenger that brings him to God. Yet for all this "he fears no evil, for Thou art with me, Thy rod and Thy staff, they comfort me." He knows that "Precious in the sight of the Lord is the death of his saints." It is a comfort to us that death has always, a particular commission from him. The circumstance of time is fixed by him. "The number of our months is with him." Whether we are to die young or old; whether we are to be seized at home or abroad; to be carried off by accident or disease; whether we shall expire suddenly or slowly; are secrets impenetrable to us, but all is wisely and kindly ordered by his providence.

The subject of the present short notice, was not one whose exit would create any remarkable chasm in the political or literary world.

Though the strength of his intellect would have enabled him to compete with many who have shone in the counsels of the nation—or gained notoriety by their literary labors. But still in the death of Mr. Law, society has lost one of its most valuable members, whose loss will be felt by that part of the community with which he was connected. His mind active, enterprizing, energetic and beneficent, gave impulse to an extensive connection in business. But to his family which was the centre of his affections, though by being sanctified it may prove a blessing, yet as an earthly loss it never can be repaired,—he cannot return to them.

---

\* "Sed omnes una manet nox  
Et calcanda semel via lethi."  
"Pallida mors aequo pulsat pede pauperum tabernas,  
Regumque turres."—HOB.

His moral character stood deservedly high—his unbending integrity, in his strict regard to truth and to his promise, from which no hope of gain could induce him to swerve, was a prominent trait in his character.

With high intellectual powers, improved by extensive reading and close observation, he was yet remarkably unobtrusive and modest. So much so, that we feel a delicacy in speaking highly in his praise as it would offend him were he living. His social qualities were of the most kind and agreeable description. His conversation had for its object the giving or receiving of information or useful entertainment. It was dignified yet easy and engaging. Though independent and unhesitating, he was never obtrusive nor dictatorial. Never aiming at display, his expression was the result of clear and distinct thought. Upon religious subjects he was particularly interesting and instructive. And few who have heard him engaged in prayer, can forget the deep toned piety which pervaded his exercises. His prayers for the prosperity of the church, were peculiarly fervent. He seemed with David to have no greater wish than that God would *send redemption to Israel from all his troubles.*

He was firmly attached to the doctrines of the Reformation, invariably lending them all the weight and influence of his character. Being deeply impressed with the importance of divine truth, and of exhibiting it in his religious profession, he had in early life made a public profession of religion, and from a thorough conviction of the truth of the distinguishing principles of the Associate church, he fully embraced them, and ever after consistently and uniformly maintained them. As Providence had blessed his industry and activity in his temporal affairs, with a bountiful hand, he contributed to the support of the church, the spreading of the gospel, the relieving of the poor and other religious and charitable purposes, with a liberality as generous as it was unostentatious.

The circumstances of his death should admonish us to “be also ready, for in such an hour as ye think not the Son of Man cometh.” He was far away from the bosom of his family. Yet he needed no kind care to soothe his dying hour, for he passed from the vigor of life to the house appointed for all living in a few moments of time. His surviving friends have no reason to sorrow as those who have “no hope.” We trust he was one of those who “learned to die daily.” Let us all seek to have our “life hid with Christ in God,”—*that when the earthly house of this tabernacle is dissolved, we may have an house not made with hands eternal in the heavens.*

These are the reflections of one in no way connected with the deceased, except by the ties of professing the same faith, and of a friendly intercourse of several years standing. To those who had no particular interest in the deceased, this brief notice of one on whom the stillness of the grave now rests, will not be unprofitable, if it shall cause them to reflect that time is precious. Soon the reader and the writer shall appear before the judgment seat of Christ.

July, 1836.

X. Y. Z.

ERRATA.—Inlast No. Art. I. p. 59 beginning a paragraph, for “The act then passed,” read, “There was no real change in the principle involved in this law, made by the act of Assembly in 1690. The act then passed,” &c. P. 63, line 21, for “It is to be,” read “It is be.” P. 70 line 13 from bottom for “justice” read “future.”—P. 71, line 3 for “Ever” read “Even,” and substitute a *comma* in the place of the *period* next following.

THE  
RELIGIOUS MONITOR,

AND

EVANGELICAL REPOSITORY.

---

SEPTEMBER, 1836.

---

**ART. I.—** *Review of an Account of the Secession from the Established Church of Scotland, and of the principles of the Seceders, contained in the first and second numbers of the Biblical Repository, for 1835.*

(Continued from page 115.)

REMARKS ON THE JUDICIAL TESTIMONY.

About 16 or 17 pages of the second article of the Repository are occupied with an analysis of the Judicial Testimony, enacted in 1730 by the first four Seceders. As it would be impossible to do justice to this publication by any abridgment which would not by its length trespass on the patience of the reader; and as in the Repository a judgment of its contents is seldom expressed, we shall only make a few brief remarks.

The editors of the Repository appear carefully to quote from this Testimony every thing said against unlimited toleration. It will be no more than justice to the first Seceders to say, that they were not by any means in the hindmost rank of the advocates of civil and religious liberty. The very expressions, which they use show that they were advocates of toleration, but not of "boundless toleration." The civil and ecclesiastical governments of Britain were so blended together that the enemies of the one must of necessity be the enemies of the other. The civil government had established the Protestant religion in opposition to Popery, and after what the Presbyterians had suffered from Popery, it is not at all strange to find them regarding it as an enemy both to their civil and religious liberties, and that they were exceedingly jealous of any toleration granted by the State which might restore the Papists to power. The opinion of the Seceders on this subject was not peculiar to them, nor are we prepared to say that it was either unchristian or unreasonable. Those who wish well to the liberty of their country, would do well to guard themselves against those whose principles bind them to determined hostility against every free govern-

ment, and bring them under slavish subjection to the most despotic power on earth. If it be reasonable to refuse the fellowship of citizens to those who still retain allegiance to other foreign powers, there can be no good reason to make an exception in favor of the subjects of the Pope. When Britain was brought under the yoke of Oliver Cromwell, it is said in this Testimony, that a most sinful toleration of sectarian errors and delusions was granted by Cromwell. But observe, from the effects attributed to it, what kind of toleration was intended. "This was the first of *this kind* known among us since the Reformation; and thereby such laxness in principle and practice, was introduced as paved a way for the more general apostacy and defection which followed very soon thereafter. The aforesaid toleration was faithfully witnessed against by some ministers in the provinces of Perth and Fife, in their Testimony, published anno 1659, as contrary to the word of God, our Confession of Faith, and Larger Catechism; and as contrary to, and inconsistent with the solemn oath and covenant of God, sworn by the nation; and likewise, as producing many dismal and sinful effects, such as the increase and growth of errors and blasphemy, with laxness and profaneness in practice; and also as a temptation to men to break the Lord's bonds asunder, and to cast his cords from them." (*Testimony of 1737, p. 27.*) What is referred to will be evident from the history of Cromwell's proceedings. When he invaded Scotland he prohibited the meeting of the General Assemblies, limited the power of the Church in discipline, encouraged those who were enemies to the Presbyterian form of government, and forbade the taking of oaths or covenants without the direction of the court. He was followed by an army most of whom were Independents and Anabaptists. These, as bishop Burnet says, were all gifted, and preached as they were moved. He mentions that once, when he was present, they came into a public assembly of the Church, and reproached the preachers for laying things to their charge which were false. The debate grew fierce, and they at last drew their swords. This was the kind of toleration with which the Presbyterians of that day were exceedingly dissatisfied, and which the Seceders notice with disapprobation in their Testimony.

At the accession of James II. the toleration granted was still more exceptionable. It proceeded from the supreme authority of the king in ecclesiastical matters, it tended to establish the Popish on the ruin of the Protestant religion; and laid a foundation for persecuting the Presbyterians by the condition on which they were to be allowed their liberty, which was that "they were not to teach what might any wise tend to alienate the heart of the people from the king or his government." When it is considered that the king was a Papist, it is easy to see that this condition implied that nothing was to be said against Popery. Others besides the Seceders have thought the thanks given on this occasion to King James by the ministers of Edinburgh, were both unseasonable and sinful.

The situation of things in our own country may render it proper to notice another censure, which the Seceders passed in this Testimony upon the General Assembly of 1690, the first which met after the Revolution, as the accession of the Prince of Orange to the throne has been usually called. The index of the unprinted acts of the Assembly, 1690, says this Testimony, bears a public declaration by the Moderator, "That the Assembly would depose no incumbents simply for their judgment concerning the government of the church." That is, they

declare that the perfidious prelates (meaning those who had abjured Presbyterianism for prelacy,) and their underlings were not to be deposed for their treacherous defection from the covenanted principles of this church. And in consistency with this declaration the Assembly 1694, enjoin their Commission (as several Assemblies afterwards did,) "To receive into ministerial communion such of the late conform ministers, as, having qualified themselves according to law, shall subscribe the formula." (*Testimony* p. 53.) It seems evident that this reception of those who were prelatists in principle, and Presbyterians from convenience or interest, laid the foundation for that corruption and tyranny which issued in the Secession. That a corresponding liberality in admitting among Presbyterians in the United States those who are Independents in principle and Presbyterians only in name, has introduced corruption and contempt for church authority is generally known and confessed. Whether these things will increase till they work a similar issue is yet to be seen.

The editors of the *Repertory* give a large extract from this *Testimony* respecting the errors of Professor Simpson, and the proceedings of the Assembly in his case. They also testify their approbation of the views of the Seceders respecting the sinful lenity of the Assembly towards him. Why have they not also given us their opinion about the proceedings in the case of Professor Campbell, whose errors are scarcely less opposite to the true gospel than Mr. Simpson's? The only judgment they give us is in substance, that this is the most tedious part of this tedious *Testimony*. In the enumeration of his errors, they have omitted one of the most important, as it appears to be completely subversive of the true doctrine of justification. The fourth error with which he was charged was, "That we are to settle it as our main purpose to recommend ourselves to the love, esteem and commendation of God, and of all mankind, by our moral virtue." And in the account of the *Testimony* given by the Seceders against the proceedings in his case, after stating that they censured the Assembly for overlooking, or too slightly censuring some of his errors, it should have been added, and for adopting others. Mr. Campbell gave explanations of his doctrine, which was not a novel thing with heretics even in that day, and the Assembly agreed to some of his explanations, in which he advanced the same errors before taught, only in a more covert manner. It may be some apology for the particular notice taken of his errors, that it was at the time when the brethren were preparing their *Testimony*, that his case had been before the church courts; he was also occupying a conspicuous station as a Theological Professor; his errors were of the most important kind, overthrowing at the same time the foundations both of doctrinal and practical religion; and from this case the general state of the Church might be ascertained, so that the Seceders appear to have regarded a pointed *Testimony* against his errors as peculiarly seasonable and important. It is not uncommon that some one through superior talent or fortuitous circumstances, is placed at the head of systems of error. But it is unjust to regard all the opposition made to the system of error under the name of such a prominent individual as opposition to that man. If Arius, Pelagius, Socinus, and others, had been quite alone in their belief, it is probable that we should never have heard of their names. It is evident from the accounts given us of the preachers in the time of Mr. Campbell that his system of doctrine was as to the leading features of it, exceedingly fashionable. The description



of the moderates, given in Dr. Witherspoon's characteristics, agrees with the account of the same persons contained in this Testimony, and from both it is evident that there was a Campbellism in that day as well as in this, and that it was the prevailing and fashionable religion. So that there is no reason to suppose that the whole force of the Judicial Testimony on this subject was directed against this one man.

The Repertory thinks the Seceders, had no reason to find fault with the Assembly for refusing to enter on a trial of Professor Simpson, and directing Mr. Webster, who had brought up his case on *public fame*, to bring charges against him before the Presbytery to which he belonged. This course, they say, was evidently proper. If so, it seems as if the worst heretic ought to pass unnoticed, until some one will consent to become his prosecutor. What if Mr. Webster had declined a task usually regarded as odious? Then, Mr. Simpson might have gone on to propagate his errors with impunity. It is a homely but a sound maxim, that "what is every body's business is nobody's business." When there is a report of error taught in the church, the whole church is concerned in taking notice of it, and employing measures to purge out this leaven, whether any one will become a prosecutor or not.

The testimony of the Seceders, it is noticed, complains of the repeal of the penal statutes against witches. What things were reckoned as among the crimes of witches and charmers, may be ascertained from the chapter on this subject in Stewart's collections—He notices as among the things relevant to infer the crime of witchcraft—Paction to serve the devil; the use of magic arts or charms, though for good ends, as for the curing of diseases in men or cattle. Consulting with such persons is declared to be censurable, also professing necromancy, and getting responses by the sieve, the shear, and the book, and all such cheats and species of sorcery. Under the same chapter, fortune-tellers are described and declared punishable arbitrarily, not capitally. Mr. Gib, says, in a note on this part of the testimony, that "The Associate Presbytery is not to be considered as having ever interested themselves in the affair of these *penal statutes*.—What they saw cause to testify against, as among the public sins of the nation, is,—an *absolute repeating* of these statutes; That there shall be no prosecution against any person for witchcraft, sorcery, enchantment or conjuration."

#### THE DECLINATURE.

The Judicial Testimony as has been stated, was published in 1737. The next Assembly which met, May, 1738, passed a long act respecting the Seceders. The Repertory says, "They chose still to treat them in the spirit of meekness, brotherly love and forbearance." How much foundation there is for this assertion of the editors, may be learned from their own account of the act, from which it appears that the Assembly declared the Seceders guilty of "schismatic conduct," by which they "had laid themselves liable to be again cut off from the church." "Synods and Presbyteries were required to make reports of their proceedings to the next Commission; and this court was authorized and empowered, if they should judge it expedient, to cite the separating brethren before the next General Assembly, to answer for their irregular conduct; and it was enjoined on all to exert themselves to prevent the increase of the schism, which threatened to disturb the peace of the church, and which was so contrary to the spirit of the gospel;

and to endeavor to reclaim the poor deluded people who had been seduced to take part in this division." The "meekness, brotherly love and forbearance" of such measures, are sufficiently evident without any comment.

It has been questioned by some, whether there is any proper call to exercise discipline towards those who voluntarily decline the communion of the church, or the authority of her judicatories, and who may on this account be regarded as excommunicated by their own act. But whatever may be thought of the proper course towards such, there is not much reason to suppose that the General Assembly were moved to take the measures, adopted against the Seceders by a conscience of duty and a spirit of faithfulness to Christ. Their proceedings do not look like measures originating in a concern for the truth, and the best interests of the Lord's cause, but rather like measures of resentment against those who had honestly exposed their defections. The contrast between the papers published by the different parties is striking, and no person of a spiritual mind can fail to observe it. The acts of the Assembly are in the "high tone of church authority" as even the enemies of the Seceders are obliged to own. They never show a disposition to confess any guilt, or examine into the defections alledged against them. They never attempted to answer the reasonings of the Seceders, or use any measures to satisfy their minds except arbitrary acts. Where they had made the most manifest and greivous defections, they ever show the greatest bitterness against the testimony by which these were exposed. On the other hand the Seceders write as men not particularly concerned in their own cause, but in the cause of the Lord. They neither use railing or bitter language, but after all that is said to the contrary, considering the provocations which they had received, the spirit of meekness appearing in their papers is remarkable, and worthy of high commendation. When they have occasion to speak of the defections of the church, they do it plainly, yet neither with bitterness nor pride, but with sorrow and humiliation. If it were not for the length and number of these papers and the frequent though necessary repetitions of the same things, there could be no better defence of the secession than to publish all the papers of the Assembly, and of the Seceders, side by side, and let them speak for themselves. No child of God could be long at a loss to find with which party, was most of the spirit of Christ. He would soon discover on the one side a spirit not very remote from that of the men who had in former ages shed the blood of the saints, and on the other, a spirit but little inferior to that which appeared in the fathers of the Erskines and others of the Seceders who had suffered during th late fiery persecutions.

Agreeably to the act of Assembly, the Commission at their meeting in November of the same year, gathered out of the reports, of Synods and Presbyteries, materials for a libel against the Seceders, and appointed a committee of their number to put the same in order and form, against their next meeting in March, at which time the draught of the said libel was approved, and appointed to be put into their hands, with a citation to appear before the Assembly, May, 1739. This proceeding was regarded by these brethren as a call in Providence, in addition to former calls of the same nature, to declare their mind more particularly in relation to the Judicatories of the established Church. This they did in a Declinature, adopted May 16th, 1739, and read the next day to the Assembly, as their answer to the above mentioned libel.

This paper is entitled, "Act of the Associate Presbytery, finding and declaring, that the present Judicatories of this national Church are not lawful, and rightly constituted courts of Christ, and declining all authority, power and jurisdiction that the said Judicatories may claim to themselves over the said Presbytery, or any of the members thereof, or over any that are under their inspection; and particularly declining the authority of a General Assembly now met at Edinburgh, the 10th day of May, 1739."

In this act, after stating that church courts lawfully constituted, are the ordinances of Christ, appointed for gracious ends, they proceed to show that the Judicatories of the established Church of Scotland, were so perverted from these ends, that it was warrantable to decline their authority. "It is with regret," say they, "that this Presbytery find themselves obliged in duty to take this step. It would be matter of great satisfaction to them, that they had not these grounds and reasons, which are of such weight and importanee with them, as to oblige them to testify and declare in the above manner." To this measure they regard themselves as obliged in consequence of the libel put into their hands. "And they humbly and earnestly intreat all ministers, elders and others who desire to be found faithful unto the Lord in this day of perplexity and treading down, seriously to consider the following grounds and reasons of their present act, declaration, and declinature, and to weigh them, without any partial bias, in the balances of the sanctuary."

1. Their first reason for declaring the judicatories not lawful and rightly constituted courts of Christ, was their receiving into their number and supporting intruders. As the subjects of a king were warranted to refuse the jurisdiction of those who had not the king's authority, so they judged themselves warranted to decline the jurisdiction of a court partly composed of intruders who could have no authority from Christ as judges in his house, and partly of those who supported these men, and associated with them in judgment. The judicatories were also constituted of many members guilty of scandalous practices, shepherds who scattered the sheep of the Lord's pasture, who ruled them with force and cruelty, lived disorderly, and yet were not censured.

2. Their second reason for the above act, was the toleration of the erroneous, and the enaction of laws contrary to the laws of the King of Zion, by which ministerial freedom was restrained, and the heritage of God oppressed and broken. In addition to the cases of Messrs. Simpson and Campbell, formerly noticed, they mention the recent case of Dr. Wishart, accused of errors, and acquitted without any particular examination of his doctrines, simply on the ground of his professing an adherence to the confession of Faith.

3. A third reason is partly taken from some recent proceedings in the case of Captain Porteus. This man who is acknowledged to have been of a profligate character, in attending upon a public execution at Edinburgh, having received some provocation, fired, and caused his men to fire upon the promiscuous multitude, by which means a considerable number of persons were killed, and several others wounded. He was in consequence of this convicted of murder and condemned to death, but being a favorite with some men of influence, he obtained a reprieve. Such, however, was the general indignation against him, that one of the most orderly mobs which perhaps ever assembled together, collected on the evening of the 7th of Sept., 1736, and having broken open the prison, carried him out and executed him in the Grass-Market. At the next

meeting of Parliament an act was passed by which all persons charged with being accessory to the murder of Captain Porteus, were commanded on pain of death, to surrender themselves for trial within a limited time; all persons concealing or succoring them after that time, were adjudged to incur the pains of death; and persons were encouraged to become witnesses against their accomplices by the promise of pardon, and of a great reward, yet all the authority and promises of the government availed nothing. No discovery was made of a single individual engaged in this mysterious transaction. It was required that the act above referred to, should be read in the time of public worship, on the first Sabbath of every month for a year, by every minister of the Church of Scotland. This appears to have been intended as a measure of revenge, against the stricter ministers by whom, it is probable, the king and parliament suspected the mob to have been instigated. And it was farther enacted, that if "any minister shall neglect to read this act, as is hereby directed, he shall for the first offence be declared incapable of sitting or voting in any church judicatory; and for the second offence, be declared incapable of taking, holding, or enjoying any ecclesiastical benefice in Scotland." It was also ordained that these *ecclesiastical penalties*, should be executed by the court of Session, or any court of Justiciary, upon a summary complaint, at the instance of his Majesty's Advocate. Most of the ministers of the Established Church read the above act in whole, or in part, though various measures were employed to elude the indignation of the people against them for doing it.

In the Declinature, this is noticed as a subjection of the church to the civil powers in spiritual matters. The reading of the act being purely of a civil nature, was no part of the worship of God, and, therefore, a manifest violation of the Sabbath, and a prostitution of the ministry to secular purposes. It's being enjoined by the civil powers, and yet submitted to by the ministers, exposed them to the contempt of the people; and one of the penalties being suspension from the ministry, submission to it, was a consent to the power of the magistrate over the church in things purely spiritual. Yet the Assembly neither censured those who had submitted to this act, nor did any thing to assert her right in opposition to these encroachments of the civil power. This, together with various things of the same character, were considered by the Seceders as sufficient ground for charging the judicatories with having allowed themselves to become "subordinate to the civil powers in their ecclesiastical meetings, functions, and administrations, and, therefore," say they, "this Presbytery cannot own them as free and lawful courts of Christ." This affair of Captain Porteus, says the Repertory, "was made a handle of by the Seceders in their act and testimony." It is a little strange, not that they found this in the act and testimony, where it never happened to have a place, but that they should have ventured to reprobate the course of the Seceders in reference to this act. They had surely forgotten where they were, and what was the genius of this government, else they would hardly have expected success in this attempt to cast odium upon the Seceders. What free citizen of the United States is prepared to condemn these men, for standing up in defence of the rights of the church, against the slavish submission of the ministers of the establishment? Or who can respect those ministers who showed themselves willing to do what their consciencies could not approve, for fear of incurring the displeasure of the government, and losing their votes and their benefices? If in the United States such an

act were passed by the civil authorities, requiring every minister in the country, on the pain of losing his office and worldly support, to read a paper, the reading of which, all serious people would regard as a profanation of the Sabbath, a prostitution of the ministry, and a consent to the magistrate's power in religious things over the church, we hope the Editors of the Repertory, as well as the Seceders, would make a handle of it; and that they would handle any who would tamely submit to such tyranny, in a way not much to their credit.

The Seceders having stated the above reasons for declining the judicatories of the church, go on to say, "It is matter of grief and concern to them, that matters are come to this pass between the said judicatories and them. Their consciences bear them witness that they desire unity and harmony in the Church; but the unity which they ought to desire, is the unity of the Spirit, even unity in the Lord; it is such a unity as may make for the glory of God, for the honor of truth, and for the real edification of the body of Christ. And therefore, they do with all sincerity, beseech the present judicatories of the church, to return to the Lord, from whom we have, every one of us, deeply revolted, and to acknowledge and mourn over the sins of our fathers, and the defections of the judicatories, ministers and people of the present age and generation; and to use proper means for the conviction and humiliation of such as have been intruded into the ministry, or who have been active in carrying on the course of defection: As also they intreat them to display the banner of a judicial testimony, in asserting the crown-rights of the Redeemer, and condemning the encroachments which have been made upon His crown and kingdom of late, and in former times; and to assert judicially, the truths of God, that have been of late assaulted and opposed; and to condemn expressly, the errors which have been vented, to the subverting and corrupting of the truths of God, and to the poisoning of the youth who are trained up for the holy ministry. If these and the like duties were sincerely attempted, then might this Presbytery hope for a beautiful unity and a desirable harmony with the present judicatories. But they are afraid that these their sincere and hearty desires shall be despised and contemned by the said judicatories: and therefore, they judge it their duty, with all humility, tenderness and earnestness, in the bowels of our Lord Jesus Christ, to intreat and beseech their reverend, worthy and dear Brethren, both ministers and elders, who regard the covenanted testimony of the Church of Scotland, and who desire to be found faithful to the Lord, that for the love they bear to the honor and glory of the Redeemer, and his despised truths, and for the sake of the weary, broken and scattered heritage of God through the land, as also, that they may be in a capacity to transmit a faithful testimony to succeeding generations, to come out from the present judicatories, and from all ministerial communion with them, as they would not be partakers in their sins, in regard they are constituted, as said is, of such corrupt and scandalous members, and are in their judicial capacity, carrying on a course of defection and backsliding. And for the other reasons and grounds above mentioned, they also do, in the same manner, intreat and beseech their said worthy and dear brethren, that they would make use of the keys of government and discipline, committed unto them by the Head of the church, for the end and purposes for which they are given them; that they would put to their hand to lift up the standard of a judicial testimony for the borne-down truths

of God, and for purging and planting the house of God in Scotland, according to the word of God, and our Reformation-principles agreeable thereto, and after the example of our worthy progenitors in the year 1638; believing that the set time for favoring Zion, even the time that the Lord hath set, will come. As for this Presbytery, whatever the conduct of the judicatories towards them may be, and however they may be borne down, reproached and despised, they are persuaded that the cause is the Lord's; and, however weak and unworthy they are whom He hath singled out in his adorable Providence, to put hand to a testimony for him, and whatever He may see meet to do with them, they desire to rest in faith and hope, that the Lord will build up his Jerusalem in Scotland, and gather his dispersed Israel into one." [*Acts and proceedings of the Associate Presbytery, pp. 23-25.*]

On the next day after passing this act, the Presbytery met and continued in their constituted capacity, till they were informed that the Assembly were calling their names by their officer. After a brother had engaged in prayer for the Lord's presence and countenance in this weighty affair, they went as a Presbytery into the Assembly-house, when the moderator of the Assembly told them, that though they were called to answer to a libel, yet he was warranted in the name of this Assembly to acquaint them, that, notwithstanding of all that was past, the Assembly were willing to receive them with open arms, if they would return into the bosom of the church. Mr. Thomas Mair made answer, as moderator of the Presbytery, stating that they had appeared before the Assembly in their Presbyterial capacity, and offered to read the above mentioned act of declinature. But the Assembly first ordered their libel to be read, after which "Mair," as the Repertory says, "was permitted to read the Presbytery's 'Act and Declinature,' and then delivered it into the hands of the moderator of the Assembly."

**THE LIBEL FORMED AGAINST THE SECEDERS; THEIR REMARKS UPON THIS LIBEL, AND UPON THE SENTENCE OF THE ASSEMBLY AGAINST THEM.**

This libel is framed against Messrs. Ebenezer Erskine, William Wilson, Alex'r Moncrieff, James Fisher, Ralph Erskine, Thomas Mair, Thomas Nairn, and James Thompson, the two last of whom had lately acceded to the Associate Presbytery. The Repertory says, it is "written with peculiar force and solemnity." The amount of it is, that these brethren had seceded, had published a testimony, and proceeded to judicial acts by licensing young men to preach, and exercising discipline.

The remarks which the Presbytery made upon this document appear to us to be much more forcible and solemn than the libel itself. However, this may be owing to the same kind of taste which keeps us from relishing the energy and sublimity of the seraphic Watts, in the judgment of some so far superior to the sweet psalmist of Israel. Something of the character of the libel and the merits of the cause at issue will appear from a brief sketch of these remarks of the Presbytery.

The libel, in the preamble, virtually charges these ministers with not acting agreeably to their ordination vows, in which they had promised submission to the government of the church, and engaged to follow no divisive course. The brethren answer, that not they, but the judicatories were violating these ordination engagements, by pursuing mea-

tures contrary to that Presbyterian form of government which they were all equally bound to maintain. They inquire why the libellers make no mention of the Confession of Faith, by which the Seceders always wished to be tried, and the doctrine of which the judicatories refused to assert and maintain, in opposition to prevailing errors. The preamble charges them with offences contrary to those texts of scripture requiring love and charity, peace and unity; but as the brethren say in their answer, neither a particular text nor a particular offence is specified, and they omit *the truth* which the scriptures require with love, peace and unity, as the foundation of them. And the principal ground for making this charge, was their having witnessed against defections, which they regarded themselves as obliged to do by the law of love; Lev. xix. 17.

After this general charge, a number of particular offences are mentioned in the libel, and first of all, "That the said ministers had seceded from this church without any justifiable grounds," &c. In answer to this it is said, that the secession was not from the communion of the church, but from the judicatories, and that this had been made necessary by the judicatories themselves. The reasons of this step they had stated to the world, but no attempt had been made to answer these reasons, and satisfy their minds that they had no just grounds of secession. Mere assertion, and church authority were the only measures employed to convince them of an error.

The second article of libel was, "That the seceding ministers had assumed a power of associating and erecting themselves into a Presbytery," &c. They answer, that they had a warrant from the word of God to do so, and they had given their reasons for this in the preface to their Testimony, to which they refer.

The third article of libel is their framing and publishing a testimony, in which they cast many groundless and calumnious reflections upon the church. In answer to this, they observe, that the Assembly has passed a general condemnation upon this testimony without specifying a single particular in which it has departed from the word of God, or the laudable acts and constitutions of the church; a thing which they are persuaded the Assembly could not do. They also notice this, as a sad evidence of a spirit of defection, when those who were reprov'd pronounced themselves innocent, and prosecuted such as dealt plainly and faithfully with them. Jer. ii. 35. xviii. 18.

The fourth article of the libel, consists of charges of dispensing ordinances to persons of other congregations, ordaining elders in some of these congregations, appointing and keeping fasts in different corners of the country, by which means their proper ministerial work in their own parishes was neglected. To this the brethren answer, in substance, that they regarded themselves as obliged to attend to such parts of the oppressed heritage of God as had acceded to them. The insinuation, that in so doing, they neglected their particular flocks, they assert to be a "barefaced calumny." They were willing to have their diligence in their own parishes compared with that of their present accusers.

The fifth article of libel is, their "actually licensing one or more to preach the gospel." They reply by owning that they had, as charged, licensed Mr. John Hunter, and that they judged it their duty, not only to license, but to ordain, "whenever Providence should open a door for it, particularly among the scattered, and broken heritage of God, who

are groaning under the weight of intruded hirelings, and can find no help and relief from the present judicatories." The relief of such was one main end of their Presbyterial Association.

The sixth article of libel, coincides with the first, accusing them of secession, only the secession of the first four ministers, is dated from June, 1734, instead of November, 1733, when the Commission thrust them out from communion. To this singular inconsistency, the Assembly were driven by their own inconsistent, vacillating course. They could not charge the Seceders with what was in reality the act of the Commission which cast them out of the church, nor could they bring up again, what by their own act, had been buried in oblivion when the sentence against the four brethren was repealed, and therefore, in order to revive a prosecution which could not be legally done, they change the date of the offence, and charge these men with seceding from the church, at a time when they had no connexion with it. If the error of the date be corrected, then the case will be simply thus. These four men were first punished, and when it was found that this would not subdue their spirit of religious independence, they were pardoned, and when this show of clemency did not subdue them, they are devoted to punishment a second time. And the great ground of offence was, that they had consented to the punishment inflicted; when they were cast out of the church, they went out, and because they went out, they must be taken up and cast out again. Such is the true character of this *libel*, written with such "peculiar force and solemnity."

Several other articles follow, which relate to the exercise of discipline, such as absolving some, and excommunicating others. And the whole is concluded, with a particular charge against Mr. Ebenezer Erskine, on account of a warning or protestation, read by him from the pulpit of Stirling, against five elders who had, with the concurrence of the magistrates, usurped the place of twelve others in collecting for the poor. In their remarks, the Seceders answer all these charges particularly, and give a full narration of the case of these five elders, with a copy of Mr. Erskine's protestation, and a defence of it. [*Acts and proceedings of the Associate Presbytery, pp. 44-52.*]

The Declinature of the Seceders was read in the Assembly, May 17th. On the 19th, the Assembly past an act, declaring the above-mentioned libel relevant to infer deposition, and proven in its most material articles by the declinature, by which paper they say, they find that "the said defenders have had the unparalleled boldness to appear before the highest judicatory of this church, to which they had vowed obedience, and instead of answering for themselves as pannels or defenders at the bar, pretended to appear as a separate, independent, and constituted judicatory, and to read or pronounce an act of their condemning the church, and the judicatories thereof upon several groundless pretences, and to decline the authority of the same; and that they have farther, in presence of the Assembly, by the said paper, taken upon them to speak in most injurious, disrespectful and insolent terms, concerning the highest civil authority: Therefore the General Assembly do find and declare, that the said defenders for the offences so found relevant and proven, do justly merit the highest censures of this church, and particularly that of deposition, &c."

The Assembly, however, agreed to delay their final sentence, for a year, urging it however, in the strongest terms, upon the next Assem-



bly to inflict the censure of deposition, if the defenders persisted in their "unwarrantable separation"

In their remarks upon this sentence, the Seceders take notice of the heavy charges brought against them of "unwarrantable and schismatical practices," and of doing what "in them lies to ruin and destroy the interest of religion in this church." They complain that they are condemned in a general and summary way, on the ground of their declinature, while not one article of it is found to be contrary to the word of God, or the standards of the church. They complain that the steps of defection pointed out in the declinature, are declared to be nothing but "groundless pretences." They also complain, that in the spirit of the persecutors of the church, an attempt is made to excite the civil authorities against them, by representing them as speaking "in the most injurious, insolent and disrespectful terms of the highest civil authority." The only foundation for this charge, was their testimony against the power exercised over the church by the civil authorities in the case of captain Porteus. And by this act, the Assembly approves of such exercise of civil authority in the affairs of the church, so as to pronounce a testimony against it, injurious, disrespectful, insolent, and a crime meriting deposition. They conclude, upon the whole, that the judicatories manifest no disposition to remove the grounds of their secession, and that the Associate Presbytery, have good ground and reason to judge it more and more warrantable and necessary for them to continue to testify in the way of Secession. [*Acts and proceedings*, pp. 52-60.]

In 1740, the General Assembly, agreeably to the act of the preceding year, passed the sentence of deposition on the eight ministers mentioned in the libel, and declared their churches vacant. Thus the bonds between them and the Establishment were at last completely sundered, and no farther attempts were made on either side to effect a re-union.

#### THE EFFECTS OF THE SECESSION.

It is difficult to calculate with any precision, what effects would have been produced, on the supposition of a different state of things from that which has actually taken place; yet it is at least very reasonable to suppose, that the yielding of the Seceders to the tyrannical authority of the church, would have been a death blow to religious freedom in Scotland. If the bravest sons of the church had bowed beneath the yoke, it would have discouraged others from resisting, and it would have encouraged their oppressors to proceed farther, and make the yoke heavier. The cause of civil liberty is also in all cases, and especially where civil and religious things are so much blended as in Britain, intimately connected with the freedom of the church. And it will not be any more extravagant, to suppose the cause of civil liberty indebted to the resistance of the high handed measures of the church by the Seceders, than to suppose it indebted to a similar resistance by the first Reformers. The previous history of Britain, as well as the history of other nations, shows that if ever a slight usurpation of power be permitted at the first, it often encourages men to go to the utmost in tyranny and persecution. If it be wise to pray that we may not enter into temptation, it is equally wise to defend ourselves from the beginnings of civil and ecclesiastical bondage.

There can be no doubt that the Secession from the Established

Church proved a very seasonable check to the abuse of church authority, and to measures which evidently tended to bring the people once more, either under the bondage of prelacy, or a presbyterian bondage, equally intolerable. And wherever the church aims at the exercise of a lordly dominion over men, she always resorts to the same means; she unites with the civil power, and subjects herself to its authority, that she may be able to rule. This we see the Established Church of Scotland doing at this very time; while she was enslaving her members to her own power, she was also enslaving herself to the King and Parliament. The Secession, however, though small in its beginnings, changed materially the state of things. There was now a refuge for the oppressed, and it became evident, that extreme measures would drive the people so generally into the Secession, that the Establishment would be endangered. Now it was, that the men who could be moved by no argument, and restrained by no shame, were affected by fear, and began to sooth and court the people, whom before they had treated with contempt, and trampled under their feet. Now, they began to speak of peace and unity and charity, and to pity "the poor deluded people." Sir H. Moncrieff testifies by numerous facts, to the good effect of the Secession, in bringing the Assembly to more moderation and care in their measures, and to pay more deference to public opinion, while at the same time, he admits that this was in the spirit of accommodation to the times, and not from any change of system or principle. He says of the Assembly of 1736, "They discover more solicitude to deal tenderly with the people, and not to irritate their humours by unnecessary exertions of authority." He says again, speaking of the subsequent Assemblies, that they "evidently showed an inclination to conciliate the people," in respect to settlements; in some instances in direct terms, setting aside the presentees, to whom the opposition was most violent. He mentions the case of Mr. Mercer, in which the decision is said to be very unlike the proceedings of Assemblies since 1730. This Mr. Mercer, was the person who first moved a censure on Mr. Erskine's sermon, on which account, says Sir H. M., "he was in the highest degree, obnoxious to every order of people." [*Appendix, pp. 449-450.*] If we were only to look at these isolated cases, we might be tempted to think that there was quite a revolution in the church. It is, however, evident, that these decisions in favor of the people, were constrained by the fear of losing them, and where there were no fears that the "poor deluded people" might be seduced to take part with the Seceders, the church courts pursued the same measures as before.

The Repertory, after Sir H. Moncrieff, attributes the rapid increase of the Seceders to their popularity, their perpetual appeals to the people, and especially to their seizing upon every subject of popular discontent on account of the decisions of the Assembly, and finding a sphere of activity wherever there was an unsuccessful resistance to the induction of an obnoxious presentee. If the Seceders received into their communion, those who acceded to their profession, and granted to them the dispensation of gospel ordinances, they are not alone in so doing. Would other societies refuse people under such circumstances, lest they should be accused of finding "a new sphere of activity," "and the prospect of a new congregation to be added to their sect." They had testified against the defections of the church, while they were in it, at the hazzard of being cast out and deposed, and when

they had suffered themselves to be cast out, rather than be restrained from what they believed to be their duty, were they to be condemned because they did not give up that liberty for which all this had been endured? May Sir H. M. and the Repertory find fault with the Seceders, and yet must the Seceders be condemned, if they point out what they believe to be the failings or defections of others? But it is said, as if to set forth the unfair measures used by them to increase their party, that "they did not confine themselves to their original grounds of complaint against the Establishment, arising out of the act of 1732." What if they did not? If we find more sin in ourselves or others than we once saw, must we, notwithstanding, confine ourselves to our original confessions and complaints? It is evident, that as the attention of the Seceders was more particularly drawn to the history and principles of the church, their views of her defections were enlarged; but they had never confined themselves to the act of 1732, as their only ground of complaint. Mr. Erskine did not do this in his sermon, but expressly spoke, and was charged with speaking, against other unrighteous acts of the judicatories, and against many corruptions prevailing in the church. The act of Secession, also enumerates some things particularly, and mentions "many other weighty reasons" of secession, in general terms. After all that is said to the disparagement of the zeal and faithfulness of these men, we are persuaded that their success was owing to the divine power attending their ministry, and not to the low arts of which they are so frequently accused. Sir H. Moncrieff, himself, is much more candid in some parts of his book, than in those selected by the Repertory. He attributes the increase of the Secession more to the oppressive measures of the Assembly, than to the zeal, the labors, or the low cunning of the Seceders. In giving an account of the measures pursued by the Assembly, in respect to intruders, he states, that when ministers who were not acceptable to the people were presented, the congregations usually continued for a time to oppose them, and carried the matter from Presbyteries to Synods, and from Synods to General Assemblies. But, though artful measures were employed to soothe the people, yet the affair was always so managed that the settlement was effected. The compromise was always in favor of church authority. The consequence was, that the people desisted from any attempts to get redress from church courts, and whenever a minister was intruded upon them against their will, they went to work quietly to build a Seceding meeting-house. The increase of the Secession was not, therefore, according to this author, owing to low arts used by the Seceders to allure men into their communion, but to the oppressive acts of the Establishment. The people were driven out of the national church, and obliged to seek the bread of life elsewhere, unless they were content to sit down under the ministry of men whose entrance by force afforded much more evidence of their being wolves and hirelings, than true and faithful shepherds. All societies consider themselves at liberty to teach and propagate what they believe to be truth, and to receive into their communion such as agree with them in their principles. The Presbyterian "Sect" in the United States, the Established Sect of Scotland, and all others, regard themselves at liberty in these things, as much as the "Sect" of the Seceders. And if we must be a *Sect* because we happen not to be so numerous as some others, there would be the more excuse for diligence to increase in number, that we might rise above the reach of that ill name. Yet if Sec-

tarianism consist in zeal and efforts to increase numbers more than to promote principles, the Secession church has not, hitherto, rendered herself remarkable for such a spirit. She has not shown a disposition to gather in from all sources, people of all kinds, that she might strengthen her party, but has been generally reproached for regarding principle too much, and refusing on all hands, such as agree not to her profession. Had she respected party more, and principle less, she might have occupied a higher place in the esteem of those who measure the worth of churches by number, much in the same way that the world measures the worth of men, by money.

Another measure which the Seceders are represented as having employed to increase their number is stated in these words, "They at the same time devised expedients and restrictions, by which for many years, they excluded their adherents from all communication with the established churches; and in this way from all opportunities of information, beyond what they received from themselves, or by their direction."—Where, however, is the proof of such restrictions, or the probability that the people having left the established church, because of alleged tyranny, would have quietly yielded to a bondage like that which the Pope imposes on his subjects. What were these restrictions devised to exclude all communication with the established churches? Did they prohibit their people from all social intercourse with members of the Establishment? Did they forbid the reading of their books? Did they prevent all correspondence? We have a high opinion of these men, but we cannot be convinced without some proof that they had so much art and power, as to cut off so entirely all communications between their people, and the members of the national church. It is true the Seceders were then, and are still, opposed to what is called occasional or promiscuous communion, but this is a very different thing from excluding people from *all communication* with those with whom they do not commune. It is an undeniable fact, that the Seceders generally, if we may say so much in their defence, have much more liberality in communications with others, than many others with them. Though they feel no freedom in having communion with others in ordinances of worship, where they believe that there are corruptions in which they would offend God by partaking, yet they shut not themselves out from those means of communication of which they can avail themselves without sin. There are many of the members of this church, who occupy a portion of their time in reading. Go into their houses and examine their books; and though you will not find them willing to join in the bowing, the genuflexions, and other ceremonies of episcopacy, you will find them reading and prizing the works of Messrs. Hervy and Scott, and other evangelical Episcopalians. Though they object to the system of Independent government, yet they will read Drs. Owen and Edwards, and prize such men as highly as any of their adversaries. And though they cannot relish the strains of Dr. Watts, and other imitators and hymn-makers, and feel no freedom to join in a communion polluted by doctrines and measures, subversive of the gospel, and where the invitation given to them, would be given with the same freedom to Papists, Socinians, and every thing coming under the Christian name, yet they will read the works of Dr. Watts and his defenders; they read the writings of such men as Drs. Miller and Alexander; they read the Standard, the Christian Herald, the Presbyterian and the Repository. How much this liberality is reciprocated the articles reviewed may testify.

It is believed that few respectable members of the Secession would publish to the world accounts of the General Assembly, containing as great mistakes about their principles, as these articles emanating from such a respectable source, contain respecting the Seceders, and to what cause can this be attributed, but an unwillingness to examine their writings. It will be vain to say that there are no writers among them worth reading. Not to say any thing of the Messrs. Erskines, Brown, Gib, and other fathers of the Secession, the religious and literary history of this age will place the names of Drs. Anderson, M'Crie, Jamieson, Professor Paxton, Mr. Stevenson, and others on the list of the most eminent of authors. And surely if the editors of the *Repertory* had read the writings of these men, they would have perceived that they never could have remained in connexion with a society, holding the narrow principles and acting from the unworthy motives which they have been pleased to attribute to the Seceders. We wish still to make no impeachment of the candor of our brethren, but are sorry that they should have published to the world some of the serious accusations contained in their periodical without more careful investigation.

It has been said that one effect of the Secession was to check the high handed measures pursued by the Established Church. This, however, seems to have operated most powerfully at the first. When the greater portion of the people who were zealously attached to the principles of the Reformation, had united with the Seceders, it seems as if the Assembly became less fearful of losing what was left, and ceased to be so careful in their measures. The moderate party, who took a name as opposite as possible from their true spirit, carried on with a high hand; they drove out of their communion, in some cases even out of Scotland, some of the most eminent of their ministers, such as Mr. Gillespie, the father of the Relief Church, and Dr. Witherspoon, who took refuge from their oppressions by removing to America, and became one of the brightest ornaments of our country.

In another respect, the effect of the Secession was altogether unfavorable. As it might naturally have been anticipated the separation of those who had been most forward in opposing corrupt doctrine, was much felt and lamented by those friends of truth who were left behind, and some of them after struggling in vain, for a time, ceased even to attend upon meetings of the Assembly; so that grievous errors were suffered to pass without any notice, or were only visited with such inadequate censures as tended to give them encouragement. Of these cases it may be proper to give a few examples.

Mr. John Glass had been deposed in 1730, for advocating the Independent system of church government, opposing Creeds and Confessions, and teaching the doctrines, afterwards more generally known by the name of Sandemanianism, from Mr. Sandeman, a coadjutor or successor of Mr. Glass; but in 1739, he was relieved from this sentence by the Assembly, after which he became the father of the abovenamed sect. Dr. Wm. Wishart, principal of the university of Edinburgh, was brought before the Assembly of 1738 for denying in published discourses, the doctrine of original sin, maintaining the sufficiency of the light of nature, opposing Creeds and Confessions, and the instruction of children by catechisms, &c. Dr. Wm. Leechman, professor of divinity, was also brought before the Assembly of 1744, for asserting in a printed sermon, "that God merely as *Creator* is the proper object of prayer; that an assured trust in the goodness and mercy of God as *Creator*, is the principal

means of acceptance in prayer;" that the light of nature is sufficient as a guide, and that natural ability is sufficient for the performance of prayer without the intercession of Christ, or the influences of the Holy Spirit. Both these men, occupying such important stations, and teaching such radical errors, were dismissed without any retraction, simply on the ground of their renewed declaration of adherence to the Confession of Faith. Mr. James Meek, minister at Cambuslang was brought before the Assembly in 1775 on a charge, by elders and members of his congregation, of teaching that sincerity was the ground of our acceptance with God; that we know of no cause for Christ's agony in the garden, except the apprehension of what he was to suffer from his disciples and his enemies; that all have a right to come to the Lord's Table, however enormous their crimes have been, if they resolve to do better; that sinners can make some compensation to God for their former enormities, that they have the merits of Christ to co-operate with their sincere endeavours; and that when faith goes above or beyond reason it is credulity. Yet the Assembly refused to take any notice of his erroneous doctrine, and decided to "sustain Mr. James Meek as minister of Cambuslang."—[*Appendix to the Re-exhibition of the Judicial Testimony.* pp. 168, 170.]

At the time of the declinature, 1739, the number of the Seceding ministers appears to have been only eight. In 1742, there were twenty, Mr. Wm. Wilson had been removed by death, twelve had been added by ordination, and one by accession. In 1744, they agreed to a division into three Presbyteries, viz. Dunfermline, Glasgow, and Edinburgh, the two former consisting of eight ministers each, the latter of nine. The number of settled ministers at this time was twenty-five, the congregations settled and vacant, forty-one. In 1747, when the breach took place respecting the burgh oath, the Synod consisted of thirty-two ministers. Of these, one, Mr. Thomas Someville took part with neither side; of the remaining thirty-one, nineteen took the side of opposition to the oath, and were called, anti-burghers; twelve were in favor of it and were called Burghers. In 1774, the anti-burgher Synod was composed of eleven Presbyteries, and about one hundred ministers. At the present time the whole number of the congregations of the Secession in Scotland, together with those of the Relief is estimated in the Repertory at 470, about equal to one half the number of those of the established Church. The members of the United Secession alone, are supposed to embrace a fifth or a fourth part of the whole population. Their ministers are said to be about equal to one half the number of the established Clergy, (948). There are probably upwards of two hundred ministers of the United Secession in Ireland; their number is probably about the same with that of the Presbyterians of the Synod of Ulster, who are dissenters in Ireland, as well as the Seceders; Episcopacy being established by law. There are other branches of the Secession, both in Scotland and Ireland of whose numbers we have not any accurate information. The number of Seceders in the Provinces of the north is not accurately known, but it is long since they had a Synod in Nova Scotia. There are a few congregations of them, in different parts of England. In the United States, there are eighty-six ministers of those properly called Seceders, and about the same number of the Associate Reformed, who sometimes go by this name, from their having generally belonged to the Secession before that union with the Reformed Presbytery or Covenanters which separated them from us. The whole number

of ministers in the Secession may therefore be considered as about eight hundred or one thousand. Yet this increase from the four first to eight hundred or one thousand, is nothing, compared with the progress of many other Societies. The Methodists have perhaps increased in a five or ten fold proportion. And it would be far more worthy of gratulation if we had increased or even not declined in the love and zeal for which our fathers were distinguished.

That which may justly be regarded as the most important effect of the Secession, was its influence in the promotion of the truth of the gospel. The controversies which began to be agitated in the days of Mr. Thomas Boston respecting the nature of the gospel, tended very much to expose the legal spirit which prevailed, and to elucidate the doctrines of grace. He and those who afterwards formed the Secession stood side by side in this contest for the grace of Christ as the Saviour, as well as for his rights as the King and head of the church. And had he not been removed by death there is no reason to doubt, but as he had been with them in maintaining the truth, so he could not have parted from them when they were called to suffer for it. What has been stated in former papers may show what was the occasion of the Secession, but if we look at the proper grounds of it, we will find that the thing which led the way, was the opposition made by the Assembly to the truths of the gospel, and these truths became the chief matters of testimony, on the part of the Seceders. But to do justice to this portion of their history, and of their Testimony, it will be necessary to go back, and give some account of those things which occasioned their act respecting the doctrine of grace, which was a judicial deed, subsequent to the Testimony, yet regarded as a part of it; and this will require a separate section.

[To be continued.]

---

## ART. II. *Remarks on the ancient mode of singing Psalms.*

It is very probable that many are unacquainted with the origin of the practice still followed in many congregations, of giving out the lines of the Psalm to enable all to join in singing it. It is also probable that those who oppose any change from this practice are chiefly influenced by a respect to what they regard as an ancient custom. But whilst zeal against innovations is to be commended and cherished, especially in such an age as the present, it appears in this instance to be misguided. The custom of giving out the line has neither the sanction of antiquity, nor of the practice of the purest of the Reformed Churches in the age of the Reformation.

The occasion of this custom in Scotland was the introduction of the present authorized version of the Psalms. Previous to the preparation of this version, or *paraphrase*, as a different version was then called, the congregation was accustomed to follow in singing either by a psalm book or by memory. But the books in the hands of the people, and the psalms which they had committed to memory were of no more use to them when the new version was introduced. In order therefore to facilitate its introduction, the expedient of giving out the line was employed, but at the same time, it was recommended to the people to return as soon

as possible to their former mode of singing without any such interruption.

The act of the Westminster Assembly is well known, yet perhaps not a few have never adverted to its true spirit. It is in the following terms: "That the whole congregation may join herein, [in singing of psalms,] every one that can read is to have a psalm book; and all others, not disabled by age or otherwise, are to be exhorted to learn to read. But for the present, where many in the congregation cannot read, it is convenient that the minister, or some other fit person appointed by him and the other ruling officers, do read the Psalm, line by line, before the singing thereof." The first part of this act enjoins that all who could read should have psalm books; others who could not read were to be exhorted to learn; and why are these things mentioned in connexion with singing psalms if they contemplated the continuance of giving out the line, in which case those who could read, would have no advantage over those who could not, and those who had books would have no advantage over those who had none? It is very evident that these words of the Assembly intimate that singing by book, and not by giving out the line, is the proper mode. Then it is added, "But for the present, &c." This *But*, also intimates something different in what is recommended from the standing rule implied in the previous sentence. This expedient of giving out the line, they also mention as temporary, it was to be only "for the present." It is also limited to certain places "where" certain circumstances required it, they say not in all worshipping assemblies, but only, "*where*" congregations labor under a certain difficulty, implying that where this difficulty did not exist there was no occasion for the proposed expedient even for the present. They do not justify the giving out of the line where this difficulty occurs only to a small extent, but say "where *many* in the congregation cannot read." They also place this expedient on no higher ground than that of *convenience*. They say nothing of the case of the blind, whose situation has more frequently furnished an apology for giving out the line in modern times. Perhaps the argument drawn from this case would not be so strong, as an argument from the case of the deaf, or dull of hearing in favour of written forms of prayer. The blind could generally follow in singing from memory, but the deaf are quite shut out from participation in prayer unless forms were allowed for their convenience.

The preceding view of this act certainly corresponds with its language; and that it also agrees with its spirit and intention, appears from the account which is given of the preparation and adoption of it in Doctor Lightfoot's "Journal of the Assembly of Divines." From this Journal it appears that the Commissioners from Scotland opposed this clause which allows of the reading of the lines: and though the original form of the act is not given in the Journal, it is altogether probable that when it was committed to these Commissioners, it was limited and modified agreeably to the views above expressed. The following is the passage alluded to.

"Then was our Directory for singing psalms read over to the Scots Commissioners, who were absent at the passing of it; and Mr. *Henderson* disliked our permission of any to read the psalms line by line: and this business held us some debate: which ended in this,—that the Scots were desired to draw up something to this purpose."—(*Lightfoot's Works*, Vol. XIII. p. 344. Edition of 1825.)

The following extract from Stewart's Collections will cast some light



on the preceding act of the Westminster Assembly, and confirm some of the preceding observations.

“By the act of Assembly [of the Church of Scotland,] August 6, 1649, their Commission being empowered to emit the paraphrase of the Psalms, and establish the same for public use, they did accordingly conclude and establish the paraphrase of the Psalms in metre, now used in this church, after the Presbyteries had sent their animadversions thereupon.”

“It was the ancient practice of the church, as it is yet of some Reformed Churches abroad, for the minister or precentor to read over as much of the psalm in metre together, as was intended to be sung at once, and then the harmony, and melody followed without interruption, and people did either learn to read, or get most of the psalms by heart; but afterwards, it being found, that when a new paraphrase of the psalms was appointed, it could not at first be so easy for the people to follow, then it became customary, that each line was read by itself, and then sung. But now, having for so long time made use of this paraphrase, and the number of those who can read being increased, it is but reasonable that the ancient custom should be revived, according to what is insinuated by the Directory on this subject. And that such who cannot read may know what psalms to get by heart, let such be affixed on some conspicuous part of the pulpit as are to be sung in public at next meeting of the congregation. It were to be wished that masters of families would path [pave] the way for the more easy introducing of our former practice, by reviving and observing the same in their family worship.”—(*Stewart's Collections, Book II. Tit. I. Sect. 25, 26.*)

The French Protestant Church in their 10th Synod, which met at Figeac in 1579, passed the following act:

“Churches that in singing psalms do first cause each verse to be read, shall be advised to forbear that childish custom, and such as have used themselves unto it shall be censured.”—(*Quick's Synodicon, Vol. I, p. 132.*)

These extracts sufficiently show that the custom of giving out the lines was no part of the Reformation, but was subsequently introduced to a limited extent for the sake of convenience in certain cases rarely if ever occurring in the present day. They also show that the most renowned assemblies and purest churches in the first days of the Reformation set themselves against this custom, urging people to learn to read, and to furnish themselves with psalm books, that they might sing without any interruption. It is no ways difficult to ascertain what the judgment of the Westminster Assembly would be in cases, where there were *not* “many in the congregation unable to read,” and where there could be no difficulty in all supplying themselves with books. The judgment of the Reformed Church of France needs no comment. It was not however intended to enter into an argument on this subject which has frequently produced disturbances in different denominations, but merely to supply a few extracts to enable any who feel an interest in it to judge for themselves, what were the sentiments and usages of former times.

PHILOSOPHOS.

ART. III. *Brief Expositions of Important Texts.*

MR. EDITOR—

I have thought it might be useful, to give in the Monitor a brief exposition of some passages in the bible, which are often proposed for explanation; and the meaning of which has been often mistaken. I have followed this practice for some years, from the pulpit, immediately before paraphrasing on the psalm, and I trust not without benefit. Should the plan meet your approbation, I may, occasionally send a few remarks on other passages.

W. E.

—  
 “But to sit on my right hand, and on my left, is not mine to give; but *it shall be given to them*, for whom it is prepared of my Father.”—  
 Matth: xx. 23.

In this verse, the words in italic, “*it shall be given them*,” inserted in our English version, are not in the original. The translators, by the insertion, doubtless intended to explain the verse, but unhappily, it not only perverts the meaning, but darkens the proofs which the verse contains, of our Saviour’s deity. Read the words as uttered by our Lord, leaving out the addition of the translators, and the meaning is obvious at once. “To sit on my right hand, and on my left, is not mine to give, but for whom, it is prepared of my Father.” This proves that Christ has the thrones and mansions of Heaven, at his disposal. He has power, as God, to bestow them; but He will give them only to those, whom the Father hath given him as his people:—only to those, whom he covenanted from eternity to redeem, and for whom, God the Father hath prepared glory, as the reward of his sufferings on their behalf. As it stands in our English version, some might be ready to suppose, that Christ has no right to give a throne in heaven, even to his dearest disciple. “To sit on my right hand, and on my left, is not mine to give; but it shall be given to them for whom it is prepared, of my Father.” This addition, represents the Saviour as saying, that though he had no right to give a seat in glory, yet all for whom it was prepared, should, in due time, be put in possession of this glory, by God, the Father. The passage, however, as it stands in the original, instead of denying this divine power to Christ, is thus a proof not only of the covenant entered into from eternity, between the Father, Son and Spirit, for the salvation of an elect world:—not only of the certainty of the salvation of all, for whom Jesus died; but also, of his equality with the Father. Indeed, the doctrine of the Saviour’s Deity, is plainly written on every page of the bible. Deny his divinity, and the bible is a book without meaning. The titles, attributes, and works of God are expressly, and without limitation, ascribed to Jesus, as Jehovah Sabaoth, the Lord of hosts, as God over all, blessed forever. His essential Deity—his true and proper Godhead is acknowledged by all the hosts of heaven, where they “honor the Son, even as they honor the Father.” Wo! to the polluted worm of the dust, who dares refuse to unite in the ascription of praise, with which all heaven resounds: “Worthy is the Lamb that was slain, to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honor, and glory, and blessing. Blessing, and honor, and glory and power, be unto Him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb forever and ever.”

—  
 2d Cor. ii. 17. “For we are not as many which corrupt the word of God; but as of sincerity, but as of God, in the sight of God speak we in Christ.”

The word here correctly rendered *corrupt*, literally signifies also, to adulterate, as a dishonest dealer mixes good and bad merchandize together, or as an unjust vintner mixes his wine with water, or poisons it with deleterious ingredients, that it may "give its color in the cup," and sell to advantage. Thus false teachers adulterate the pure word of God, and corrupt the gospel, by human additions to the perfect rule, by infusing poisonous mixtures into the water of life. *They* are guilty of this sin then, who add to, or take from the pure and perfect word of God; who by human inventions, and useless mixtures would weaken the efficacy of the truth, and deprive of its nourishing qualities, the bread of life. Their pretended regard to fundamentals, assumed, as a plausible pretext for vending, with impunity, their poisonous mixtures, may pass as sufficient with men; but it will not shield from the doom denounced against those who "handle the word of God deceitfully." As wine mixed with water is deprived of its strength, so the least addition to the word, the least corruption of the institutions of the Most High, may rob them of their efficacy, and render them but a savor of death unto death to the soul. But more is implied in the word "*corrupt*," than this. It imports not only that the addition, like wine in water, may deprive the word and institution of its value, but, that this addition is a poisonous and deadly ingredient, which may bring on the deluded victim eternal destruction. It is needless to particularize the different corruptions of God's word, which, in the present day defile the church and endanger souls. Every addition, however, to the truths or institutions of Jehovah, is a corruption of his word, and a usurpation of his prerogatives and his throne. To the dishonest merchant Satan holds out the prospect of gain: to the false and dishonest teacher, he presents the same temptation, or perhaps the bubble, popularity—the praise of men. Alas! sometimes it succeeds. The blood of souls is sold for the breath of dying worms;—or they are left to perish for want of the bread of life, or poisoned with error, lest the teacher be unpopular! O how necessary the injunction of the inspired penman of our text to Timothy, and to every minister: "I charge thee before God and the Lord Jesus Christ, preach the word." Preach the uncorrupted word. Preach as one who seeks souls, not his own glory. Preach as one who feels that he has more to secure and labor for, than the praise of deceived and dying men. Preach the word as one who dreads to have the blood of souls on his hands, at a judgment day. Up, and do the work of the Lord as one in earnest. Preach as one who has utterly forgotten self, not as one whose pride has sought even the pulpit for display. Deliver your message as God has written it. With prayers and many tears, plead that your every sermon may be the very truth most pure; and studied, and spoken, as though the destiny of deathless spirits, through all the ages of eternity, were depending upon it.

By the majesty of Him whose commission you bear and whose word you proclaim; by the worth of souls which that word alone can save, preach it in purity; that when the heart faileth in the day of death, you may be able, looking back on a past life, to appeal and say; "we are not as many, which corrupt the word of God: but as of sincerity, but as of God in the sight of God," have we spoken in the name of Christ, and for the promotion of his glory.

ART. IV. *The Christian World Unmasked.*

(Continued from page 125.)

The divinity of Christ proved a sad bone of contention among the Jews, who judged of him from his mean appearance, and not from his godlike works and words. At one time he tells them, *I and my father are one.* John x. 30. The Jews understood his meaning well, and cried out, *We stone thee for blasphemy, because that thou, being a man, makest thyself God.* John x. 33.

At another time he says, *My Father worketh hitherto, and I work.*—John v. 17. I work with uncontrolled power, as my Father works; and all things obey me and my Father equally; and hereupon the Jews sought to kill him, because he had said, that *God was his Father*, (*ἰδιον πατέρα*, his own proper, or *peculiar Father*) *making himself thereby equal with God.* (Verse 18.) The Jews knew, though some among ourselves do not, what Jesus meant by calling God his *own proper Father*. They perceived by this expression, that he made himself so partake of his Father's *divine nature*, as an earthly son partakes of his father's *human nature*, which is the same in both; and that Jesus hereby would distinguish himself both from angels, who are *created sons of God*; and from believers, who are *adopted sons*; and for this expression, which seemed presumptuous and blasphemous, they sought to kill him.

On another occasion, Jesus took the incommunicable name to himself, saying, *Before Abraham was, I AM*; and this so enraged the Jews, *that they took up stones to cast at him.* (John viii. 58, 59.) Now stoning was the legal punishment for *blasphemy.* (Levit. xxiv. 16.)

When Jesus is accused of blasphemy, for making himself God, he never does refute the charge; but either vindicates his high claim in a *covert way*, (which was needful then, that his death might not be hastened) or he passeth over the charge in silence. And is silence, in such a weighty matter, consistent with the character of Jesus? If he had not been Jehovah, surely it behoved him, when called a blasphemer, to tell them plainly, "You mistake my words; I am not God, nor mean to call myself so."

This charge of blasphemy pursued Jesus through his ministry, and at length nailed him to the cross. At his trial, he is first brought before the Jewish council, where some frivolous things are urged, but nothing proved. Then Caiaphas stands up, and says, *Art thou the Son of the blessed?* Christ's appointed hour was now come, and his answer is no longer covert, *Jesus saith, I AM.* The high priest, knowing well the meaning of his words, *rends his clothes, and says, what need have we of further witnesses? Ye have heard his blasphemy. What think ye? And they all condemned him to be guilty of death.* (Mark xiv. 61, &c.)

Next he is hurried before the bar of Pilate, to have their sentence confirmed. Here again some idle matters are first urged, but not regarded by the governor. Jesus is accused of aspiring to be king, but satisfies Pilate by declaring *his kingdom is not of this world.* At length the capital charge of *blasphemy* is brought, which finished the trial. *We have a law, say the Jews, and by our law he ought to die, because he made himself the Son of God. Pilate, hearing this, was much afraid; and going to the judgment-hall again, says to Jesus, whence art thou? But Jesus gave him no answer. Pilate saith, speakest thou not unto me? Knowest thou not that I have power to crucify thee, and power to release thee? Jesus answered, thou couldest have no power at all against me, except it were*

given thee from above: therefore he that delivered me unto thee, hath the greater sin. This answer somewhat checked Pilate, but an outcry from the Jews quickens him, and he passeth sentence. (John xix. 7, &c.)

Thus both at the bar of Caiaphas and Pilate, the capital charge brought against Jesus was blasphemy, or the calling himself in a peculiar sense the Son of God, and thereby making himself *equal* with God. For this he was condemned to die; and he suffered death, as a blasphemer, for laying claim to divinity. And were he now in Britain, a multitude of those, who are fed at his altar, would lift a heel against him, and hale him to a gibbet, and cry out as before, *If thou be the Son of God, come down from thy gallows, and we will believe that thou art the proper Son of God, neither an adopted Son, nor a created Son, but the only begotten Son of the Father.* (John i. 18.)

Perhaps they might go further, so great is their zeal, and having crucified the Saviour on a false charge of blasphemy, might crucify his followers on a base pretence of idolatry. A minute philosopher has *dared* to publish muttering words about it; one, who likes to live upon the alms arising from the Lord's service; and can say genteely, *hail master*, and betray the master's honor, as a friend of old did.

When Jesus says, *the Father is greater than he*: and the Son is ignorant of the day of Judgment; these things must be ascribed to his human nature. As touching his Godhead, he is equal to the Father, being declared, to be *one* with the Father, one in nature, and bearing his *express image*: but as touching his manhood, is inferior to the Father, and his human nature, we are told, *grew in wisdom and stature*, which supposeth a finite boundary. And though at last the kingdom of Christ will be delivered up to the Father, this must be understood of his mediatorial kingdom. All things are administered at present by the hand of Jesus, as God-man mediator; but when this dispensation ends, the kingdom will return to its original order; and when thus returned, it is not said, the *Father* will be all in all, but *God* (the triune God) will be all in all.

That the Son will not lose his *essential* kingdom, as God, when his *mediatorial* kingdom, as God-man ceaseth, seems plain from these words of the Father to the Son, *Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever*; which words ascribe an *everlasting* dominion to the Son, when his *meditorial* kingdom is no more.

Thus, Sir, I have given you a summary proof of Christ's divinity from the Bible; and can you suppose that the scriptures would tell you plainly again and again, that Jesus Christ is *Jehovah*; is *God*; the *true God*; the *mighty God*; the *just God*; and *God over all, blessed for evermore*, if he was not truly God? All these lofty expressions are applied to Jesus Christ, and they would naturally mislead plain men, yea, and would confound all plain language, if he is not truly God. A man must have the old serpent's subtlety, and chop and mince his logic mighty fine, who can banish Christ's divinity out of these expressions. But what then must become of the poor, who are the chief subjects of the gospel-kingdom? They cannot buy the spawn of subtle brains; nor, if purchased, could digest it. They have nothing but the Bible; and if Jesus is not truly God, the Bible would mislead them; and so for want of a scribe's cap and dictionary, they must all miscarry truly.

You have heard before, that *the wise are taken in their own craftiness*: and now, Sir, hear how the Lord *takes* them. Gins and snares are scattered in his word to catch a subtle scribe; just as traps are laid by us to catch a fox or foulmart. Every fundamental doctrine meets with some-

thing, which *seems* directly to oppose it; and these *seeming* contradictions are the traps, which are laid. A lofty scribe, who depends upon his own subtlety, and cannot pray sincerely for direction, is sure to be taken in these snares; but an humble praying soul escapes them; or if his foot be caught, the snare is broken, and his soul delivered.

Some things spoken of the *human nature* of Christ, and of his *mediatorial* character and office, are the traps laid about his divinity, to catch a modern scribe; as the meanness of Christ's appearance in Judea, was a trap to catch an ancient rabbi.

Isaiah has an awful word about these traps, which are laid around the Saviour's person. *He (Jesus) shall be for a sanctuary (unto some), but for a stone of stumbling and a rock of offence to both the houses of Israel; for a gin and for a snare to the inhabitants of Jerusalem.* (Isa. viii. 14.) And they were taken in the snare; for they crucified the *Lord of glory*, as a vile blasphemer.

No one has cause to complain of these traps, because the Holy Spirit's guidance is promised to all them, that seek it earnestly; and if men are too lazy or too lofty to seek this assistance, they are justly suffered to *stumble, and fall, and be broken, and be snared, and be taken* (Isa. viii. 15.)

But, Sir, if you would take a modern rabbi for your tutor, and seat yourself beneath his feet, and catch the droppings of his mouth; whither, whither must you fly for shelter? Alas! the modern scribes are just in such a hobble now about Jesus, as the Jewish scribes were. Some said then, *he is John the Baptist*; others said, no, *he is Elias*; and others contradicted both, and called him, *Jeremias, or one of the prophets*. So it was then; and so it is now. Some say, he is a *mere man*, as the Turk's say; and such professors only need a pair of whiskers, to pass for musselmen. Other say, he has an *angel's nature*, but his head and shoulders taller than the highest angel. Others contradict them both, and say he is a God; but having lost a small article in St. John's greek gospel, he is not *the* God. Others laugh at this, and say, he is no God at all, but hoisted into Godship by his office; and must be worshipped in a lower strain, as wily courtiers worship princes, as starving levities worship patrons, as antiquarians worship rust, or as Christian men will worship mammon.

Again, whilst some affirm, he is not truly God, others have affirmed, he was not truly man, or had no real human nature; and so amongst them all, they have stript him worse than the Roman soldiers did, who took his cloathes, yet left his carcase; but these rogues have run away with every thing. According to their various fancies, he is neither God, nor angel, nor man; and what else they can make him, I see not, unless it be a *devil*, as the Jewish scribes made him, (John viii. 52)

Thus Jesus proves a sad stone of *stumbling* to the lofty scribes, who flounder round about him, and bedaub him grievously, but cannot get up to him; and as every scribe grows sharper than his brother, some new nature is invented for the Saviour. And Sir, if you renounce the plain account of the Bible, you will find as many caps for Christ's head, as there are maggots in a scribe's brain.

If Jesus Christ is not truly God, all his apostles, excepting Judas, were idolaters: for they *worshipped* him with great solemnity at his ascension. (Luke xxiv. 52.) Also all the Christians of the first and purest age were idolaters; for we learn from undoubted heathen records, that they prayed and sang praises to *one Jesus*, according to the character given them by Paul, *They call upon the name of Jesus Christ our Lord in eve-*

ry place. (1 Cor. i. 2.) Yea, and all the angels too, except the devils, are highly guilty of idolatry; for they sing delightful praises into God and the Lamb. (Rev. v. xi, 12.) Which adoration puts the devils, who are utter haters of idolatry, in a cruel rage at the book of Revelations, where this worship is recorded; and makes them raise up human tools to vilify the book, and try to banish it from the sacred canon.

Enough, enough, Doctor; put no more shieves upon the cart, lest you break it down. An overstocked market oversets it commonly: and a drove of lean proofs coming after the other, may prove like Pharaoh's second drove of lean oxen, which devoured all the fat ones. I would have no more than just enough of the best fed goose; cramming only breeds a surfeit. And I have heard enough to satisfy me, that Jesus is my maker and preserver, the God in whom I live and move and have my being, who deserves my highest worship and my best obedience.— And it seems agreeable to common sense, that none can *redeem* a world, but the *Maker* of it. Yet I am still in the dark about your new covenant. How does it differ from the old; and how must I get a slice of the new? Nature, you say, cannot carve for herself: who then must do this office for her, and put the meat upon her trencher?

An answer to both your questions, will occasion some little repetition, Sir, yet not a needless one, since it respects the *way* to life, which is too commonly mistaken.

In a covenant of works, a man must work for life by his *own will* and *power*, or by the natural abilities he is endowed with. He stands upon his own legs, and had need look well to them: for the tenor of this covenant is, *do and live; transgress and die*. A single trip ruins all, as in angels, so in Adam: but if the whole is kept without a flaw, a right to life is purchased by virtue of the covenant *promise*.

In the covenant of grace, all things are *purchased* for us; and *bestowed* upon us, *graciously* or freely.

These two covenants are called the old and new: no more are noticed in scripture; and a suitable *law*, respecting both, is mentioned, *the law of works, and the law of faith*. (Rom. iii. 27.) All other laws are cobwebs of an human brain, such as the law of *sincere obedience*, the law of *love*, &c. For love and obedience are the *fruits* of faith, and not the *law* of the new covenant.

And now, Sir, God himself shall tell you by the mouth of Jeremiah, what the new covenant is. *Behold the days come, saith the Lord, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel, not like that I made at Sinai; but this shall be the covenant, I will put my law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts; I will be their God, and they shall be my people; I will forgive their iniquities, and remember their sins no more.* (Jerem. xxxi. 31, &c.) And to this St. Paul alludes, Heb. viii. 8, &c. x. 16, 17.

Ezekiel describes this covenant more minutely, *I will sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean; I will cleanse you from all your filthiness and all your idols; I will give you a new heart, and I will put a new spirit in you; I will take the stony heart out of your flesh, and I will give you an heart of flesh; I will put my spirit within you, and cause you to walk in my statutes.* (Ezek. xxxvi. 25, &c.)

The *new* covenant is here shewn to consist of a rich and gracious bundle of free promises, in which *I will* and *I will* runs through the whole. God does not say, "Make yourselves obedient, and then I will sprinkle clean water upon you, to wash away guilt;" but he says, "*I will* do both; *I will* pardon you, and make you obedient also; ye

every thing, and do it by *my Spirit*. Not your own might, but *my Spirit* shall sanctify your heart, and engage your feet to walk in my statutes.”

This covenant is too glorious for nature to behold: she shrinks from the dazzling sight; fears woeful consequences from it; and, trembling for morality, beseeches the vicar to marry Moses unto Jesus, and couple the two covenants. From this adulterous alliance springs the spurious covenant of faith and works, with a spruce new set of duties, half a yard long, called legally-evangelical, or evangelically-legal; unknown to Christ and his apostles, but discovered lately by some ingenious gentlemen.

However, Jesus does not thank old nature for her fears. He has promised in his covenant, to provide a new heart, and good feet, as well as justification and pardon; and what he promiseth, he will perform. Jesus does not want the staff of Moses; nor will the master of the house suffer an alliance with his servant.

And so much, Sir, for the nature of the new covenant: your next question was, how do we become partakers of it? Now the blessings of this covenant were all purchased by Jesus, and are lodged in his hand to dispose of; free pardons to bless a guilty sinner, free grace to sanctify his nature, with full power to lead him safe to Canaan. Jesus therefore says, *look to me, and be saved; come to me, and I will give you rest.*—But the bare command and invitation of his word will not bring us to him.

Nature lost her legs in paradise, and has not found them since: nor has she any *will* to come to Jesus. The way is steep and narrow, full of self-denials, crowded up with stumbling-blocks; she cannot like it: and when she does come, it is with huge complaining. Moses is obliged to flog her tightly, and make her heart ache, before she casts a weeping look on Jesus. Once she doated on this Jewish lawgiver, was fairly wedded to him, and sought to please him by her *works*, and he seemed a kindly husband: but now he grows so fierce a tyrant, there is no bearing of him. When she takes a wry step, his mouth is always full of cursing; and his resentments so implacable, no weeping will appease him, nor promise of amendment.

Why, Doctor, you are got into your altitudes: I do not understand you. Figures are above my match: I never could get through arithmetic. Pray, let us have plain English.

So you shall, sir. Man is born under the law of works, and of course is wedded to that law: it is the law of nature. Traces of the moral law are still upon his heart; the fall has blotted the two tables, but not defaced them wholly. Where revelation is bestowed, the tables are renewed, as at Sinai; but wrote as yet in stone; not on the heart; recorded in the sacred volume, but not engraven on the inward parts. By means of this outward revelation and the moral sense, men acquire some notion of a covenant of works. This covenant suits their nature, and is understood in a measure, though neither in its full extent nor in its awful penalties. Jesus begins his lectures with the *law of works*, somewhat known to the scholar, and urges that law on his conscience with vigor, to drive him to the *law of faith*. The young Israelite is called to Mount Sinai, where Jesus trains his people now, as he did aforetime. And until the heart has had a thorough schooling here, has heard and felt the thunders of the law, it will be hard and stony. It may be pitiful to others, but want compassion for itself; may weep at a neighbor's rain, but cannot truly feel for its own. The bosom is bound about



with wrappers of obedience, that when the curses of the law are heard they only tingle in the ear and graze upon the breast, but do not pierce the conscience. The man knoweth not his real danger: the law of works refreshes him; and while he sippeth comfort from his faint obedience, Jesus Christ is only used as a make-weight,—like the small dust thrown in the scale to turn the balance.

Now the legal heart is crushed at Sinai: there Jesus Christ, by his Spirit, sets the law home upon the sinner's conscience; then he *feels* that the curses in the law are his proper portion, not because he is the chief of sinners, but because he is a sinner. Thus his bosom is unswaddled, the heart begins to bleed, the mouth is stopped quite, all legal worthiness is gone, he stands condemned by the law, and *all* his hope is fixed on Jesus. While the law was only written on paper, he found no galling condemnation. His heart, like the stony tables, received the letter, and felt no impression; but when the commandment reached his inmost soul, then he died. This makes a *free* salvation highly needful, a *whole* Saviour truly precious, and a *pure* covenant of grace delightful. And now the scholar comes to Jesus Christ, with cap in hand, and bended knee, and bleeding heart, and with St. Peter's gospel prayer, *Lord, save, or I perish.*

Being thus convinced of sin, his heart can have no rest till he *receives* a pardon, and finds that peace of God *which passeth understanding*. He feels a real condemnation; and must have absolution, not from man but God. Once he prayed for pardon, and rose up from his knees contentedly without it. His heart was whole; he did not want a pardon; nay, it seemed a presumption to expect it. Yet sure what we may *ask* without presumption, we may *expect* without presumption. But now the scholar sees his legal title unto heaven is lost, and finds a legal condemnation in his own breast beside, which makes him hasten to the *surety*, and call upon him, *as the Lamb of God who takes away our sins, and as the Lord our righteousness*. He views the surety as his law-fulfiller; both as his *legal title* and his *legal sacrifice*; and he wants an application of these blessings to his heart—an application by the Holy Spirit, to witness that they are placed to his account.

He sees a need, that both the *legal title* and the *legal sacrifice* should be imputed, to answer all the law's demands. And he marvels much that any who allow the imputation of Christ's *death* should yet object to the imputation of his *life*; since, if the obedience of Christ's death may be *imputed*, or placed to our account for pardon, why may not the obedience of his life be *imputed* also for justification, or a title unto glory? One is full as easy to conceive of as the other: both are purchased by the surety; both are wanted to discharge our legal debts; and both will be embraced and sought with eagerness when our debts and wants are truly known. But here the matter sticks; men do not feel their wants, and so reject *imputed* righteousness. The heart must be broken down and humbled well before it can *submit to this righteousness*. (Rom. x. 3.) Till we see ourselves utter bankrupts we shall *go about to establish our own righteousness*, and cannot rest upon the surety's obedience, the God-man's righteousness, as our legal title unto glory.

But, sir, this is not all. Every one who is born of God is made to hunger for *implanted* holiness, as well as thirst for *imputed* righteousness. They want a *meetness* for glory, as well as *title* to it; and know they could not bear to live with God, unless renewed in his image. Heaven would not suit them without holiness, nor could they see the face of God

without it. And having felt the *guilt* of sin and the *plague* of their sinful nature, by *conviction from the Holy Spirit*, (John xvi. 8.) this has taught them both to dread sin and loathe it: to *loathe* it for its vile uncleanness, and *dread* it for the curse it brings. They consider sin as bringing both the devil's nature and the devil's hell. They view it and detest it as the poison of the moral world, the filthiness of a spirit, the loathing of an Holy God, and such a cursed abomination as nothing but the blood of Christ could purge away.

And, sir, where *imputed righteousness* is not only *credited* as a gospel doctrine, but *received* by the Holy Spirit's application, it produces love to Jesus,—tender love with gratitude. And this divine love not only makes us willing to *obey* him, but makes us *like* him; for *God is love*.

*Christian holiness*, springing from the application of imputed righteousness is a glorious work indeed, far exceeding moral decency, its thin shadow and its dusky image. It is a true devotedness of heart to God, a seeking of his glory, walking in his fear and love, rejoicing in him as a reconciled Father, and delighted with his service as the only freedom.

Full provision is made for this holiness in the new covenant; and Jesus, the noble king of Israel, bestows it on his subjects. Let me repeat his words: *I will give a new heart, and put my Spirit within you, and cause you to walk in my statutes*. Believers look to him with prayer and faith; by looking are *transformed into his image*, (2 Cor. iii. 18.) and taste the blessed fruits of Canaan before they pass the banks of Jordan.

But, sir, the holiest Christian can put no trust in his holiness. His daily seeking to *grow in grace* proves his holiness defective. *Tekel* is wrote on every duty, *Thou art weighed in the balance, and found wanting*. (Dan. v. 27.) And he knows the meaning of those weighty words, applicable both to soul and body, *Verily, every man at his best estate, is altogether vanity*. (Psalm xxxix. 5.) His utmost holiness and his freest services do not answer the demand of God's law; and if depended on for justification in any measure, would bring him under the law's penalty, and condemn him. He is therefore forced to fly out of himself *entirely*, and seek a refuge *only* in Christ.

[To be continued.]

#### ART. V.—Decrease of Population in Heathen Nations.

[Communicated by a Missionary at the Sandwich Islands.]

I WISH to direct the attention of the Christian public to the distressing fact, that *heathen nations decrease rapidly before the march of civilization; to assign some causes for the fact, and to speak of the influence which a fact of this kind should exert on the conduct of Christians*.

No one at all conversant with history or acquainted with heathen nations, will deny that such is the fact. Look at South America. Where is her once numerous population? Gone, gone for ever! Where are the former occupants of the West Indies? Perished,—swept as with the besom of destruction. And how is it with the once numerous tribes who lined the shores of the Atlantic, where she washes what is now called New-England? Where are the warriors who once spread terror through the whole country, or who hunted their game where smiling villages,

with their numerous, busy population are now seen? Not a vestige remains of them to show the traveller where once they kindled their council fires, or lay in ambush to surprise and destroy their unsuspecting foe. And I surely need not ask, what are the prospects of the remaining tribes of Indians at the West and South! Thrust from the ranks of civilized nations, when about to assume the only standing which could prevent their irretrievable ruin, and trodden to the dust by the very men who had sworn to protect them, the heart of every Christian philanthropist in the land bleeds in anticipation of their speedy and utter extinction! So at the Sandwich Islands, and other islands of the Pacific where men from Christian countries have commenced the work of civilization. *Two*, at the lowest computation—I think *three*—die where *one* is born; and full half who are born die before they reach the age of three years. And this mortality obtains where means of civilization are most abundant.—A member of this mission, in a recent visit to Tahiti, saw a missionary of the London Missionary Society who had labored a few years on one of the Friendly Islands, unfrequented by men from other countries, and he stated the increase to be as two to four, or as great as the decrease at Tahiti and the Sandwich Islands. Wherever civilization has gone to the aid of the heathen, professedly to raise them from their degradation, they have sickened at her approach, and her embrace has been to them the embrace of death. Did heathen nations know the result of their intercourse with men from lands professedly Christian, they would cry out like the Ekronites on the approach of the ark of God—would flee from contact with men of other countries as they would avoid the plague.

But why is it so? Why should the heathen shrink away and die at the approach of civilization? Most certainly there is no necessity that such should be the result. The heathen are ignorant and uncivilized, and they need the aid of civilization; and they might derive incalculable benefit by their intercourse with men from Christian countries. The cause, then, why they derive no benefit from such intercourse must be sought in the character of foreigners who visit them, and in the course they have seen proper to pursue.

One reason why the intercourse of foreigners with heathen nations has proved so disastrous may be found in the fact, that the wants of the heathen have in consequence greatly increased, while the facilities for supplying those wants have been withheld. Merchants visit uncivilized nations, and make a display of their trinkets and goods; others land on their shores, and build houses, and purchase horses, and live after the style of their own country. The people see the superiority of the method of living adopted by their visitors, and they pine for these untried gratifications. Still, even if they may contrive to obtain these foreign commodities for a season, they cannot be said to derive benefit, permanent benefit, unless they are put in a way to supply their own wants. But those who profess to desire the civilization of the heathen are not forward to teach them the *arts* and usages of civilized life. They would keep them in ignorance, would render them dependent, that they might the more easily take advantage of their necessities. How was it with the Cherokee and Choctaw tribes of Indians? While they continued their savage mode of life, were moving in their habits, idle and intemperate, and, of course, wasting away, little fear was expressed as to their influence on the community around them; they might indeed be vicious, and idle, and improvident, but they were a surer prey to the harpies who hovered about them, ready

to seize and bear away the last pittance in their possession. But no sooner did these tribes cease their wandering habits, and resolve on cultivating their soil, and becoming skilled in the arts and usages of civilized life, than they were compelled to feel the iron hand of oppression wresting from them their all, and driving them naked into the wilderness. And I aver that this is the very spirit with which Christians have approached heathen nations.

But the chief reason why the intercourse of foreigners with heathen nations has proved so disastrous is found in the fact, that many of them have introduced almost every vice that can disgrace and ruin soul and body, while they scarcely practice a single virtue before the heathen.—This is a most affecting truth. Multitudes—not of the lower classes of society only—but men who would be thought *gentlemen*, intelligent and honorable, and who may have occupied a high rank in society at home—I say, multitudes of these men no sooner land on heathen shores, than they plunge headlong into scenes of dissipation; wallow in the slough of sinful indulgence. The miseries thus entailed upon the heathen are shocking beyond description, and are nearly irremediable. To specify,—look at the Sandwich Islands. For fifteen years the gospel has been preached at these islands, and every means employed to heal the maladies of the soul and body. Yet, after all, notwithstanding the force of example in their teachers, notwithstanding medical assistance and instruction to parents in rearing their children, notwithstanding every agency we can bring to bear upon the people, and notwithstanding the favorable changes which have actually taken place among them, the people are not healed; disease and death are not prevented; the people continue to decrease. And why? *Disease has contaminated their blood*; the seat of life is tainted, and loathsome and deadly diseases are transmitted from generation to generation. Oh, what disclosures will be made at the bar of God! What an account will Christian nations be called to render to the Judge of all the earth!

In view of these facts, let Christian nations feel their indebtedness to the heathen. Paul felt that he was a debtor to men of every character and description. So should Christians all feel, and, in view of this indebtedness, should they act. Oh, my friends, my Christian brethren, how cheerfully ought you, ought *we all*, to toil for the degraded heathen!—Had Christians been prompt in obeying the command of their ascending Lord, had they not waited till unprincipled men had polluted the heathen, and sown among them the seeds of disease and death, how much misery had been saved to the world! How much more easily might the gospel have been introduced into heathen lands! How many more might have been saved from perdition! I do assure you, dear friends, that I am often ashamed when I look into the face of a heathen, and I pray God to help me and you too, to be faithful in laboring in their behalf, that our garments may be clean from their blood.—*A. Quarterly Register.*

---

#### ART. VI. *English Unitarians.*

We copy below, from the numbers of the Congregational Magazine for April, May and June, the documents connected with the withdraw-

ment of the Unitarian Presbyterians from "the General Body of the three denominations of Protestant Dissenting ministers residing in and about London and Westminster."—*N. Y. Ch. Observer*.

From the *Congregational Magazine* for April.

*Attempted dissolution of the General Body of Protestant Dissenting Ministers of the three denominations.*

During the past months events have transpired in connection with the body of Dissenting Ministers in the metropolis, the importance of which, as they may affect the religious character and civil rights of that association, cannot at the present moment be estimated.

The nature of this transaction will be best understood, by a detailed account of the proceedings of the Unitarian body.

Our readers are aware that the General Body of Dissenting Ministers in the metropolis, is constituted by the union of three separate and independent societies, called the Presbyterian, the Congregational, and the Baptist Boards.

In the Congregational Board, constituting a majority of the whole body, there are no Unitarian members. The Baptist Board aforesaid have had a small minority of Unitarian Baptists attached to their list, though not meeting with them for business, but within a few months they have resolved that in future the names of those gentlemen shall not be reported to the general body in connection with their Board.

In the Presbyterian Board, however, the majority were Unitarian ministers, and only three of its members adhered to the Trinitarian opinions of its founders.

A long train of circumstances, which it is not possible now to explain, have made the Unitarians of the Presbyterian Board uneasy in their connection with the General Body, and therefore specially convened on the 4th of March, an extraordinary meeting at Red Cross Street, "to take into consideration the necessity of withdrawing from the two of the three denominations." The Rev. Joseph Hutton, LL. D., late of Leeds, but now of Carter Lane, was called to the chair.

The business was introduced by an elaborate speech by the Rev. Robert Aspland, of Hackney, who moved the adoption of a series of resolutions, which was seconded by the Rev. Thomas Madge, late of Norwich, but now the successor of Mr. Belsham, at Essex Street Chapel.

The Trinitarian members of the Board were in their places, and the Rev. Wm. Broadfoot, as their senior member, though laboring under the effects of serious illness, protested against the proposed proceedings.

The following resolutions were however proposed and carried, the chairman also begging to express his concurrence with them.

"Resolved, That this body, being one of the three bodies which constitute the General Body of Protestant Dissenting Ministers of the three denominations in and about the cities of London and Westminster, feels itself impelled at the present crisis, to take prompt and decisive measures for the assertion of its independence, and the preservation of its rights and privileges.

"(1.) That the three bodies of Protestant Dissenting Ministers formed themselves into a united body upwards of a century ago, for the maintenance and extension of civil and religious liberty, upon the understanding and engagement that the bodies should not call in question or interfere with each other's religious opinions and doctrines; the only terms

of association with regard to individual members of the respective bodies, being their standing 'accepted and approved' in their several denominations.

"(2.) That notwithstanding known differences of judgment in religious matters between the three bodies, and, in some instances, between the members of the same body, the catholic principle of the union was, for a very long period, sacredly observed, and the united body consequently proceeded in peace and harmony, and by their cordial co-operation rendered eminent services to the cause of religious liberty; the Presbyterian body being certainly not behind the two others in zeal and exertion.

"(3.) That we lament that, within these few years, the catholic principle of the union has been infringed, by allowed references, at general meetings in the public proceedings, to doctrinal differences subsisting between the bodies, and the members of the same body, accompanied by reflections and insinuations to the prejudice particularly of the Presbyterian body.

"(4.) That we record with pain, that at the last election of the Secretary of the General Body, a most valuable and universally respected member of this body, who had, by the suffrages of the United Body, filled the secretaryship for seven years with such punctuality, diligence, and ability, as procured for him the warm thanks often repeated of the whole body, was set aside, on the ground openly alleged, and even declared in print, of his religious views on points of doctrine, and those of the body to which he belongs, not being consonant to those of the majority of the Three Denominations.

"(5.) That we perceive with feelings of deep regret the same spirit of intolerance and exclusion in the resolution of the Antipædobaptist body, not to admit to membership hereafter any Ministers, though hitherto eligible, who shall not profess certain articles of religious belief; and in the subsequent determination of the General Body upon the appeal of the aggrieved party, to take no measure for the relief of ministers who may be thus proscribed for conscience sake.

"(6.) That our serious attention has been also and of necessity drawn to various public proceedings of individuals and parties of the two other denominations; proceedings notoriously assisted by certain leading Ministers of one at least of those denominations—openly applauded by others—and approved, it is apprehended, by the greater part of them—the object or sure tendency of which is to degrade the English Presbyterians in public estimation, to deprive them of rights and privileges until this period never disputed, and even to revive against them, by means of legal technicalities, the penal statutes, which the wisdom and justice of the Legislature had repealed, to the satisfaction and joy of all enlightened men in the nation, and so far to thrust them out of the pale of civil protection,

"(7.) But contemplating the proceedings, and various indications of the disposition of the majority of the members, of the United Body of Ministers, we cannot entertain a doubt that it is the wish and purpose of such majority eventually to exclude the Presbyterian Body from the union, or to make its relative position such as no religious body alive to its own dignity, could consent to occupy. That, therefore, we feel it to be an imperative though painful duty—imposed on us equally by regard to our own characters as Protestant Dissenting Ministers, who hold it to be one of the inalienable rights of conscience, that no man shall, without his own consent, be answerable to another for his honest judgment upon the

sense of the Holy Scriptures, by respect for the memory of those that went before us and laid the foundation of our freedom, and by regard to the welfare of those that shall come after us,—to withdraw as a body from an union, the compact of which has been violated, and in which we see no prospect of equal and peaceful co-operation or of real and effective service to the interests of religious liberty,—our regret, however, is lessened by the pleasing reflection that the original purpose of the union has been, in great part, accomplished by the extension of the liberties of Protestant Dissenters, under the sway of the august family now upon the throne of these realms : and by the conviction that for what remains to be desired for the complete emancipation of conscience, we are justified by recent experience in placing entire confidence in his Majesty's present enlightened and liberal Government, which voluntarily proffers from the throne concessions which to religious freedom our fathers prayed for with faint hopes of success.

“In declaring, as we now do the Union of the Three Denominations dissolved, and in resolving to proceed hereafter in our single capacity as the Presbyterian Body of Ministers, unless an alteration in the spirit of the bodies with which we were lately associated should make re-union practicable and desirable, we disavow all angry and hostile feelings ;—we tender to the other denominations, with some of whose members we, as individuals, are and still hope to be united in the bonds of Christian esteem, our sincere wishes for their usefulness in the cause of freedom, truth, and virtue ; we preserve our sincere disposition to co-operate individually with the members of the other denominations in works of charity, in so far as doctrinal distinctions are kept out of sight, and all parties meet on terms of equality and unity ; and conscious that we have done nothing as a body to provoke this unhappy separation, but on the contrary have attempted every thing in our power to resist and retard it, we are willing to abide by the judgment of moderate and candid men, in the two other bodies of the Protestant Dissenters throughout the kingdom, of our countrymen at large, and of posterity, on this our deliberate and solemn act.”

The Rev William Broadfoot, President of Cheshunt College ; the Rev. John Young, minister of Albion Chapel ; and the Rev. Robert Redpath, of Wells street Chapel, the orthodox members, met on Monday, March 7, and prepared the following *Protest* against the proceedings of the *Unitarian Majority* of the Presbyterian Board.

“Against the vote passed at the meeting of the Presbyterian body, on Friday last, the 4th inst, at the library, Red Cross street, for separating the said body from the two other bodies of the general body of the three denominations of Protestant dissenting ministers, the undersigned members of the Presbyterian body protest, for the following reasons :

1st. Whilst the undersigned have no right to object to any members of the Presbyterian body withdrawing, if they think proper, from the General Body of the Three Denominations, they maintain, that should such members constitute ever so large a majority, the minority, however small, can be in no respect constrained to concur in their act, but are entitled to remain as Presbyterians in the united Body of the Three Denominations, retaining all the privileges which they have hitherto enjoyed in consequence of their union with the other two bodies.

“2d. As the immediate result of the withdrawal of the Presbyterian Body from the other two, would be the breaking up and terminating of the General Body of the Three Denominations of Dissenting Minister,

of London, Westminster, and their vicinity, the undersigned feel themselves bound to express, in the strongest terms, their marked disapprobation of an attempt, in their estimation so reckless and so improper; and the more so, considering the acknowledged powerful and happy influence the said General Body has had for upwards of a hundred years, in sustaining and extending throughout this whole kingdom, correct notions of civil and religious liberty, besides the beneficent remonstrances it has been honored, and not without success, to make in behalf of the right of private judgment on the great concerns of religion, and in aid of the oppressed in other counties of Europe.

“3dly. Because the members of the body who have carried this vote for separation, have evidently, and from their own showing, had recourse to this measure purely from their feelings as Arians or Unitarians, they alleging, as the reason of their doing so, their being aggrieved by the conduct towards them, on account of their doctrinal opinions, of the evangelical portion of the General Body of the Three Denominations. With such feelings the undersigned can have no sympathy, agreeing as they do, so far as the great doctrines of the Christian religion are concerned with the Congregational Body, and with that of the Particular or Anti-Pædo Baptists, and differing from them materially on the minor consideration of the form of church government, a difference which has been always recognized in the intercourse of the Three Denominations.—While the undersigned offer no opposition to Arians or Unitarians who view themselves aggrieved, seceding from the General Body, they cannot for one moment entertain the proposal of the withdrawal of the Presbyterian body on any such account, or regard the attempt as otherwise than groundless and unjustifiable.

“4thly. The undersigned feel themselves bound to oppose the vote of separation, from the additional consideration that they, properly speaking, are the only Presbyterians of the body, those withdrawing being only so in name, besides their being, by the late decisions in the case of Lady Hewley's Charity, legally adjudged to be no Presbyterians, all that was Presbyterian of the body remains with its identity, unaffected by the circumstance of a majority of its members being in favor of the vote.

“5thly. On all these accounts the undersigned consider themselves as carrying with them all the privileges belonging to the Presbyterian Body, and as being and constituting the Presbyterian Denomination in the General Body of the Protestant Dissenting Ministers of London and Westminster and their vicinity, and do, in consequence, claim the minutes of the Presbyterian Body.

WILLIAM BROADFOOT,  
JOHN YOUNG,  
ROBERT REDPATH.

*London, March 7, 1836.*”

In the spirit of this Protest, they proceeded to appoint Mr. Broadfoot the Secretary of their Board—admitted to their number, the Rev. Mr. Archer, of Oxendon Chapel, and took measures to secure an early meeting of the General Body to consider the business.

On Wednesday, the 9th of March, an extraordinary general meeting of the Protestant Dissenting Ministers of the Three Denominations was accordingly held at the Library, Red Cross Street, “To receive a communication from certain members of the Presbyterian Board, respecting a resolution of the said Board to separate from the general Body.”



The Rev. Joseph Fletcher, D. D. of Stepney, was called to the chair, We understand that the preceding documents were presented to the meeting, and ordered to be entered on the minutes—that the claim of the Orthodox Presbyterians to all the privileges of the Presbyterian Board was allowed, that a deputation was appointed to wait upon Lord John Russell, his Majesty's Secretary of State for the home Department, with a Memorial explanatory of the whole proceedings. That deputation\* consisted of Dr. Fletcher, the Chairman, the Rev. George Clayton, Secretary, and the Rev. Messrs. Broadfoot, Yates, Tidman, Binney, Steane, and Watts, who attended at the Home Office, on Thursday, March the 17th, but the result has not transpired.

From the Congregational Magazine for May.  
*Annual Meeting of the General Body of Dissenting Ministers.*

On Tuesday morning, April 12th, the annual meeting of the Ministers of the three Denominations was held at the Library, Red Cross Street; the Rev. F. A. Cox, D. D. L. L. D. in the chair.

The Rev. George Clayton, of Walworth, was re-elected Secretary for the ensuing year; and after the other routine business was transacted, the Committee, appointed for that purpose, presented the draught of a statement to the public, in reply to "The reasons for withdrawal from the General Body," published by certain members of the Presbyterian Body. The further consideration of it was, however, adjourned to Monday, April 18th, when, with some verbal alterations, it was unanimously adopted.

*Statement of the Ministers of the Three Denominations.*

(1.) That from the passing of the Act of Uniformity, in 1662, till the demise of King William III., in 1702, the Protestant Nonconformist Ministers of the several denominations of Presbyterians, Congregationalists, and Anti-Pædobaptists, residing in and about the cities of London and Westminster, held occasional meetings of their respective denominations, for the purpose of presenting petitions and addresses to the throne on such matters as affected their rights as Protestant Ministers, or respected the general interests of civil and religious liberty.

(2.) That on the accession of Queen Anne, in 1702, the "three Denominations" for the first time united in an address to her Majesty, and since that period have been accustomed to hold united meetings. That in their collective capacity as "the Protestant Dissenting Ministers of the Three Denominations, residing in and about the cities of London and Westminster," they have enjoyed the privilege of access to the throne in each successive reign to the present time, and of presenting addresses by deputation, as circumstances rendered expedient.

(3.) That some time after they had been recognised by the Government as a Body enjoying these privileges, the Ministers formed themselves into separate and distinct bodies, known respectively by the names of "The Presbyterian Body," "The Congregational Board," and "The Anti-Pædobaptist Board." That the first general meeting of the three Denominations, after the separate Bodies were organized, was held on the 11th day of July, 1727. That in these separate Bodies the Ministers of each Denomination have formed their own internal arrangements, and reported from time to time such Ministers as were added to their num-

\* This step became necessary, as the Seceding Unitarians had deputed Dr. Rees, Mr. Aspland, and Mr. Madge, to wait upon Lord Melbourne and Lord John Russell upon the same subject.

ber, and had been "accepted and approved" in their several Denominations. Thus introduced to the General Body, they have severally continued members during life, unless they violated the standing laws of the Union; were officially notified as no longer members of the Body to which they respectively belonged; voluntarily withdrew from the Union; or were excluded by a vote of the General Body.

(4.) That the General Body in its collective capacity has never interfered with the proceedings of the respective and distinct bodies; its main object being the support and extension of civil and religious liberty—more especially in relation to the interests of Protestant Dissenters. That it, therefore, never took cognizance of the theological opinions of its members; such matters being left to the inquiry and decision of the separate Bodies.

(5.) That, nevertheless, it has been for many years the conviction of a great majority of the members of the General Body, that important changes had taken place in the doctrinal principles of "the Presbyterian Body;" many of its ministers having become, by their own professions, "Unitarians," and entertaining opinions essentially different from those of the Presbyterian Body, at the commencement of the General Union. That some also of the "General Baptist Body," reported as belonging to the Anti Pædobaptist Denomination were of the same religious opinions with the Unitarian members of the Presbyterian Body.

(6.) That whatever might be the sentiments of the great majority of the General Body respecting this departure from the principles of the early Presbyterians on the part of such as are called Unitarians, no proceedings of the General Body have ever interfered with the "independence, rights, and privileges" of any of the separate bodies. That the General Body is not therefore responsible for such proceedings as have recently been adopted by any parties who may have called in question the moral right of Unitarians to be termed Presbyterians; or have employed legal measures in relation to any charitable trusts which may have been affected by the denial of that right; and that whatever may be the opinions of individual members on these subjects, the proceedings of the General Body have never, by its acts and resolutions, violated a single principle of its original constitution.

(7.) That in the annual election to the secretaryship of the General Body in 1835, the late Secretary received the grateful and unanimous thanks of the meeting for the ability with which he had discharged his official duties. That, nevertheless, it was deemed expedient to confer that appointment on a minister of one of the other denominations; because the appointment of members of the Presbyterian Body for a long series of years to that office was not consistent with the principle of rotation by which other appointments were regulated; because the relative position of the Presbyterian Body to the General Union had been materially changed, since, for many years after the formation of the Union, the members of the Presbyterian body had been the most numerous of the respective bodies, and on that account the Secretary had been generally elected from that denomination; while at the present time, and for a long period, they had not constituted one-seventh of the General Body; and because it was deemed expedient that the office of the secretaryship, being the only standing appointment, should at the present period be filled by one whose sentiments might be regarded as in more entire

accordance with those of the General Body of the Dissenting Ministers.\*

(8.) That as the General Body had never interfered with the proceedings of the separate Boards, it acted in perfect accordance with the principle and object of its constitution, in not interfering with the recent decision of the Anti-Pædobaptist Board, in declining to report in future as "accepted and approved Ministers," such as were of Unitarian principles belonging to the Baptist denomination.

(9.) That the recent withdrawal of certain Unitarian members of the Presbyterian Body from the General Union had not affected, and does not affect, the existence, constitution, and objects of the Union.—That those members who are in every respect Presbyterians, and have been for many years members of the General Body, still continue to sustain that relation; that their protest against the secession of the Presbyterian Body, and the reasons alleged in support of their continued connexion with the Union, have been cordially approved by the General Body; that the Union of the Ministers of the "Three Denominations" is thus inviolably preserved; and that the representations given to his Majesty's Government and the public, of the Union being dissolved, because certain Ministers of Unitarian principles have withdrawn from a body still consisting of more than one hundred and forty Ministers, are contrary to fact, and adapted to produce unwarranted and unjust impressions.

(10.) That the imputations contained in the alleged "reasons for withdrawal by the seceding ministers," reflecting on the General Body, as if any of its members were desirous of depriving them of their civil rights, or of "reviving the operation of penal statutes," are not accordant with fact, and unworthy the character of any party professing to regard the dictates of truth, justice, and charity.

F. A. COX, D. D., LL. D., Chairman.  
G. CLAYTON, Secretary.

From the Congregational Magazine for June.

*Further proceedings of the Unitarian Seceders from the three denominations.*

At an extraordinary meeting of the body of Presbyterian ministers residing in and about the cities of London and Westminster, specially convened to take into consideration certain resolutions, relating to the withdrawal of the Presbyterian body, purporting to have been passed by the General Body of the Three Denominations, held by adjournment at Dr. Williams' Library, Red Cross street, on May 2, 1836.

The Rev. Robert Apsland, in the chair.

(1.) It was resolved unanimously—that this body of Presbyterian ministers, residing in and about the cities of London and Westminster, by its constitution entire and independent, and entitled and empowered to determine its own measures, at a special meeting held 4th of March, 1836, did, by a deliberate vote, passed agreeably to the forms and usages which have been observed by the body from the period of its incorpora-

\* It is but just to acknowledge, that while these several reasons were urged by various members of the General Body, in support of the amendment which substituted the name of Mr. Clayton for that of Dr. Rees, as Secretary for the ensuing year, Messrs. Price and Blackburn, who moved and seconded that amendment, assigned as the reason for the change they proposed, the Unitarian opinions of Dr. Rees; and though it is impossible to prove that this is the prevalent reason, yet many circumstances might be alleged to justify that assertion.—*Editor of Cong. Mag.*

tion, withdraw itself from the two other bodies of Congregational and Anti-Pædobaptist ministers; and that the resolutions declaring and affecting this withdrawal, were officially communicated to the respective secretaries of the two other bodies, and were, in various ways laid before the public; and that therefore, we have seen with a stronger feeling than surprise, that those two bodies have associated with themselves three dissentients from the resolutions of this body, who are members of the Scottish Secession Church, and connected in discipline with an ecclesiastical synod in Scotland, and were never considered as English Presbyterians but by courtesy, and pronouncing these individuals to be the Presbyterian body, have assumed that the two bodies aforesaid, with the individuals above described, constitute "The General body of the Three Denominations of Protestant Dissenting Ministers," and under this character have issued a series of resolutions, bearing the date of April 18, 1836, relating to our withdrawal.

(2.) That while we do not dispute the right of the Congregational and Anti-Pædobaptist bodies to unite with one another, and to add to their united body any individuals whom they choose, and to denominate such union by any name or title which shall truly designate it, we feel ourselves bound, by a regard to our rights and privileges to resist and expose an attempt to extinguish this body, and to put in its place three individuals who, in strictness of speech are not English Protestant Dissenting Ministers; and that we do again declare in the face of the world, that the union of the three denominations of Protestant dissenting ministers is dissolved from the period of our withdrawal.

(3.) That we adhere to the former resolutions of the date of the 4th of March, which we are fully prepared to substantiate and defend. That having carefully examined the resolutions of the two denominations and others, we do not hesitate to pronounce, that in so far as they purport to be an answer to the resolutions of this body, they are irrelevant, inconsistent and evasive—that they are besides historically incorrect; and farther, that they completely justify the charge preferred by this body, of the violation, on the part of the majority of the General Body, of the first principles of the late Union, viz. that the theological opinions of the separate bodies and their individual members should never be called in question or brought into discussion—inasmuch as they assert that "the great majority" were "for many years," watchful as to the "doctrinal principles" of the minority,—as they admit, although cautiously, that the new election of the late secretary was owing to the religious sentiments not being in accordance with those of the majority,—as they declare cordial approbation of the protest of the three individuals dissenting from the resolutions of this body, amongst which reasons is an appeal to a late decision in a court of law, supposed (as we believe very erroneously) to adjudge the English Presbyterians to be "no Presbyterians," on account of their religious faith,—and moreover, as they uniformly studiously designate this body by a merely doctrinal term, which term is not and never was assumed by the body, and could not have been used in the General Body, except in breach of order, and is not a fair representation of this body in its collective capacity, since whatever may be the theological sentiments of individual members, into which no inquiry is allowed, all ministers otherwise duly qualified, are admitted into the body, who hold the fundamental Protestant Dissenting principle, (the fundamental principle at least, of the English Presbyterians from the time they were recognized by law,) of the right of the free and unlimited ex-

ercise of private judgment in matters of religion, together with the corresponding right to full christian communion on the acknowledgment of the divine mission of our Lord, and of subjection to his authority as the head of his church.

(4.) That we are willing to give credit to the declaration of the two denominations; disclaiming for themselves as bodies, the purpose or wish to revive and put in force the penal statutes against any of their dissenting brethren; and that we leave it to the individuals in those bodies who have taken part in or expressed approbation of the recent legal proceedings against some of the English Presbyterians, to vindicate their consistency in making such use, or seeing, without remonstrance, such use made, of the penal statutes as tends to deprive the English Presbyterians of trusts committed to their hands from their foundation, and of ecclesiastical endowments established by and inherited from their fathers.

(5.) That in this trying exigency, we have been encouraged and confirmed in our deliberate and conscientious determination of withdrawal by the sympathy of our lay brethren, the English Presbyterian deputies of the metropolis, as declared in their recently published resolutions, and also by the general assurance of the approbation and concurrence of the English Presbyterians, both ministers and laymen, throughout the country.

(6.) That it be referred to a committee, now to be appointed, to draw up and publish without delay, a statement in justification of such of the foregoing resolutions as relate to the resolutions of the two denominations, and the individuals associated with them.

THOMAS REES,

Secretary.

---

#### ART. VII. *Religious Intelligence.*

CHINA.—We copy the following from the London Evangelical Magazine just received.—*Ch. Int.*

“CHINA OPENED,” AND IN WHAT SENSE?—By SAMUEL DYER, a Missionary, eight years resident at one of the posts of observation.

*To the Editor of the Evangelical Magazine.*

DEAR SIR,—I should not presume to intrude myself upon your notice, and upon that of your readers, but from the impression upon my mind that British Christians to a very considerable extent, entertain erroneous views relative to the present aspect of China in relation to the missionary plans and operations. The prospect is, indeed, very bright and very glorious; but as yet we see it principally with the eyes of faith. Certain items of the prospect have, however, been of late more clearly developed: and with diffidence I offer the result of my observations upon these items respectively.

I ought, perhaps, first to *account* for a difference of opinion grounded upon the same facts, seeing that my observations differ from those which have of late been given to the public. We all know that there are some hearts which always burn, which are constantly in a flame,—full of holy love and holy zeal in the service of their blessed master; and they are highly privileged men, and men whose shoes we are not worthy to bear. And we want such men, to brave the dangers which we are too

timid to encounter. Their portion of the work is the most honorable to perform, and they are thrice blessed in their happy zeal. But then such men see with eyes peculiar to themselves; and, in sketching out a plan of operation, they will sketch a plan which none but themselves can execute,—yea, in their fiery ardor they will sketch a plan which even they cannot execute; only they have this advantage over us, that they remain undaunted, even though their plans should fail. I proceed to notice—

In my humble judgment there are some senses in which China is not yet open.

1. China is not generally opened to the reception of missionaries.—We need go no farther in proof of this assertion than the journals of very recent expeditions into the interior of China. It was most evident, on these occasions, that those who composed the expedition were watched with extreme jealousy; and on one occasion a party in a boat were fired on from both shores of a river, and driven back without being permitted to attain their object. It is true that the common people manifested no opposition to the strangers; but then, as soon as the authorities interfered, the common people slunk away in much timidity. But here is the point; as long as the authorities in China are so extremely jealous, however favorable the common people may be to the strangers, it is quite impossible for them to settle down among them. It would appear indeed, from some of the voyages along the eastern coast, that in some places perhaps a missionary might settle down for a month, or even two; but this is vastly different from what the case would be on the supposition that China were open to the reception of missionaries. If China were thus open, there are men upon the borders of the empire who would locate themselves within the walls of the city at the very first signal—yea, and even at the hazard of their lives, for “they love not their lives to the death.”

2. China is not yet open to the establishment of Christian schools; and,

3. China is not open to the printing of the scriptures and tracts in the interior. These follow of necessity from the first position; but with respect to this last there is this additional idea, that at Canton there were some moveable types (the character being cut upon the face of the metal.) which were cut for the use of the late lamented Dr. Morrison; and when I enquired for a few of them as specimens, I could not procure them, for they had been melted up during the late disturbances. However, it should be remembered that this was at Canton, where opposition is the strongest.

4. We want something more than bare assertion to prove the point in question; we want one missionary to settle, and having settled, and having made suitable attempts to publish the gospel to the people, let him write to us, and invite us to join him; and woe be to us if we refuse to come to the help of the Lord against the mighty!

II. There are other senses in which China is open. And here I would observe, that never was the prospect more bright, more glorious, than at this present day.

1. We can pour as many books into China as we can print. I speak not now of the Chinese colonies in the Archipelago, which would consume vastly more books annually than we can at present print; but into China Proper we can pour books by myriads. The trading expeditions to the eastward afford opportunities which we have seldom or never had

till most recently. Tracts and books are torn away from the distributors before they have time to open their packages. The avidity for our books is most striking; and, instead of one or two or three presses, we want a score, before we need have many books in store for lack of readers. If true, it is a most interesting fact, that Bhuddism spread over China by means of books, and books too that had no promise of a divine blessing to accompany the reading of them.

2. Never were our books better adapted to accomplish the desired end than at present. Leang Afa's tracts, at least many of them, are *beautifully simple*; the later tracts from the pen of the missionary at Batavia are most readily understood by the people. The Harmony of the Four Gospels, from the same pen, is most desirable. The revision of the Chinese Scriptures is going on under the most favorable auspices. Gospel truth is thus brought into more immediate contact with the Chinese mind than has ever been the case before. I do not mean barely to assert these things. I do not merely pass my own judgment; I appeal to the illiterate and uneducated Chinese—the poor emigrants from China; they point to certain books as most easily understood, and these are the very books we are now speaking of. I appeal to the well-educated and well-informed. I appeal to the Chinese classics themselves. Never were our books more idiomatic than at present.

3. The means of multiplying these books are rapidly increasing. Although I must needs speak with great diffidence on this head, I may state that beside the xylographic presses now in operation for China, typographic presses are preparing for four different missionary stations, and that when the preparatory work is accomplished, which makes progress from day to day, in eight months, and for £100, we can put any typographic press in operation in behalf of China; whereas the outlay for the first edition of 2000 copies of the Scriptures from a set of new blocks (blocks included) is nearly £2000.

Hoping that these brief remarks may assist, in some measure, in forming a just estimate for the present openings of usefulness in respect of China.

I am, sir,

Your obedient servant,

Straits of Malacca, Nov. 1835,

S. D.

ROMANISM IN FRANCE.—It would be an erroneous opinion to suppose that the Catholic influence in France is either small or rapidly diminishing. Far from it. The overwhelming mass of this nation is Roman Catholic without doubt. It is true, however, that a large portion of the French Catholics are liberal and tolerant. It is also true, that there is an increase of Catholicism in France within the last two or three years.

And here I may remark, that the history of the Catholic religion in France, during the last century, or century and a half, is truly remarkable. When, through a long struggle, the Catholics had put down the Protestants, and monopolized every thing about the government, they carried matters to such a pitch that enlightened men of the world became infidels, and by their writings Voltaire, D'Alembert, Diderot, and Rosseau, and their associates, succeeded in exposing the corruptions and oppressions of the Catholic church to contempt. The result was, the general prevalence of infidelity in France, and revolution of 1789-94, with all its horrors, and the destruction of the monarchy and

the church. Then succeeded, during the republic and the reign of Napoleon, a period of twenty years, in which the Catholic religion had but little influence upon the state and government. Its operation was quiet, unostentatious, and humble, and consequently few attempts were made to further propagate infidelity. And it is a remarkable fact, that few infidel works were published during that period. Very few editions of Voltaire's and Jean Jacques Rousseau's works were published during this period of twenty years.

But when the restoration took place, and Louis XVIII. came to the throne, succeeded by his brother Charles X., then came back the Catholic religion, not strictly speaking as to its existence (for it had been re-established nearly twenty years, by the influence of Bonaparte,) but in its former power, its superstitions, its external processions, its crucifixes in the streets, and its persecuting spirit. The court was ruled by the priesthood, and it seemed as if in a few years the country had gone back almost a century into ignorance and persecution. And what was the consequence of all this? The press began to teem again with attacks made upon Christianity, or, in other words, upon the Catholic religion, which was considered the same thing. New and large editions of the worst of Voltaire's and J. J. Rousseau's works were called for and circulated all over France; and the grand battle was fought between bigotry and infidelity, in which tyranny and liberty were also enlisted. The result was, that liberty and infidelity triumphed. Perfect toleration of religious opinion was to a good degree secured, and for a time the Catholic religion received a severe blow. Many thought it was a death blow; but it was not so. It was soon found that there was need of religion to sustain good order. All good and prudent men have seen and felt this. They have feared the re-enacting of the scenes of the first revolution. The consequence has been, for the last three years especially, an increasing return of the people to the Catholic church. This has simply been owing to the fact, that they have not known whither else to go. It is true, indeed, that evangelical religion has made much progress; but the laborers have been too few to make a sensible impression on the masses of people in this nation. And this is now the simple state of the case. Catholicism is increasing; but it is only the return of many who were for a time carried away from it by the political principles of the late revolution. It is nothing more than that.

It may be interesting to your readers to see a statement of the appropriations from the treasury for the maintenance of religion for the year 1837. It is as follows:

*1. For Catholic Worship.*

14 archbishops, including two cardinals,	240,000 fr.
66 bishops,	660,000
174 vicars-general	365,000
660 canons (attached to cathedrals)	1,003,500
3,301 cures,	4,190,100
20,705 parish priests,	20,900,000
5,419 vicars,	1,896,650
2,525 bourses (scholarships) at 400 frs. each,	1,019,000
<b>Total, 30,426 priests, &amp;c.</b>	<b>34,276,600 frs.</b>
	<b>or \$6,389,362 50</b>



**2. For Protestant Worship.**

For the support of 366 pastors of the Reformed Church, and 230 of the Augsburg Confession (Lutheran), in all 595,890 frs., or \$166,875.

In this sum is included 30 bourses (scholarships or bourses) of 400 frs. each, and 60 demi-bourses, at 200 frs. each, for the education of young men for the ministry.

Although the amount given to support the Catholic worship appears considerable, yet it is not one fourth part of what was given for the same object before the revolution of 1789.

---

**CONGREGATIONAL UNION OF SCOTLAND.**—This body met in Edinburgh on the 4th of May. We find a brief account of their proceedings in the London Congregational Magazine for June. Mr. Scales, a delegate who attended from the sister body in England, in a letter to the editor of that work, says "In the evening of the day of meeting, a *soirée* of the friends of the Union was held in the assembly room. Mr. W. L. Alexander, pastor of the church in Argyle Square Chapel, presided, and above eight hundred persons were present; the spectacle was altogether brilliant and imposing, and the proceedings of the evening were of a most pleasing character; there was a sober cheerfulness, a high state of feeling, joyous and exhilarating at times, yet rational, sacred, and spiritual throughout. There were no formal resolutions. Mr. Ewing spoke of the origin and progress of Congregationalism in Scotland; Mr. Cornwall, on Revivals of Religion; Dr. Russell, on Christian Love and Unity; Mr. M'Ray, on Slavery in America, a subject which is now exciting much attention in this country, and about which our brethren appear to feel very strongly. Near the close of the meeting Mr. George Thompson came in from Glasgow, and was enthusiastically received. He addressed the meeting with powerful interest on the state of American slavery."

From a report of the proceedings of the body in the Edinburgh Patriot, we learn that the Rev. Dr. Wardlaw, of Glasgow, proposed a series of resolutions on the subject of American Slavery, which were seconded by Dr. Russell, supported by Mr. George Thompson, and unanimously adopted. We have not room for them this week. We may perhaps insert them, with some comments, hereafter. We fear that the efforts of our good brethren in Scotland, though no doubt well intended, will rather injure than promote the cause they have so much at heart. They must not take their representations of the state of things in this country from such men as Mr. Thompson.—*N. Y. Ch. Obs.*

---

**SCOTCH BAPTISTS.**—An article in the London Baptist Magazine, presents but a melancholy picture of the present state of the Baptists in Scotland, so far as regards christian union. It appears that there are two classes of them, known by the name of Scotch and English Baptists. The English Baptists are the same in their government and discipline as the churches of that denomination in England, with this difference, that in general they partake of the Lord's Supper every Sabbath instead of once a month. The Scotch Baptists are somewhat different, contending for a plurality of elders, mutual exhortation by the brethren on the Lord's day, and disapproving of pastoral support, &c.; but so miserably divided are they, not only from each other, but among themselves, that the remark has become almost proverbial in

Scotland: "The Baptists are a mere rope of sand." The writer, himself a Baptist, while lamenting this state of things, admits that the facts are undeniable. "They are facts too notorious to admit of contradiction; for it may with safety be affirmed that there is not a denomination of christians in all Scotland, Presbyterian, Relief, Secession, or Independent, but what has got the start of the Baptists so far as Scriptural union is concerned." S.

**CONVERTS FROM POPYRY IN IRELAND.**—We learn from a late minister of the Dublin Record, that one of the most highly esteemed priests of the Roman Communion in that city, recently sought an interview with a clergyman of the Established Church, avowed to him his conviction of the errors of the church of Rome, and expressed his determination to withdraw from her communion. The Record adds:

Amongst the laity a considerable movement is also perceptible, and several highly respectable persons have recently left the mystical Babylon, we trust never to return under its galling yoke. Not many days since, Mrs. Edwards, a Roman Catholic lady, requested her confessor, the Rev. Dr. O'Reilly, to appoint a day, when he would, according to his repeated promises, remove some very distressing doubts which had arisen in her mind. The Reverend Gentleman accordingly waited upon her at her house. The lady had so arranged matters that two Protestants, one of whom had formerly been a Romish priest, but is now, we firmly believe, a faithful servant of the Lord (we allude to the Rev. Mr. Nolan) should be present at the interview between her and her former spiritual adviser. The objections were stated, but were not answered to the lady's satisfaction. Her understanding as well as her conscience had been awakened; and the sophistry which previously had been adequate to keep her in the regions of spiritual darkness, now proved totally unavailing. The Protestant gentleman propounded several questions to the priest, which he felt himself quite unable to answer. He became manifestly uncomfortable, and made several attempts to quit the apartment with as good a grace as possible. The lady and her other visitors, however, contrived to detain him; and the controversy was carried on with vigor, until his Reverence virtually struck his colors, and the lady declared herself fully persuaded that she had previously been the victim of a system of delusion which she was resolved from that hour to repudiate. An authentic account of the particulars of Mrs. Edward's reformation has just appeared, we have been told, from the pen of the Rev. Mr. Nolan himself. We also expect to be able, in a few days, to announce the conversion of another Roman Catholic clergyman of this city, with regard to whom, circumstances prevent us from being more explicit at present.

A previous number of the Record had contained the following announcement.

A Roman Catholic priest, named Swaine, hitherto engaged as an officiating clergyman in the Carmelite chapel, adjoining York-row, has abandoned the Romish persuasion. For some time past it appears that his mind was seriously affected with doubt as to the purity of the religion in which he was educated. Having determined to renounce the Church of Rome, his intention was communicated to a superior priest, whose conscience was in perfect peace on the question of religion. This confidant, we are informed, offered Mr. Swaine a considerable sum of money, if he would give up his intention, and apply personally at the

Court of Rome for absolution. However, the plan did not succeed, and Mr. Swaine is now on his way to America, with letters of recommendation from one of the dignitaries of the Established Church.

---

ART. VIII. *Miscellany.*

**RELAXED VIEWS OF TRUTH.**—The editor of the *Charleston Observer*, in an apology for the rigidly Orthodox, refers to the unhappy effects on truth produced by the vain attempt of the great Baxter to cement a union between truth and error, and quotes the following paragraphs from "*Orme's Life of Baxter.*"—*Presbyterian.*

"In illustration of the influence now adverted to, it must be remarked, that the first stage in the process of deterioration which took place among the Presbyterian Dissenters, was generally characterized by the term *Baxterianism*; a word to which it is difficult to attach a definite meaning. It describes no separate sect or party, but rather a system of opinions on doctrinal points, verging towards Arminianism, and which ultimately passed to Arianism and Socinianism. Even during Baxter's own life, while the Presbyterians taxed the Independents with Antinomianism, the latter retorted the charge of Socinianism, or at least with a tendency towards it, in some of the opinions maintained both by Baxter and others of that party. To whatever cause it is to be attributed, it is a melancholy fact, that the declension which began even at this early period in the Presbyterian body, went on slowly, but surely, till from the most fervid orthodoxy, it finally arrived in England, at the frigid zone of Unitarianism."

"I wish not to be understood as stating that Baxter either held any opinions of this description, or was conscious of a tendency in his sentiments towards such a fearful consummation, but that there was an injurious tendency to his manner of discussing certain important subjects. It was subtle, and full of logomachy; it tended to unsettle, rather than to fix and determine; it gendered strife rather than godly edifying. It is not possible to study such books as his *Methodus*, and his *Catholic Theology*, without experiencing that we are brought into a different region from apostolic Christianity; a region of fierce debate and altercation about words, and names, and opinions; in which all that can be said for error is largely dwelt upon, as well as what can be said of truth. The ambiguities of language, the divisions of sects; the uncertainties of human perception and argument, are urged, till the force of revealed truth is considerably weakened, and confidence in our own judgment of its meaning greatly impaired. Erroneous language is maintained to be capable of sound meaning, and the most Scriptural phrases to be capable of unscriptural interpretation, till truth and error almost change places, and the mind is bewildered, confounded, and paralyzed. In this mode of discussing such subjects, was this most excellent man led, partly by the natural constitution of his mind, which has often been adverted to; partly by his ardent desire of putting an end to the divisions of the Christian world, and producing universal concord and harmony. He failed where success was impossible, however plausible might have been the means which he employed. He understood the causes of difference and contention better than their remedies; hence the measures which he used frequently aggravated instead of curing the disease."

---

**BRITISH IDOLATRY.**—This title, to the extract which we give below,

from the letter of a correspondent of the London Record residing in India, is far more correct and proper than that of "American slavery," to the articles which under this head are now circulating in English Magazines and newspapers. It has long been the disgrace of the British government, that her Protestant soldiers are compelled, even on the holy Sabbath, to aid in the mumeries and idolatrous ceremonies of Papists and Mahometans. We are happy to find that the good people are at last beginning to awake to the importance of cleansing themselves from this sin. Mr. Plumptre has given notice of his intention to introduce a motion on the subject at the present session of the British parliament.—*N. Y. Ch. Observer.*

"You are probably aware that both by His Majesty's regulations and by the articles of war, the European troops are required to attend divine service at their respective places of worship on the morning of the Lord's day. Yet in direct opposition to this praiseworthy regulation, and more than this, in daring violation of the Divine command, the whole of the European artillery were kept from church, and employed the greater part of one of the Sabbath days in Lent, in firing a series of salutes in honor of a Mahomedan festival! I will only add, that I am credibly informed that this subject was made the ground of a presentation to the ordinary, and a representation to the Government, of which no notice whatever has, up to this time, been taken, or, as far as I have been able to ascertain, any means adopted to prevent a repetition of so extraordinary a desecration of that day, which is specially appointed to be kept holy, as being the Sabbath of the Lord our God. It is quite unnecessary that I should stop to remark on the dishonour thus done to the Gospel of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, or the encouragement and triumph (so injurious to missionary exertions) afforded to the false prophet. I pass on to inform you secondly, that the band of one of His Majesty's regiments, consisting with one exception, of Protestants, members of the Church of England, and six of them pious men and communicants, were at a later period compelled on two occasions, to attend the Roman Catholic chapel, taking part in the service, and especially in that part of it where the host is elevated. Both times the men were plentifully supplied with liquor by the priest, at whose house they played for some hours, and who drank with them, and they were marched back to their barracks, several of them in a state of intoxication, on the Lord's day, two or three hours only before the holy communion was administered, in which several of them were to join.

"Many of your readers will wonder how this should be, when his Majesty's regulations so distinctly forbid a Roman Catholic soldier being ordered to attend a Protestant place of worship. They will naturally argue that, by parity of reason, the Protestant's conscientious scruples should be respected, particularly when he is a member of that pure and Apostolical Church which publicly and justly denounces the sacrifice of the mass as a 'blasphemous fable and dangerous deceit;' but in this they give proof of their honest simplicity! They need but to visit our colonies, and especially this of India, to know that the Protestant's conscience is the last thing considered.

"The religious scruples either of the Mahomedan or of the Heathen, or Christian idolater, are accounted sacred, and even applauded, but not so those of the Protestant, though they are based upon the Word of God, the blessed and only Potentate, the King of kings, and Lord of lords.

**THE GENEVA PRESBYTERY ON INSTRUMENTAL MUSIC.**—The following article has been put into our hands, with a request that we would publish it. It gives us an additional exemplification of what has been too frequent in the church, the gradual introduction and increase of vain or superstitious rites. *Paulatim*—little by little, is the way in which all errors and extravagances and superstitions obtain prevalence in the church. We confess we were scarcely prepared for a solemn presbyterial *recommendation* of the use of instrumental music in the churches in all cases where it is possible.—*Ch. Magazine.*

The following question came up for advice, from the session of the church in Waterloo, viz: Is the use of instrumental music in divine worship consistent with Presbyterianism?

Whereupon, the question was put to all the members of the presbytery, and unanimously answered that instrumental music in divine worship is consistent with Presbyterianism and the gospel; and that they not only highly approve of the same, but would also recommend to all the churches under their care, where it can be done, to secure the aid of such music in the public praise of the sanctuary.—*Extract from Minutes.*

**WM. WIRT AND POLITICS.**—In the Memoirs of the Rev. Dr. Rice, just issued from the press, we find a letter from the late excellent and amiable Wm. Wirt, in which he thus amusingly expresses his unfitness for political life. ‘I am sick of public life; my skin is too thin for the business; a politician should have the hide of a rhinoceros to bear the thrusts of the folly, ignorance and meanness of those who are disposed to mount into momentary consequence by questioning *their betters*,—if I may be excused the expression after professing my modesty. ‘There’s naught but care on every hand;’ all, all is vanity and vexation of spirit, save religion, friendship and literature.’

**CLAUSE IN AN ANTIENT LEASE.**—“Our respected friend, Gen-Stephen Van Rensselaer,” says the Christian Intelligencer, “has shown us a clause in an ancient lease given by one of his ancestors. This lease was given at the first ettlement in that district of country, when for a length of time the want of a regular ministry was expected to exist. We copy the clause not only as curious in itself, but also as showing the care of our forefathers in promoting religious observances, and the order of their own church in their earliest settlements.

1651. A LEASE FROM THE DIRECTOR OF RENSSELAERWICK FOR THE OLD MAIZE LAND AT CATTSKILL.

*The tenant to read a sermon or portions of the Scriptures every Sunday, and high festival, to the Christians in the neighborhood, and sing one or more psalms before, and after prayers, agreeable to the custom of the church of Holland.*

**ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD.**—The Associate Presbytery of Albany, on the 24th ult. ordained to the office of the holy ministry Mr. Hugh H. Blair, and installed him in the pastoral charge of the 2nd Associate Congregation in the city of New-York. Sermon by the Rev. John G. Smart—Charges by the Rev. James Martin.

The same Presbytery, at a meeting held in Albany on the 20th of July, licensed Mr. Chauncey Webster to preach the everlasting gospel.

THE

# RELIGIOUS MONITOR,

AND

EVANGELICAL REPOSITORY.

---

OCTOBER, 1836.

---

ART. I.—*Review of an Account of the Secession from the Established Church of Scotland, and of the principles of the Seceders, contained in the first and second numbers of the Biblical Repository, for 1835.*

(Continued from page 182.)

#### THE ACT CONCERNING THE DOCTRINE OF GRACE.

The act concerning the doctrine of grace, was passed by the Associate Presbytery, October, 1742, after having been about two years under consideration. "The object of it," says the Repository, "was plainly enough announced in the title page, where, 'Errors vented and published in some acts of the Assemblies of the church' are particularly mentioned." Very well. A work is not the worse that there is no concealment of the design. But the evident intention of this remark is to insinuate that the design was evil, that the Seceders were seeking for some things in the acts of Assemblies, "to make a handle of," as in the affair of Captain Porteus. They were anxious to find faults, even though only imaginary. "We think," say they, "we see already the tendency manifested to depart as far as possible, from the commonly received opinions of the Established church." This charge in this place seems to occupy an unfortunate position, seeing this controversy had not originated after the Secession, but was carried on between the Orthodox and the Neologists or Legalists, before this event, so that in no act of the Secession, could there have been less reason to accuse them of taking up new opinions, in order to widen the difference between them and the establishment. Both parties are represented by the Repository, as holding the same Confession of Faith, but differing, as many do in the present day, by different modes of interpretation. However, it is more than insinuated that the real departure from this venerable standard, was on the part of the Seceders,

for it is added, "Though at first, the Secession was not on account of false doctrines held by the Established church, yet, from the period when this event occurred, there was an evident divergence in their opinions from those of the older divines." They evidently mean that this divergence was on the part of the Secession, as appears from the connexion. So that, though they complained that "gospel doctrine got the name of a *new scheme*," the complaint must have been owing to their own departure "from the commonly received opinions." Enough has already been said, to show that if the first Seceders might be allowed as judges of their own reasons of Secession, a principal one was that the Assembly "were pursuing such measures as did actually corrupt, or had the most direct tendency to corrupt the doctrine contained in their excellent Confession of Faith." To this Confession the Seceders also continued to adhere with the greatest strictness, and though it is an easy thing to assert, it would be another thing to prove that the divergence from it was on their part. The act concerning the doctrine of grace does not prove this. A man may interpret grace to mean merit, and the Confession of Faith to be a system of Arminian, or Hopkinsian doctrine, but yet no one in the sober exercise of reason, will place such interpretations on equal footing with those which agree to the letter and spirit of the thing explained. The act on the doctrine of grace agrees to the views which were entertained of the Confession of Faith, by Mr. Boston, and the other eleven, who defended the same truths contained in this act, in their representation, and in their answers to the twelve queries; and we have seen nothing in the Repertory, or elsewhere, to show that their views of the Confession are not correct.

In Scotland, where the parties are best known, it would probably be regarded as a singular defence of the Established church to maintain that the divergence in doctrine from the Confession had been on the part of the Seceders. We believe the strongest ground occupied by the enemies of the Seceders there, has been that the departures of the Established church alluded against them, do not exist, or are not so grievous as represented. We have never before seen it asserted that the Established church adheres more strictly to the Confession than the Seceders. The favorite author of the Repertory may here be quoted to some purpose against them. The utmost that Sir H. Moncrieff maintains, is that in respect to principle and practice, there is no essential difference between the parties. Though he concedes not the whole truth in this case, yet he is much nearer to it than our brethren of the Repertory, and being better acquainted with the facts, is entitled to greater credit.

"The Separatists in Scotland, says he, on all subjects of discipline and pastoral duty, follow the same general rules with the Established church. They make no innovations in the forms of worship, or in their public doctrines; and the manner in which they discharge their clerical functions, is exactly the same with that which distinguishes the parochial clergy.—There is no essential difference in the education, in the doctrines, in the standards, or in the general character of the established and the Seceding clergy. They are all attached to the same constitution of the Presbyterian church, and have all the same general ideas of pastoral duty." This is certainly a wonderful degree of likeness, after the Seceders have been in existence more than a hundred years, and yet all this time, according to the Repertory, laboring to widen the difference by departing "as far as possible from the commonly received opinions of the Established church."

The origin of the controversy, which occasioned the act concerning the doctrine of grace, was the condemnation by the Assembly of 1717, of the following proposition advanced by the Presbytery of Auchterarder, "That it is not sound and orthodox to teach that we must forsake sin, in order to our coming to Christ." This proposition that Presbytery had adopted with some others, for their satisfaction in the trial of young men, many of whom were infected with Arminian and Baxterian doctrines: and one of them had appealed against it to the General Assembly. It was deservedly noticed by the Seceders, that on the same day that Professor Simpson, after having taught errors quite subversive of the gospel, was dismissed without any censure except that he had used "expressions that bear, and are used by adversaries in a bad and unsound sense," the Assembly condemned the above proposition of the Presbytery in the strongest terms, declaring their "abhorrence" of it as "unsound and most detestable."

The Repertory treats the dispute about this proposition, as a very trivial affair. They call it "a mere dispute about the exact order of exercises in the conversion of a sinner, while as to the nature and essence of the work, there was no difference at all." If so, they may at least admit that the Assembly were very wrong in their severe sentence against the opinion of the Presbytery. Something is said by the Editors, in opposition to the proposition, and something also, in its favor, "Forsaking sin," they say, "is involved in the very act of coming." "When a sinner comes to Christ, he comes either forsaking his sin, or cleaving to it." And yet they admit "that the simple act of believing is in the order of nature prior to all acts of penitence or love." And then they give up the question as a metaphysical distinction into which the Scriptures enter not, and which savours "more of the captious spirit of the Schoolmen, than of the simplicity of the gospel."

From these sentiments, we feel constrained to dissent, notwithstanding the respectable source from which they emanate. The order of things is often a main point. It is of great consequence in many of the common affairs of this world, and much more in things which respect our eternal salvation. Christ makes it of consequence, whether the tree or the fruit shall be first made good, and whether the offering of the gift shall be first, or reconciliation to a brother; and the order of gracious exercises, is often noticed as not a mere scholastic distinction, but a reality, and worthy of being carefully observed. "Faith worketh patience, &c." "Add to your faith, virtue; and to virtue, knowledge, &c." In the present case it appears to us plain, that the Scriptures teach that there can be no forsaking of sin, before coming to Christ, and that the opposite doctrine, which is, that sinners should forsake their sins before coming to him, is quite subversive of the true gospel. It would lead to the conclusion that we can do something without Christ; that we do not absolutely need him to save us from all our sins; that we need not, and should not come to him without a price; that we are not warranted at once to believe in him when he is preached, but should prepare ourselves for faith by forsaking our sins; that it is not true, that "Whatsoever is not of faith, is sin," seeing without faith we can forsake sin; and that we must in part, heal ourselves, and then come to the physician. A great part of the controversy between the Reformers and the Papists turned upon a question not unlike the present. It was this, whether works done by the natural man, could entitle him to supernatural grace. If sinners are left to believe that forsaking sin is, in order, before believing on Christ, they will very naturally



regard this forsaking of sin as entitling them to believe on him ; and this too is the popular doctrine of the day, that the promises of pardon are made to certain qualifications, such as repentance and reformation of life. It is a pity that the Repertory should lend its aid so far to doctrines so opposite to the true gospel.

The tendency to legal or Arminian doctrine, manifested in the condemnation of the aforesaid proposition, appeared still more evident in the Assembly's condemnation of the doctrines contained in a book called, "The Marrow of Modern Divinity," written by Mr. Edward Fisher of England. Certain passages extracted from this book, were condemned by the Assembly of 1720 ; also in the year 1722, by an act concerning doctrine, confirming and explaining the aforesaid acts of the Assembly of 1720. Some notice has already been taken of this proceeding, in stating the grounds of the process against the Seceders. A full history of this affair would swell to a volume, instead of a few pages of a review ; and it is by no means easy to give a brief account, which will be either clear or satisfactory. We must, therefore, content ourselves with a few remarks, referring those who feel an interest in this controversy, and who wish to see one of the most clear statements, and able defences of the doctrine of the gospel, to the original papers ; particularly, to "a full and true state of the controversy concerning the Marrow of Modern Divinity, as debated between the general Assembly, and several ministers in the years 1720 and 1721. Containing the act of Assembly concerning the Marrow, the representation and petition of the twelve ministers against that act, the twelve Queries agreed upon by the Commission of the Assembly to be put to the said Ministers, answers given in by these ministers to these Queries, authorities of eminent Divines with respect to said queries, and, the controversy concerning the Marrow considered in a familiar dialogue." The reader is also referred to the act of the Associate Presbytery, concerning the doctrine of grace, or to Mr. Gib's Display, in which that act is contained with some slight abridgment.

The object of this act of the Associate Presbytery, is not fairly represented in the Repertory, and they seem less excusable in this instance than in some others, as they appear to have had the Act itself before them, which disavows the object attributed to it. "The more immediate object of this Act," says the Repertory, "was to censure the General Assembly for their treatment of a work entitled, "The Marrow of Modern Divinity." And again, "It is manifest that the object of this Act was to defend 'The Marrow of Modern Divinity' from the objections and censures of the General Assembly." Let us hear the account which the Presbytery give of their own design. "The Associate Presbytery did, and hereby do judge it their duty, according to the powers given them by the Lord Jesus Christ as a judicatory of his house, to assert"—what ? The soundness or usefulness of some book ? Not at all ; but, "to assert the truth from the holy Scriptures, and our Standards of doctrine concerning the *free grace* of God, in the Salvation of mankind lost ; in opposition,"—not to unjust strictures upon an obscure author of a former age, but "to the corrupt doctrine vented in some acts of Assemblies, darkening and enervating the same." The Seceders never interested themselves particularly in this book. They never professed to regard it as unexceptionable. Mr. Erskine as we have stated was accustomed to admit that there were unguarded expressions in it ; but they complained that "The Assembly had given a deep wound to the

gospel doctrine of free grace, by condemning several precious and important truths, through the sides of that book." The writings of the greatest heretics, may sometimes contain valuable truths mixed with their errors: and it is surely not difficult to see how these truths are the same in themselves, wherever they are found, and that the condemnation of them, cannot be justified on account of the evil nature and tendency of the book which contains them; and the defence of them does not necessarily imply the defence of the book, or of any thing erroneous contained in it. It is altogether unfair to represent the act of the Seceders concerning the doctrine of grace, as the mere defence of "The Marrow of Modern Divinity." They believe this to be a book in general sound and useful, but it would not alter the case, if it were of an opposite character. The Seceders complained respecting the doctrines condemned, and of the injury done to the truth, not particularly of the injury done to the book.

The Repertory gives us an analysis of this "act concerning the doctrine of grace," agreeably to their notion of its object. There were six heads of doctrine noticed in the act of the Assembly, under each of which, they accused the "Marrow" of error in passages cited from it. The second of these, though for the sake of order, treated as the first in the act of the Presbytery was,

1. "*Of Universal Atonement and Pardon.*"

Under this head, the Assembly refer to these among other passages of the book which they of course condemn: "The Father hath made a deed of gift and grant unto all mankind, that whosoever of them all shall believe in his Son shall not perish." "Hence it was, that Christ said to his disciples, *go and preach the gospel to every creature under heaven*, that is, go and tell every man without exception, that here is good news for him, *Christ is dead for him.*" "Here," says the act of Assembly, "is asserted an universal redemption as to purchase." But as the Presbytery show in their act, the author clearly teaches the doctrine of particular redemption, and that Christ represented the elect and suffered for them only. And as these passages cannot be understood as teaching a universal atonement, it must be something else, which is intended in the condemnatory sentence of the Assembly. It is obvious that under the misapplied term of universal redemption, they condemn the unlimited offer of Christ to mankind sinners as such; their view is that Christ is only offered, or granted to persons having certain qualifications, and that the gospel alone is not a sufficient warrant for us to receive Christ as ours. The Presbytery proceeds to prove that there is an unlimited giving, or grant of Christ to all, though many refuse to receive him, and after asserting the truth on this subject, they condemn the following errors in which they consider the Assembly involved by their condemnation of the Marrow: 1. "That the free, unlimited and universal offer of Christ in the gospel, to sinners of mankind as such, is inconsistent with particular redemption; or, that God the Father's making a deed of gift unto all mankind, that whosoever of them shall believe on his Son, shall not perish, but have everlasting life, infers a universal atonement or redemption as to purchase. 2. That this grant or offer is made only to the elect, or to such as have previous qualifications commending them above others."

"If," says the Repertory, "the Assembly only misapprehended the meaning of the 'Marrow,'—and yet were sound in their own opinions

respecting the extent of the atonement, why bring this forward as a sign of great defection." The preceding notice of the act, is a sufficient answer to this question. The Presbytery considered that the free unlimited offer of Christ, was condemned under the name of "universal atonement."

## 2. "Concerning the Nature of Faith."

The first head treated of in the act of the Assembly, and the second noticed in the act of the Presbytery, is concerning the nature of Faith. The principal passage cited from the "Marrow," and condemned under this head is this, "Be verily persuaded in your heart, that Jesus Christ is yours, and that you shall have life and salvation by him, that whatsoever Christ did for the redemption of mankind, he did it for you." In vindicating the truth in opposition to this act of the Assembly, the Presbytery distinguish between the assurance of faith, arising from reflection which respects the certainty of our being believers; and the assurance which is in the nature of faith, which respects the promise of the gospel and is an appropriating persuasion, that Christ is ours in particular. They prove by a number of satisfactory arguments, that there is such an appropriating persuasion in faith, and conclude by condemning various doctrines which they regard as taught by the act of Assembly. "1. That saving and justifying faith, is *not* a persuasion in the heart that Christ is ours, that we shall have life and salvation by him; and that whatsoever Christ did for the redemption of mankind, he did it for us. 2. That all the persuasion in justifying faith, is only *a belief and persuasion of the mercy of God in Christ; and of Christ's ability and willingness to save all that come unto him*: This being such a faith as Papists and Arminians can subscribe unto, in a consistency with their other errors and heresies. 3. That one must first come to Christ, and be a true believer, before he appropriates Christ, and the whole of his salvation to himself, upon Scripture ground and warrant: Whereby the true nature of faith is subverted."

The expressions of the Marrow condemned by the Assembly are said by the Repertory to have been "bold and unwarrantable." It is admitted that they were "bold." So are many expressions used by believers, which have the sanction of the Scriptures. The word of God teaches us to use great boldness, and boldness of the same kind which appears in the expressions of this author. As to these expressions being unwarrantable, we are not prepared to admit it, until something more specific is alleged. The reader's attention is again turned away from the question of the truth to the book. "The Associate Presbytery," it is said, "seem to consider the book as free from error; for they enter into an elaborate defence of every opinion to which objection had been made." And it is added that "this controversy about the nature and object of faith is still *sub judice*, and is intricate and thorny." The editors "do not intend to enter into it, further than to say, that in [their] opinion it has done no good." So it seems they are not willing that it should remain "*sub judice*" any longer, for they have dismissed both sides from the bar with disgrace. But why should this question be regarded as *sub judice* more than a thousand others. It is true there are still disputes about it, and the question may never be settled to the satisfaction of all, but what doctrine of the Bible is not in the same situation? The very existence of the divine Being is disputed, and it may never cease to be a disputed point, yet shall we regard every thing which is disputed

as doubtful, and dismiss the most momentous questions with the summary judgment, the controversy respecting them, "has done no good?"

It is surely of great importance that sinners should be made acquainted with the object, the nature, the warrant, and the evidences of faith. The peculiar relation in which it stands to our salvation, renders a mistake respecting it, like a mistake in entering on our way, which may make a long and painful journey mere travelling out of the road. The receiving or appropriating of Christ, which is the same thing, is a doctrine of vital importance. If saving faith necessarily includes this appropriating persuasion, or acceptance of Christ as ours, on the simple ground of his giving himself to us in the gospel; then he that does not comply with the gospel by thus receiving Christ, is destitute of this saving faith, and if he be encouraged to think that a general belief in Christ, as the Saviour, is sufficient, he will be deceived and ruined.

But though the Repertory professes to dismiss the question without any judgment upon its merits, their defence of Dr. Scougal can only agree with the denial of the appropriating persuasion maintained by the Seceders. In the introduction to this act, the Presbytery had noticed Dr. Scougal's "Life of God in the soul of man" as "a book calculated to lead off from the righteousness of Christ without us, to a righteousness within us, and inward *sensations* as a ground of pardon and acceptance."—"Now," says the Repertory, "we are bold to affirm that none have more injured and dishonored the doctrine of the righteousness of Christ *without us*, than those men who have endeavored to separate it from a righteousness *within us*; not as a ground of pardon and acceptance, which Scougal never taught, but as the end of justification by the righteousness of Christ, and the only scriptural evidence that we have any participation of this righteousness." Passing over the insinuation contained in this extract against the Seceders, and such as concur in their views of grace, we would only ask to what the doctrine advanced in it natively leads. "If righteousness within us be the *only* scriptural evidence that we have any participation of the righteousness of Christ;" then we cannot believe in Christ as *our righteousness* until we have a righteousness within us, unless we believe this without the only scriptural evidence of it. We must then work righteousness before we dare claim the righteousness of Christ. Is not this advocating the very doctrine attributed to Dr. Scougal? Is it not leading to a righteousness of our own as the ground of our trust in Christ for pardon and acceptance? And is it not plainly denying that there is any assurance, persuasion or evidence in faith itself? God is represented in the gospel as giving us Christ and all the blessings of the covenant freely. He brings them near to the worst of men, the stout hearted and those that are far from righteousness without any respect to qualifications, preparations, or any thing else in those to whom this offer is made, except that they are lost and perishing sinners. What is the duty of those to whom this offer is made? Would it agree to this rich grace, or be honorable to this liberal giver, to say, "we will not believe on the ground of the liberality, truth and faithfulness of the giver, we will only believe when we find ourselves in the enjoyment of these blessings. The grace and faithfulness of God in the gospel offer go for nothing with us; the evidence, and the only evidence which will satisfy us, will be the actual possession of the things offered? We will not believe God's word, but only our own experience." Yet this appears to be the very nature of that faith whose *only* evidence is righteousness of life. The doctrine of the Seceders respecting faith as

stated in this act is the same with that of the Confession of Faith and Catechisms which define faith to be a grace, by which "the sinner receives Christ, and rests on him and his righteousness for pardon of sin, and for accepting and accounting of *his person* as righteous in the sight of God for salvation." "Faith receiveth and applieth Christ and his righteousness." "By faith they receive and apply unto themselves Christ crucified, and all the benefits of his death." &c. [Larg. Cat. quest. 72, 73, 170, 189. Shorter Cat. quest. 86.]

### 3. "*Holiness not necessary to salvation.*"

Under this head the Assembly condemned the following expressions of the "Marrow." "If the law say, good works must be done, and the commandment must be kept, if thou wilt obtain salvation, then answer you and say, I am already saved before thou camest; therefore I have no need of thy presence,—Christ is my righteousness, my treasure and my work, I confess, O law! that I am neither Godly nor righteous, but this yet I am sure of, that he is Godly and righteous for me." Again, "Good works may rather be called a believer's walking in the way of eternal happiness than the way itself." This doctrine, says the Assembly's act, tends to slacken people's diligence in the study of holiness, contrary to Heb. xii. 14, &c. &c.

The Repertory only notices here that the Presbytery "strenuously contend" in defence of the sound meaning of the author. What the mind of the editors is, appears from their asserting under this and other heads that the "Marrow" contained the errors alledged by the Assembly. They say, for instance that, "the third error of the "Marrow of Modern Divinity," which the Assembly condemned, was that "holiness is not necessary to salvation." That the book really taught such a pernicious doctrine, will scarcely be supposed by any candid person who reads it. But as we have nothing except assertion to support such weighty accusations, we shall leave them upon that frail pillar; and only add a list of the errors which the Presbytery regarded as implied in the different acts of the Assembly under this head.

"1. That the gospel strictly taken, is a new, proper and preceptive law, with sanction; binding to faith, repentance, and the other duties which are consequential to the revelation of the grace of God. 2. That though the righteousness of Christ only founds our *title* to eternal glory, yet it is our *personal* holiness, or our own obedience to the new law, upon which we obtain the *possession* thereof. 3. That our personal holiness or good works have a *causal influence* upon our eternal salvation, and are a *federal and conditional* mean thereof; in which sense the Assembly's directing ministers to preach the necessity of a holy life in order to the obtaining of everlasting happiness, is of very dangerous consequence to the doctrine of *free grace.*"

The Presbytery have a reference in their act not only to the act of the Assembly, 1720, above mentioned, but also to the act of Assembly, 1722, which accounts for the notice of some errors not implied in the former deed.

### 4. "*Fear of Punishment and Hope of Reward, not allowed to be motives of a Believer's Obedience.*"

The passage particularly cited in proof of this charge is this. "Would you not have believers to eschew evil and do good for fear of hell, or hope of heaven? *Answer*—No, indeed,—for so far forth as they do so,

their obedience is but slavish." A great many other passages are referred to.

The Presbytery show that the author did not hold the opinion which the Assembly and Repertory attribute to him. He does not exclude "fear of punishment and hope of heaven" from among the proper motives to obedience absolutely, but only as this fear is slavish, and hath torment, and as this hope is mercenary, and leads men to obedience as the federal or conditional means of obtaining heaven. When it is considered that the system of self love as the great motive to all obedience had been espoused by professor Campbell, and was congenial to the spirit of the times, it will hardly be thought that a suspicion of the soundness of this part of the Assembly's act was groundless. After an illustration and defence of the truth, the Presbytery condemn the two following errors: 1. "That there is a *legal connexion* instituted between the obedience of believers, and their enjoying rewards and escaping punishments temporal or eternal; or, that the Lord deals with them in this matter upon *law terms*: and that their hopes of enjoying the one and escaping the other, are to rise and fall according to the measure of their obedience. 2. That a person's being moved to obedience by the hope of heaven, cannot be said to be *mercenary*, in any other sense than that of a hope of obtaining a *right* and title to it by his own works; and that a believer ought to be moved to obedience by the hopes of his enjoying heaven, or any good, temporal or eternal, by his own obedience as the federal conditional mean and cause thereof."

5. "That the Believer is not under the Law as a Rule of Life."

Passages cited in proof.—"As the law is the covenant of works, you are wholly and altogether set free from it."—"You are now set free both from the commanding and condemning power of the covenant of works." The Assembly, 1722, declare, "That it was not the meaning nor intention of the said act in the least to insinuate, that believers in Christ are under the law as a covenant of works; or that they are obliged to seek justification by their own obedience: in regard the Assembly did apprehend, that the author understood by the *covenant of works the moral law strictly and properly taken*." They also condemn the following proposition, taken from the representation of the twelve brethren; "That the law as to believers, is really divested of its promise of life and threatening of death," adding, "if by the law they understand the moral law, the rule of life."

The Presbytery show that the moral law strictly taken, signifies the covenant of works; that being free from it as a covenant does not imply freedom from it as a rule of life; that these two propositions are not the same, viz. "That believers in Christ are not under the law as a covenant of works," and, "that they are not obliged to seek justification by their own obedience;" else the believer is no more free from the covenant of works, than the unbeliever who is as little obliged to seek justification by his own obedience as the believer. They also shew that while the Assembly of 1722, owned in words that the believer was not under the law as a covenant, they still kept him under the commanding and condemning power of the law equally with the unbeliever, by their virtually asserting in opposition to the Representatives, "That the law as to believers is not really divested of its promise of life and threatening of death." They then proceed as under the former heads to assert the

truth, and to condemn the opposite errors implied in the acts of the Assembly.

6. *"The six following Antinomian paradoxes are sensed and defended by applying to them that distinction of the Law of Works, and Law of Christ.*

"1. A believer is not under the law, but is altogether delivered from it. 2. A believer doth not commit sin. 3. The Lord can see no sin in a believer. 4. The Lord is not angry with a believer for his sins.— 5. The Lord doth not chastise a believer for his sins. 6. A believer has no cause, neither to confess his sins, nor to crave pardon at the hand of God for them, neither to fast nor mourn, nor humble himself before the Lord for them."

The Repertory takes no notice of this part of the Assembly's act in which they have condemned, in several instances, the express language of the scriptures. The author mentions these paradoxes, as expressions which admit of an unsound sense, but may also be sound, according as they are viewed in relation to the law of works or the law of Christ; and as it is only in their relation to the law of Christ, that he defends them, it must be in this sense that the Assembly condemns them. The Presbytery therefore regard the Assembly as condemning the following truths: 1. That believers are not under the law as a covenant. 2. That they do not commit sin as it is a transgression of the law of works.— 3. That God sees no sin in them, as under the cover of Christ's perfect righteousness. 4. That they do not fall under his vindictive wrath. 5. That he does not chastise them as an implacable enemy. 6. That they are not to mourn for their sins as transgressions of the law of works.— Then follows, as under the former heads, a condemnation of the errors involved in the Assembly's act of condemnation.

The remaining part of this act of the Presbytery consists of "a view of evangelical subjection, and obedience to the moral law." The first article treats of the obligation, the second, of the evangelical grounds of obedience to the law, and the third, of the connexion betwixt God's covenant of grace and our covenant of duties, and the influence which the one has upon the other.

Having long been accustomed to regard this act as containing a most clear illustration and defence of the true doctrine of the gospel, we were sorry to find it meeting with no more favor from the editors of such a respectable work as the Repertory. It is evident they do not coincide with the doctrines of the act, and this may in some measure account for their regarding it with less favor than the "Act and Testimony;" and for their considering its spirit as somewhat captious and antinomian. Perhaps as they regard some of the chief points of the controversy not only as thorny, but useless, they may not have given them that attention which they have bestowed on many other subjects; and they might, upon more careful investigation, discover the doctrine of this act to be more agreeable to truth than they had supposed. If so, they would, no doubt, entertain a more favorable opinion of its spirit and character.

It is readily admitted that there is much darkness in the minds of many in respect to the gift of Christ in the gospel to sinners as such; there is also much difficulty in bringing them to understand it. But whence does the difficulty arise? Is it not from the god of this world, and the spirit of this world blinding their minds, and keeping them from knowing "the things which are freely given to them of God?" There is nothing

difficult in the doctrine itself. In other cases we can easily understand the nature of a gift; and if any one were making us a present, we could see without any teaching that, terms, conditions and qualifications had no place. If the thing were offered, and we should begin to mention such things, would not the giver at once reply, "what do you mean by talking of terms, and qualifications, and conditions? I am offering nothing as a premium, nothing as wages, nothing as an article of sale or bargain: it is a gift, which of my own free will I grant to you." If the person to whom it is offered still say, "but still it cannot be mine unless upon the condition that I accept of it, and I can have no reason to believe it mine until I have it in my hands, and from use obtain the "only evidence" of possession;" would not the giver regard this as trifling with his offer, and unreasonably questioning his truth and good will? Would he not reply; "The thing offered, is offered without any condition, and if you respect my word you can have no reason to question this; but if you will not believe and accept what I give you, the gift will remain with me." The application of this case to the question in dispute, might be easy; yet many will not see it, and yet we hope that not a few who have not distinct, yet have not unsound opinions on this subject.

#### THE ACT FOR RENEWING THE COVENANTS.

An overture for the renovation of the National covenant of Scotland, and the solemn league and covenant was approved by the Associate Presbytery, October 1742, at the same time that the act respecting the doctrine of grace, was passed. But owing to objections by Mr. Nairn, this overture was not completed, and finally enacted till December 1743. On the 28th of this month, all the ministers of the Presbytery engaged in the solemn work of covenanting; and afterwards, Feb. 1744, they recommend the observance of it to their congregations; accompanying this recommendation with suitable directions.

Though these proceedings are related by the Repertory, they give us no opinion respecting them. This is on various accounts to be regreted. There are two things which appear to be among the most favorable indications of a true reformation: the one is, the resolute cleaving of the soul to God, expressed by public and solemn covenanting; the other is, its determined opposition to all his enemies expressed by a faithful testimony against corruptions and defections. We hope not to be suspected of a disposition to flatter when we add, that we regarded something of both these favorable indications, as appearing in the late "Act and Testimony" of some of our brethren in the general Assembly. If we seem forward to notice what we judge to be the faults of others, we wish also, to be forward when opportunities occur, to show that this is not from a spirit of malice or envy, by also testifying in favor of that which we judge to be right. It was not the mere name, but the spirit of this testimony by which we were gratified. There was in it an open and direct appearance against prevailing errors, a duty in a great measure neglected in times past; and though this explicit appearance against error was not so extensive as was to be desired, yet not only as individuals, but as a church we willingly, publicly, and unanimously recognized it as indicating the spirit of reformation, and we are ready always to rejoice in such a spirit wherever, and with whatever degree of fruit it is found. And as the spirit of reformation appears in the aforesaid deed, in the explicit opposition made to error, so also in its containing something of the nature of public religious covenanting without the express form. It was virtu-



ally on the part of all who signed it, a bond and pledge, that they would abide by God and each other, in holding the truths of his word in opposition to the errors specified. There seems also to be something of the providence of God, in the season of this event deserving notice. This Testimony was framed and published, soon after a large portion of our brethren in Scotland had, for the sake of union, dropped the one which they had hitherto maintained, and in consequence of their uniting without a harmony of sentiment, were unable to agree upon another; so that they no longer testify judicially against prevailing errors. They still indeed have a book sometimes called their Testimony, but not entitled to the name, as it has never been enacted, or recognized by them as a standard and term of communion. Now at the time that our brethren in Scotland were forsaking this duty, it seemed to be a token for good, that the Lord was raising up some in this land to attend to it; and as our brethren there, were also forsaking the covenants of their fathers, so we hoped there would be a spirit here which would call forth these deeds from that obscurity and disgrace in which the enemy had sought to bury them. And after all that may be said and supposed of our sectarianism, we hope we are not utter strangers to the spirit in which John said "He must increase, but I must decrease." If the cause of God prosper, it may well be a small matter to us, what societies flourish or decline. As our fathers appealed to the "first free, faithful and reforming General Assembly of the church of Scotland," so we have no objection to transfer the appeal, and lodge our cause in the hands of the first free, faithful and reforming General Assembly of the United States. If both they and we were brought to such a pure regard to truth as should animate us, it would be of very small consequence whether we should all become Seceders, or all, General Assembly Presbyterians.

It is gratifying to find these covenants of our fathers, and the renovation of them mentioned in the Repertory without any marks of contempt, or even of opposition. There is no appearance of that spirit which condemned these covenants to be ignominiously burnt, and pursued with relentless fury, all who had sworn and would not renounce them. Yet it would have been still more gratifying if our brethren had seen proper to express their approbation of these deeds,—may we not say,—deeds of their fathers and of ours. These persecuted Presbyterians professed in their covenant to give up themselves, their land and their offspring to be the Lord's. They regarded this transaction as binding the souls of their posterity forever. Would our brethren be willing to disown the ecclesiastical paternity of these martyred Presbyterians; or, will they own them, and yet deny that they did well in this surrender, which they made of themselves and their children; or, will they acknowledge their right to do as they did, and yet renounce their deed? May we not hope that the present state of things will bring some at least to look back to the ancient times, and to consider what Presbyterianism was in its purest and best days? The corruptions which prevailed and distracted the church at the time of the Secession had this effect upon the Seceders. They had in common with others in a great measure forgotten their covenant with God, and his wonderful works in the days of their fathers, they were floating down with the stream unconsciously, till aroused by their near approach to shipwreck and ruin, then they began to consider more attentively the former times, and to observe from whence they were fallen. The late disturbances in Scotland have in like manner once more called the attention of some of the sons of the Establishment

to the covenants of their fathers ; and desires have also been expressed to have these covenants renewed. In a letter to the writer, dated March 28th, 1835, the late Dr. M'Crie makes the following remarks: " We are in a very singular state in this country, both politically and ecclesiastically. The Voluntary agitation has done greater good to the Establishment than to the Secession. It has roused the ministers of the established church to greater diligence in their pastoral duties, and made them look back to the history of their church in her purer times. Some of the speeches delivered by them at their public meetings are quite novelties from that quarter,—covenanting and the covenants spoken of with the greatest respect, and wishes for their revival unequivocally expressed. I do not mean that this is general, even among the evangelical party which has been rapidly increasing for some time back. On the other hand, the Seceders, by joining in voluntary associations with Independents, Baptists, and other classes are losing fast all that distinguished them formerly, and sinking into latitudinarianism, and indifference to a public cause. And though I trust they still retain their love to evangelical doctrine, and attend more to ecclesiastical discipline than the established church, yet considering their numbers and the infection of example, there is reason to fear that they have already suffered in these respects also, and that they will suffer still more."

Perhaps the troubles of our brethren in America, and the profane attempts of such men as Sir Walter Scott, to heap disgrace on our Presbyterian fathers, and the covenants for which their blood flowed so profusely, may be overruled to similar good ends. These efforts of enemies from within and from without, may call the attention of the friends of truth to those glorious, though troubled times, when men loved not their lives unto death, and resisted even unto blood striving against sin. And if their attention be powerfully called to those times, they will without fail consider as of the first importance, the scriptural example set, of returning to the Lord and laboring for the reformation of his church by public and solemn covenants. There will be no radical cure till there is a searching into the root of the disease ; and no hearty returning to the Lord till we go back to the beginning of our defections. And in our opinion, the beginning of the defections of Presbyterians since the period of these covenants has always been in forgetting them, and every degree of revival may be measured by the degree of attention given to these deeds. Whenever there has been an attempt to break asunder these bands, and cast away these cords, there has been a rapid progress in declension. On the other hand, whenever any have been brought back, one of the means of drawing them, has been the calling of these deeds to remembrance. It is especially to churches that it is said, " Remember therefore, from whence thou art fallen, and repent and do the first works,—Remember how thou hast received and heard, and hold fast and repent." (Rev. ii. 5. iii. 3.)

#### THE ANSWERS TO MR. NAIRN'S REASONS OF DISSENT.

While the overture for renewing the covenants was under consideration, a difficulty arose about a paragraph in the "acknowledgment of sins," in which there is a confession of the evil of what is called the "Anti-government system." A small society of people had set themselves not only against the acknowledged corruptions of the civil government, but had opposed the duty of submitting to it in its lawful commands. They had at this time only one minister, Mr. M'Millen, who

had been cast out of the communion of the established church, but as we may learn from Mr. Boston's memoirs and other sources, they had something of the zeal attributed to the Seceders for extending their party, and a few of those who had united with the Seceders, had subsequently connected themselves with this society. Mr. Nairn appears to have adopted their sentiments, and finally joined with them, though he soon afterwards deserted them. When the act for renewing the covenants passed, it was by the unanimous vote of all present except Mr. Nairn, who wished to dissent on account of the aforesaid paragraph. In this paragraph after an acknowledgment of the sins of the rulers it is added :

“—So we desire to be humbled for the dangerous extreme into which some have gone, of impugning the present civil authority over these nations, and subjection to it in lawful commands, on account of the want of those qualifications which magistrates ought to have, according to the word of God and our covenants; even though they allow us in the free exercise of our religion, and are not manifestly unhinging the liberties of the kingdom; an opinion and practice contrary to the plain tenor of scripture, and to the known principles of this church in her confession and covenants, and of all other reformed churches: And that some few carry their zeal against the defections and evils of the times, to the dangerous extreme of espousing principles in favor of propagating religion by offensive arms; quite contrary to that disposition which ought to be in all the professed followers of Christ, who came not to destroy men's lives but to save them.”

Mr. Nairn was persuaded when the act was passed to withhold his dissent, but at the next meeting of the Presbytery he presented it, and withdrew. On Sept. 29th 1743, the Presbytery adopted answers to his reasons of dissent. These reasons embraced two grounds of complaint. The first complaint related to the manner in which the covenants were to be renewed which he insisted should be in the same words in which they had been originally sworn, else it would not be a renewing of the former covenants, but a new and different deed. The second complaint related to the acknowledgment of the present civil rulers, and subjection to them in their lawful commands, which he regarded as sinful on account of their not having certain scriptural qualifications.

In their answers, the Presbytery,—more at length than the difficulty of the question seems to require, though not perhaps more than tenderness would justify, show that the use of the precise words of the former covenants was neither necessary nor proper; that Mr. Nairn himself in some things did not urge this, and in other things urged the continuance of the words where he could not employ them according to their meaning. He was for retaining the civil part of these covenants in which subjection to the civil authorities was recognized while at the same time he was for disowning the civil authorities presently in being, and for regarding his professed subjection as to a magistrate who might hereafter be, or who might never be. He was for holding on to the words, and letting go the meaning of the words, a thing absurd in itself, and at war with the history of the renovation of covenants mentioned in the Scripture, and in former periods of the church. Such a scrupulous adherence to the form of words had not been manifested by their fathers, but sometimes new bonds were framed after the lapse of no more than five or nine years. The Presbytery, also insist that according to their act the former covenants would be properly renewed as the act recognized the

obligation of these deeds, and alter them only so far as to suit them to their present circumstances.

Mr. Nairn objected to the omission in the covenant of that part which obligates the covenanter to "endeavor the extirpation of Popery and Prelacy," though an abjuration of these evils and an engagement against them were retained. The Presbytery answer that the word "extirpation" had of late been used in a sanguinary sense for propagating religion by offensive arms, quite contrary to the mind of the reformers; and that if they were so disposed, they had not the concurrence of the civil powers for such a purpose. The complaint against omitting the civil part of these covenants they show was peculiarly inconsistent in Mr. Nairn as he denied the authority of the present civil rulers to be lawful and binding; so that his covenanting to be subject to them (understanding no such civil powers as were in existence) would be a solemn mockery of the most High. And it may be added, that he, and those associated with him under the name of Reformed Presbyterians, have very rarely been guilty of such an inconsistency as the mode of covenanting for which they plead would imply. While they retain the name of Covenanters, the practice of the duty implied in the name is altogether neglected.

The second ground of Mr. Nairn's complaint related to the acknowledgment of the civil authorities which he regarded as sinful. The Presbytery in their answers prove that though the government was corrupt and guilty of covenant violation, yet it was lawful to be subject to it in all its lawful commands. They state their views of what the civil government should be in the following words: "As it was once a peculiar duty of the *Jewish* nation, so it is peculiarly incumbent upon every civil state whereinto christianity is introduced, to study and bring to pass, that civil government among them, in all the appurtenances of its constitution and administration, run in an agreeableness to the *word of God*; be subservient unto the spiritual kingdom of Jesus Christ, and to the interests of the true religion and reformation of the church: As otherwise they cannot truly prosper in their civil concerns, nor be enriched by the blessings of the gospel." It is evident that in this statement no parallel is intended between the Jewish nation, and what christian nations should be, but only an induction is made from parity of reason. If the civil constitution of the Jews was so framed as to be agreeable to the divine law, so in christian nations, no law should be made in prejudice to the laws of Christ's kingdom. We have quoted the above statement that the reader may judge for himself, whether there be any just foundation for the account which the Repertory gives of these reasons and answers. "The whole of the dispute" say they, "proceeds upon the principle that civil government have a right and power to regulate the affairs of the church: and that there exists a union between church and state; which principle is entirely discarded by all parties in this country." If there were any just ground of accusation against this act, it would be the reverse. It has much more appearance of giving the church "a right and power to regulate the affairs" of the state, than of giving this right and power to the state over the affairs of the church. But the object of the Seceders in this act was neither to maintain such a power to belong to the one nor to the other. They speak of the church and state as two powers, each of which is independent in its own proper sphere. What is commonly understood by union of church and state, was what the Seceders were opposing and not advocating. They regarded the church and state as admitting of a union which was for their mutual advantage, but

were not at all in favor of such a union as would give to either, the power of interfering in the proper department of the other.

It is true the Seceders were not opposed to an establishment in every sense of the term. They had belonged to the establishment of Scotland. They were settled and supported according to the laws of it; and they did not secede on account of this as a grievance. Yet they gave clear evidence, before their separation as well as after it, that they were opposed to every thing in an establishment which was oppressive, and contrary to the will of the people. They were for the right of the people to choose their own rulers, both in the church and state, and of course to determine what degree of connexion there should be between them; for if the people have the right of choosing, they must have the right of determining what the principles of those men shall be, whom they will choose. Of course, the Seceders could only have been in favor of a *voluntary* establishment. Whatever may be thought of their opinions on this subject, one thing is evident, that these opinions were much more moderate and republican than those which were generally prevalent at that time. Nor is it fair to reason from the state of things in this country, where there is such a diversity of religious professions, to the state of things in such a nation as Scotland, where a particular system of doctrine, government, and worship, was almost the unanimous choice of the people. It might be proper in such a case to do that which in other circumstances would be quite contrary to propriety and justice.

After some historical statements of the corruptions with which the civil government was chargeable, the Presbytery in their act proceed to state the question between them, and those who maintained anti-government principles. They say the question is not, whether we shall own the authority of mere usurpers or tyrants; whether we shall disobey rulers in unlawful commands, and defend ourselves against their attempts to oppress us. Nor is the question what magistrates ought to be; or whether the present civil government be chargeable with corruptions. Nor is it whether it be lawful for us to swear the present oath of allegiance to the civil government; which the Presbytery acknowledge they cannot do. But the question, is, Ought we to acknowledge the civil authority of the said government, in the administration and commands of it which are lawful; and to yield subjection to it in these circumstances?

Mr. Nairn maintained the negative of the above question. The Presbytery at considerable length defended the affirmative. Their first argument is taken from the "plain tenor of the Scriptures." They adduce Scripture precepts. Prov. xxiv, 21. Eccl. x. 4. Luke xx. 25. Rom. xiii. 1-7. Titus iii. 1. 1 Pet. ii. 13-17: and they allege the agreement of their precepts with other scriptures. They adduce Scriptural examples of such subjection as is defended. They show the perpetual obligation of these precepts, and that the examples also bind us to imitation. In a second article they show the agreement of their views with the principles of all the Reformed churches, and particularly of the church of Scotland in various periods to which they refer, viz. the period of reformation from Popery, the period of reformation from Prelacy, and the period of the late persecution.

As the act respecting the doctrine of grace was a seasonable defence of the grace of Christ as our Saviour, so these answers form a clear exhibition of what is due to him as our King, and of the subjection which we owe to those who are under him in the government of the nations and churches. But as there are very few who now hold the doctrines

which these answers so ably refute, it seems hardly necessary to dwell upon them ; we have accordingly done little more than give the sum of what they contain.

(*To be continued.*)

---

ART. II. *Proceedings of the Associate Presbytery of Pennsylvania, 1789.*

MR. EDITOR :

The subjoined proceedings of the Associate Presbytery of Pennsylvania, in the case of the Rev. Matthew Henderson, minister of the gospel at Chartiers, (now Canonsburgh,) Washington Co., Pa., are worthy of being preserved as a part of the early history of the Secession church in this country. The greater part of the original records of the Presbytery of Pennsylvania, being now lost, this fragment of history may occupy to advantage, a page or two in the Monitor. It will be read with interest by some at least, if not by many of your readers. It would, probably be difficult to find at this time, another copy of these proceedings, besides the one now in the possession of the writer of this notice, for the use of which with other valuable fragments, he is indebted to the politeness and the care of the family of Mr. James Foster, of Hebron, N. Y.

This scrap is worthy of being preserved, and of a place too in the Monitor, on another account. It shows the manner in which ecclesiastical business was conducted in those times, which is highly honorable to the faithfulness of the court, and the candor and sincerity of the individual concerned. But how different from the spirit and practice of our times! The church court now, that would in the exercise of discipline, require a minister, or a private church member, to acknowledge *he had sinned*, in abandoning his profession, or indeed, almost any other disregard of former religious engagements, would run the hazard of calling forth the sneer of some infidel anonymous ecclesiastical pamphleteer, or being denounced as persecutors by the political scribblers of the day. Witness the case of the [General Assembly Presbyterian] Synod of Philadelphia, in their dealing with the Rev. A. Barnes, and other examples which might be specified, but enough of which your readers can call to recollection. In so short a period has the spirit of the world predominated over the spirit of the gospel.

As this paper may be read by some not particularly acquainted with the the history of the Secession church in America, it may be proper to inform them that the Associate Presbytery of Pennsylvania, at the date of these proceedings, constituted the highest court of the Secession church, in America ; and all the ministers, at that time, belonging to the church with the exception of the Rev. James Clarkson, were present at the meeting referred to : they were five in number. These venerable fathers, worthies of other times, have all, one only excepted,\* some time since, ceased from their labors. But they have all left behind them names, the good savor of which is still fragrant to many who heard

---

\* The venerable Mr. Whyte, of Argyle, N. Y., now in the 81st year of his age, and who has consequently exercised his ministry longer in America than any other minister now living, in the Associate church. The Rev. R. Laing of Bovina, N. Y., is probably about two years an older man.

from them, the words of life, and learned the law at their mouths. And the ruling elders present, were in their places not less distinguished as able and faithful advocates of that order and discipline, which is inseparable from the consistent maintenance of the principles of the Secession church. They too, have gone to their rest.

The circumstances of the case to which the extract refers, were briefly the following:—Mr. Henderson had been a minister of the Associate Presbytery of Pennsylvania, previous to the year 1782, when the coalescence took place between some members of the Associate Presbytery and the Reformed Presbyterians, which gave rise to the body, since known as the Associate Reformed, in this country.\* Upon the new body's profession still to adhere to the doctrines and principles, which had been previously maintained by the Associate Presbytery, in connection with the Generaal Associate Synod of Scotland, Mr. Henderson and others were induced to fall in with the union. Trusting, that when the new Society would favor the public with the statement of its principles, which its members were still promising to the people, it would be able to vindicate the course pursued, as consistent with their former ecclesiastical engagements and principles; and as a step necessary to be taken at the time. For the principal effect of this union was to add another to the divisions of the church, already lamentably so numerous. But Mr. H. being disappointed in his expectations in this respect, was led to a more serious review of the step, which he had taken. And the result was an application to be received again into his former standing, in the Presbytery of Pennsylvania. I regret that I am not able at present to lay before your readers, Mr Henderson's letter to the Presbytery, in which, he makes the statement of his own case. In hopes of obtaining a copy of that letter, I have delayed this communication longer than I had intended. Enclosed, are the proceedings as extracted and published by order of Presbytery.

J. P. M.

*Proceedings of the Associate Presbytery of Pennsylvania, concerning the receiving of the REV. MATTHEW HENDERSON, Minister of the Gospel at Chartiers, into Ministerial and Christian Communion with them. To which are added, two Letters; one to Mr. Henderson, and one to the People of Chartiers.*

*In the Church of the Associate Congregation at New-York, Oct. 19, 1789.*

At which time and place the Associate Presbytery of Pennsylvania being met, and constituted with prayer by the Moderator, the Rev. Mr. Thomas Beveridge; sederunt, the Rev. Messrs. William Marshall, David Goodwillie, John Anderson, and Archibald Whyte, ministers, William Young, and George Gosman, elders.

Mr. Marshall laid before the Presbytery, a petition and representation from the Rev. Matthew Henderson, of Chartiers, in the state of Pennsylvania, in which petition and representation, Mr. Henderson confesses his sin in departing from his former profession, and expresses his desire to be humbled before God for it; declaring his approbation of

---

\* It would seem that the fact respecting the rise of the Associate Reformed Church in this country, is unknown to many of the members of that society. The writer of this note, has frequently conversed with members of that church, who were under the belief that, the Associate Reformed, was only an American branch of the Burgher Synod of Scotland; in the same way that the Associate church in this country emanated from the Gen. Associate Synod of Scotland.

the Testimony maintained by this Presbytery—of the Act of the Associate Synod in Scotland explaining the connexion between this Presbytery and that Synod; and further earnestly beseeching this Presbytery to restore him again to our fellowship.

The Presbytery having entered on the consideration of this petition and representation, after reading sundry other papers transmitted to them by *Mr. Henderson*, and hearing the mind of members on this subject, adjourned till to-morrow at ten o'clock, to meet in this place.

*Closed with prayer.*

*October 20th, 1789; in the same place, at ten o'clock in the forenoon.*

The Associate Presbytery being met, and constitute with prayer, by the moderator, sederunt as above. The Presbytery resumed the consideration of *Mr. Henderson's* petition and representation, and after further reasoning and deliberation on the subject, a brother was employed in prayer, for light and direction from the Lord in this affair. The moderator then stated the following question: "Shall *Mr. Henderson*, in answer to his petition, be received into Christian and ministerial communion with this Presbytery?" The roll being called, it was carried unanimously, *receive*. Wherefore the Presbytery judging *Mr. Henderson's* free acknowledgment of the offence he had given, in departing from his former profession; the declaration he has made of his hearty attachment to our received principles, and his earnest desire to be received into the fellowship of this Presbytery; to be sufficient grounds for his admission, did, and hereby do receive the said *Mr. Matthew Henderson*, into Christian and ministerial communion, accordingly. His personal absence, owing to his distance from the place of this meeting, to his age, and to his frailty, being no sufficient bar in the way of his admission.

The Presbytery then agreed to write on this subject to *Mr. Henderson*, and also to the people in *Chartiers*, *Mingo-creek*, and *Mill-Creek*, who are under the inspection of this Presbytery.

*Closed with prayer.*

Extracted by

WILLIAM MARSHALL, Pr. Cl. p. 1.

*To the REV. MATTHEW HENDERSON, minister of the Gospel at Chartiers, Washington county, Pennsylvania.*

REV. DEAR BROTHER,

The inclosed minute of this Presbytery, will inform you that the prayer of your petition was unanimously granted by us. We entertained no doubt about your integrity in this matter. It would have been very agreeable to us if you had been present; but considering your distance from the place of our meeting, your age and your frailty, we judged your absence not a sufficient cause to hinder you from being without any further delay, admitted into our fellowship. We shall represent your case to our brethren, the General Associate Synod in Scotland, in such a manner as we trust will entirely remove the offence which your conduct in these past years has given to them; and we hope that your conduct in time to come, will be such as may justify us in doing so. We are all liable, as well as you, to wander out of the straight path, especially in such a cloudy and dark day as this, in which we live. We ought to learn from the slipping of our feet, to take heed



unto our way ; to trust less in ourselves, and more in him who keeps Israel.

It is not altogether unknown to you, that we lie under much reproach, and are exposed to many troubles and temptations. In returning to us, a participation with us in affliction may be expected ; but however unworthy we are, and however much we need chastening, yet as to the hatred of those who rise up against us, and endeavor to suppress the Testimony we maintain, we may, with some confidence affirm, that it is causeless, and will not hurt us. The reproach of Christ is better than the flattery of the world. You will find it comfortable in the decline of your life, to be found aiming at faithfulness in the work of your Lord and Master Jesus Christ, whom you have served from your youth. As your ministry was not without acceptance and usefulness, at the time of your entering into the public service of the gospel, we pray God that it may be made more so now, when the evening of your day draws nigh.

You will see the propriety of intimating to your congregation what has been done by the Presbytery, in answer to your petition, and of giving what assistance you can to those in your neighborhood, who are under the inspection of this Presbytery. It was not in our power to afford any of them sermon this ensuing winter. We shall do as the Lord gives opportunity afterward.

Our next Presbyterial meeting is at *Philadelphia*, April 28th, 1790, and as it is proposed to take into consideration, the Overture published by us some years ago, concerning an acknowledgment of sins, and engagement to duties, if it is practicable for you to attend, we hope you will not fail to be there. We published that Overture at a time when the storm blew very hard in our face ; and though many difficulties appear in the way of our proceeding further in that matter, yet we would, in the strength of the Lord, and in obedience of his command, aim at going forward.

That the Lord and Head of the church, may enable you and us to act with one heart and soul in his work, is the prayer of your brethren in Christ.

Signed in our name, and by our appointment,

THOMAS BEVERIDGE, Moderator.

New-York, Oct. 21, 1789.

*To the People of Chartiers.*

DEAR FRIENDS,

Many and various are the devices of Satan for turning us aside from the paths of truth and duty, and the Lord's people are in danger of being carried away in a great measure with them. On which account so much of the Scripture is taken up in warning us to be on our guard against such devices. That the late union which gave rise to the Associate Reformed Synod, was an instance of this kind, cannot be consistently denied by any who are desirous to keep the word of Christ's patience, or who allow that it is our duty, as a church, to contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints ; that is to contend for it, as the Lord enables us, in all the ways of his appointment, particularly in the way of a steady and consistent adherence to a seasonable Testimony for his despised truths. Schemes of this kind, falling in with the bent of our corrupted nature, are too commonly successful, especially at a time of prevailing deadness and carelessness among church members. Many who had professed adherence to the cause wherein this Presbytery is

engaged, were drawn unwarily into an approbation of the Union and Constitution of the Associate Reformed Synod; thus, in effect, overthrowing what they had formerly been building; and, for several years past, have continued to justify their course of backsliding. However, amidst all the grounds of the humiliation with ourselves and our brethren who have left us, it must be acknowledged as matter of thanksgiving, that much of the divine mercy has been manifested, in regard that some have been kept in the hour of temptation; and others have been recovered. An instance of the kind last mentioned, is the subject on which we now have the satisfaction to write to you. We have sent you herewith a copy of a minute of this meeting, respecting the case of the *Rev. Mr. Henderson*; by which you will see we have fully received him into Christian and ministerial communion with us. His acknowledgment of his sin in going so far along with some brethren in their backsliding course, his entire approbation of our Declaration and Testimony, and of the Act of the Associate Synod concerning our connection with them; together with the knowledge that some members of Presbytery have of his mind, by conversation with him, leave no room to doubt of his being a hearty friend to the cause and testimony we are endeavouring to maintain. The Presbytery did not deem it necessary to insist on his personal attendance, in order to a compliance with his earnest request to be admitted into our communion, considering his age and his distance from the place of this meeting, considering also that, if he had been personally present, we could have required no further satisfaction of him than he has given us; and considering that the state of the Lord's people in your part of the country, required something to be done in his case without delay. Wherefore we earnestly beseech you to receive him as one of us. A due regard to the honor of Christ, to his cause, to our brother himself, to your own souls, rendered it necessary to withdraw from him, while he was connected in church communion with those who are opposing the Testimony of Christ, which they formerly espoused. But now that, through the divine mercy, he is disentangled from that snare, the same considerations will engage to give him all encouragement in the Lord's work, particularly, by a diligent attendance on his ministry, and continual prayer. By his restoration the Lord is anew giving you a pastor, under the banner of a Testimony for truth. As you would desire to improve your privileges, let your love to him and the testimony of Jesus be confirmed. May the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you. *Amen.*

Signed in our name, and according to our appointment,

THOMAS BEVERIDGE, Moderator.

New-York, Oct. 21, 1789.

☞ The Letters to the People at Mingo Greek and Mill Creek, are the same as the above, except a small variation in the close, as they could not attend stately on Mr. Henderson's ministry.

### ART. III. *Wresting the Scriptures.*

I had for some time been meditating a communication to the Monitor on "Wresting the scriptures" in which I intended to notice. 1. How

heretics do so for the support of their errors. 2. How hypocrites do so for quieting their own consciences and deceiving fellow men. 3. How ministers do so in the choice of texts, to show their wit and make the ignorant wonder. 4. The sin of doing so. I do not at present feel well enough to fill out this method, but I lately happened on a passage in A. Booth, which touches on the third of these heads, considerably to my notion; I send it as a selection, with a note or two added.

A. B. C.

“*Wresting the Scriptures in the choice of Texts.*”—From A. Booth.

“Some of different communions, have deliberately acted as if the preacher’s work were a mere trial of skill, and as if a pulpit were the stage of a harlequin. To display the fertility of their invention, they have selected for texts mere scraps of scripture language; which, so far from containing complete propositions, have not, in their dislocated state, conveyed a single idea. Upon these they have harranged, while the ignorant multitude have been greatly surprised that the preacher should find so much, where common capacities perceived nothing.— Sometimes these men of genius will choose passages of scripture expressive of plain historical facts, which have no connection with the great work of salvation by Jesus Christ, and handle them, not professedly by way of accommodation, for then it might be admitted, but as if they were sacred allegories. Such historical facts being *spiritualized*, as they love to call it—doctrines, privileges, duties, in abundance, are easily derived from them. Nay, so ingenious are preachers of this turn, that it is no hard matter for them to find a great part of their creed in almost any text they take.” Note. This practice is found in latter as well as in former days, and those who follow it are no less curious and ingenious than ever. One chooses for his text John xx. 7. “And the napkin that was about his head, not lying with the linen clothes, but wrapped together in a place by itself.” From which he clearly proves the power of the civil magistrate in matters of religion. At another time you will find the subject of his discourse in Exod. xv. 17. “And they came to Elim, where were twelve wells of water, and three score and ten palm trees; and they encamped there by the waters.” And the same doctrine is here more fully set forth. Another preaches from Judges, iii. 20. “I have a message from God unto thee.” From these words he proposes to show the true nature of Christ’s sufferings, that they were not vicarious, not a strict and proper satisfaction to divine justice, &c. Another brings his most forcible arguments for infant baptism, from Rev. vii. 4. “And I heard the number of them that were sealed; and there were sealed an hundred and forty and four thousand of all the tribes of the children of Israel.” Finally, one calls the attention of his hearers to 1. Chron. i. 1. “Adam, Sheth, Enosh,” from which he undertakes to illustrate the perfection and happiness of man in his original condition, his sinfulness and misery in his fallen state, and in a word to give something like an outline of “Human nature in its fourfold state.”

“Thus they allegorize common sense into pious absurdity. It might, perhaps, be too barefaced, though it would certainly suit the vanity of such preachers, were they frequently to address their hearers on the pronominal monosyllable I; and there are two passages of sacred Writ, where it occurs in the most apposite manner. The former would make an admirable text, the latter a noble conclusion; they are as fol-

lows: "*such a man as I*—Is not this great Babylon that I have built?" Mr. G. Gregory when animadverting on the conduct which is here censured, says "It is dangerous on any occasion to depart from the plain track of common sense; and there is no attempt at ingenuity so easy, as that which borders upon nonsense. It is one of the mean artifices of barren genius to surprise the audience with a text consisting of one or two words. I have heard of a person of this description, who preached from *Jehovah Jireh*, and another from the monosyllable *But*. These are contemptible devices, more adapted to the moving theatre of the mountebank, than to the pulpit; and can only serve to captivate the meanest and most ignorant of the vulgar." Sermons, introduction. p. 14, 15, 16.

"Others, and often the same persons, frequently use the gestures of the theatre, and the language of a mountebank, as if their business were to amuse, to entertain, and to make their hearers laugh. Extravagant attitudes, and quaint expressions, idle stories, and similies quite ludicrous, appear in abundance, and constitute no small part of the entertainment furnished by such characters. But in what a state must the consciences of these people be, who can deliberately, and with premeditation act in this manner? Or, what must we think of their petitions for divine assistance in addressing the people, when they intend thus to treat them? Such a man serves not our Lord Jesus Christ, but his own interests in some form or other. He may wish for popularity, and perhaps may obtain it from the ignorant multitude; but people of sense and of piety will consider him as disgracing his office, of affronting their understandings, and as insulting the majesty of that Divine presence in which he stands. It may perhaps be said, this kind of trifling has its use. It is a means of exciting curiosity, and of drawing many to hear the gospel, who might not otherwise have the least inclination so to do. Such, I presume is the chief reason by which preachers of this cast endeavor to justify themselves at the bar of their own consciences. In answer to which, a repetition of that capital saying, "*My kingdom is not of this world*," might be sufficient, for that must be a wretched cause, even of a secular kind, which needs buffoonery to support it. To trifle in the service of God, is to be profane."

Note. As there is at all times more or less inclination with some in the church, to the style of preaching above described, it would be well if such preachers would occasionally read over that part of the directory for the public worship of God, agreed upon by the Westminster Assembly, which speaks "of the preaching of the word." In which it is laid down, that "the subject of his sermon shall be some text of scripture, holding forth some principle or head of religion"—that he is to "look diligently to the scope of the text"—"in raising doctrines from the text, his care ought to be, First, that the matter be the truth of God. Secondly, that it be a truth contained in, or grounded on that text, that the hearers may discern how God teacheth it from thence.—Thirdly, that he chiefly insist upon those directions which are principally intended, and make most for the edification of the hearers," &c.

Let them consider how agreeable these doctrines are to scripture and sound sense, and then how the practice in question consists with them or with ordination vows to observe them. Finally, let them consider the great sin of wresting the scriptures.

ART. IV. *Brief Expositions of Important Texts.*

Psalm, 1. 1. "Blessed is the man that walketh not in the counsel of the ungodly, nor standeth in the way of sinners, nor sitteth in the seat of the scornful."

Or, as it is more correctly rendered in our metrical version: "That man hath perfect blessedness, who walketh not astray in counsel of ungodly men, nor stands in sinners way," &c. This book of psalms, or book of *praises*, commences with a description of the blessedness of the godly man. It points out, not the way in which a sinner is justified, and by sovereign grace, made to differ from the lost and the dying around him; but the sincerity of his faith, as evidenced by his works. These works do not justify, but prove his possession of the faith which is the gift of God, and is inseparable from justification. In this way, the sincerity of his profession is justified by his works before men *now*; and thus will his faith be justified by his works, on a judgment day. The evidences of a justified state, are here described as not walking in the council of the ungodly, nor standing in the way of sinners, nor sitting in the seat of the scornful, but delighting in the law of the Lord.

Those who are not justified, not blessed, are first described as "*ungodly*." These are such as fear not God,—Gallios, who neglect the blessed gospel, and "care for none of these things." Not to walk in their councils, is to refuse to sit in their assemblies, to receive their principles, or act on their maxims and laws. Such careless ones, who, in the pursuit of perishing pleasures can say peace, peace, when on the brink of perdition,—who though wise for this world, are yet fools and blind in reference to eternity; will soon, following these maxims of worldly policy, learn to "*stand in the way of sinners*."

By *sinners* are here intended open and bold transgressors, who not only neglect God's laws, like the "ungodly," but delight in evil courses, and plunge into the grossest crimes. Wicked in heart, and profligate in life, they first omit duty, and then like the sinners spoken of by Jude, rush on in sin, turning the grace of God into lasciviousness, and denying the only Lord God, *even* our Lord Jesus Christ. Not to "stand in the way of sinners is to avoid them, to abhor their conduct, shun their courses, and flee from their places of resort, as the way to hell, going down to the chambers of death. If the sinner is not led to see the evil and the danger of his impious career, he will go on, adding sin to sin, till, given up to a reprobate mind, he becomes fitted for sitting down in the "*seat of the scornful*."

The *scornful* are infidel mockers, whose bands are made strong; atheistical scorners, who, given up for their guilt to a blinded mind, and a reprobate spirit, recklessly scoff at the bible, and ridicule the idea of a future judgment, "walking after their own lust, and saying, where is the promise of his coming? for since the fathers fell asleep, all things continue as they were from the beginning of the creation." For any thing beyond death, they have made no preparation; to them, this polluted and perishing world is all; and they cannot still the fearful forebodings of the unhappy soul; they cannot, amid all their pleasures, enjoy a moment's peace, but in trying to believe that the declaration of the coming judgment is a dream, death an eternal sleep, and the soul destined to the death of the brutes,—to be annihilated in the grave. "O my soul, come not thou into their secret, unto their assembly, mine honor be not thou united." This is what is implied in not "sitting down in the seat of the scornful."

Now "that man hath perfect blessedness" who walketh not in the counsel of these ungodly ones; who will neither neglect, nor be driven from the worship and the truths of the living God; who will not consent to the counsel of those, who follow the multitude right or wrong; who will not neglect a single truth, nor wilfully commit a single sin, nor omit a single duty, lest he be left at last, by an insulted God, to "stretch out his hand with scorners." He who thus gives evidence that he has been regenerated by the spirit,—that by the obedience of Christ, he has been made righteous,—that by the righteousness of Christ imputed to his soul, he has been forgiven, and by a living faith united to God: he who thus, by ordering aright his life and conversation, proves the sincerity of his profession and faith; "*hath perfect blessedness*," is blessed, and shall be blessed. We have said, that our metrical translation is nearer the original, than the prose version. "*That man hath perfect blessedness*" are really the very words of God the Spirit.\* In the Hebrew, it is *asherai*, *Beatitudines*—a plural noun, literally in English, Blessednesses, or perfect blessedness. "That man hath *blessednesses*, or perfect blessedness." Stockius, well known as one of the most eminent Lexicographers and Hebrew scholars, thus translates it; and says, that the word here used, denotes all kinds of felicity, both bodily and mental, temporal and eternal. It implies also the *certainty* of the saint's final perseverance, as well as their absolute and inalienable title to that blessedness, which, from eternity, God, for Christ's sake, covenanted to bestow upon them. The condition of the covenant, perfect obedience to the law, and full satisfaction to the justice of God, has been performed by Christ:—the promissory part of the covenant, perfect blessedness to all for whom Jesus died, will not fail on the part of the Father. This perfect blessedness is secured to all the people of God, not because they persevere, but because Christ has atoned for their guilt, and now pleads for them, that their faith fail not: not because they are sinless, for then they would not need the intercession of the Great High Priest; but because the blood of Christ has answered all the claims of justice against them for their sins. The Savior is before the throne, and the sword of justice never can touch the redeemed but through Him. The law satisfied by his death, never can demand punishment again, for any of the sins of any of those for whom Jesus died. God is not unjust, to forget His beloved Son's work, and labor of love, and agonizing death; to demand again a repayment of a debt already fully paid,—paid by a ransom, sufficient, had it been needed, and had God so willed it, for the rescue of ten thousand worlds. The believer then, may truly be said to be perfectly blessed. He has the assurance of God's favor, the promise of supporting grace, and perseverance amid all the trials of earth, till death call him to glory. Inseparably united to the true vine, his leaf shall not wither. "Who then, shall lay any thing to the charge of God's elect?" Who dare say they are not perfectly blessed? The blood of Christ has purchased for all his people this perfect blessedness; who then, or what can deprive them of this inestimable possession? God's people may sometimes be cast down under a sense of sin; in difficulty and danger, in want and in sickness, they may sometimes deem themselves forsaken;—but God changes not; the inheritance is still theirs. *Perfect blessedness*, made over to the believer in the bible, sealed with the seal of heaven, and ratified by the oath of the living God,

---

\*See NOTE at the end of the article.

is his sure portion. In the darkest hour, he hears the voice of a covenant God proclaiming in mercy ;—"In a little wrath I hid my face from thee for a moment, but with everlasting kindness will I have mercy upon thee. Though your sins be as scarlet, they shall be as the snow. The mountains shall depart, and the hills be removed, but my kindness shall not depart from thee, neither shall the covenant of my peace be removed, saith the Lord that hath mercy on thee." Even when the dispensations of God's providence seem to contradict his promises, the believer opens his bible, and sees written by the hand of his Father ;—" *Happy* is the man whom God correcteth ; all things work together for good to them that love God : The Lord's hand is not shortened that it cannot save, neither his ear heavy, that it cannot hear." Leaning on the promises then, and trusting in the love of a covenant God ; the believer, instead of being left comfortless, hath in possession and prospect perfect blessedness ; and thus peaceful and happy, is enabled to go on his way rejoicing.

Say not the declaration of the spirit here is untrue, because the blessedness of heaven is not in the believer's actual possession. With as much propriety, you may charge Paul with falsehood, when he proclaims to believers, "all things are yours :"—yea, brand every promise as untrue. But no, faith contemplates them as already fulfilled, and to every christian, we repeat the cheering promise, "all things *are* yours, whether Paul or Apollos, or Cephas, or the world, or life, or death, or things present, or things to come ; all are yours." Trials you must meet with, but your Lord will turn them into blessings. Temptations you must struggle with, but God is on the throne, and your triumph is sure. Even death is yours. It comes to slay sin, not you. It comes but to free the soul from the snare of the fowler ; to break its prison, and bear it away to its quiet rest. "O death, where is *now* thy sting ? O grave, where is *now* thy victory ?" Eternity with all its joys is yours, nay God himself, in all his glorious perfections, as the eternal portion of the soul : and O, is it untrue, to say of such an one, that he "hath perfect blessedness." No, christian : of this eternal and perfect blessedness, you have now a title deed in your possession, in the hand writing of the Eternal ; and amid the fiercest assaults of earth and hell, looking through the promise, over conquered enemies and a burning world, you may shout in triumph ; "I am persuaded, that neither death nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature shall be able to separate from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord." Perfect blessedness, for Christ's sake, is the believer's portion ; and "ye know in all your hearts, and in all your souls, that not one thing hath failed of all the good things which the Lord your God spake concerning" his people of old ; and christian, they shall never fail. Till you stand triumphant in the temple of heaven, the God of grace will not turn away from you to do you good. Happy art thou, O Isracl : who is like unto thee, a people saved by the Lord, the shield of thy help, and who is the sword of thy excellency ! The Eternal God is thy refuge, and underneath are the everlasting arms." W. E.

NOTE—I have lately learned that some time ago a certain member of the Huntingdon Presbytery, (Gen. Ass.) was charged, amongst other things, by one of his people, with having asserted that this 1st verse of this first Psalm, as approved by the venerable Assembly of Divines

at Westminster, *was a lie*. "That man hath perfect blessedness;" no man hath perfect blessedness in this life; *therefore, this verse is a lie!* The Presbytery it would seem, comprehended this logic, and, (with one honorable exception) agreed to sustain the member in his reckless expression. Now, let the meaning of the word in the original be studied; let the absolute, and evangelical nature of the promises be considered; and, whether as professed scholars, or professed adherents to the Calvinistic system of truth, as taught in the bible, and embodied in the confession of faith, they should blush, to think of having sanctioned such an assertion, by their decision. For every idle word a man utters, he must give account unto God; how much more, for a solemn Presbyterial act, as a court of Christ's house; yet sitting in judgment on Christ's words, and deliberately pronouncing them untrue. For, we repeat it again, "that man hath perfect blessedness," are the very words of God, the Spirit; and the poisoned arrow is shot against heaven. There is only one way of accounting for this strange act, though, even that aggravates the sin; viz. that, in the neighborhood, were several firm friends of the scriptural psalms, whose influence on others was probably feared, and therefore, a blow at these psalms, instead of treason against the Head of the Church, is hailed as a prop to some beloved Dagon:—a scoffing banter about Rouse's psalms, is welcomed as an additional voice to swell the popular cry, "Great is Diana of the Ephesians." Ah! the blow, and the scoff may be found at last, worse than the touch of an Uzzah,—death to the soul. The sin of such attacks on Divine revelation, is attempted to be justified on the plea, that, they are "Rouse's psalms." Now, this is grossly disingenuous, and the assertion is based either on ignorance, or wickedness. Every scholar knows, that they are not Rouse's psalms; but the most correct translation of the Scripture psalms; and more agreeable to the original, "than any heretofore." The translation of the psalms by Sir Francis Rouse, was consulted by the Westminster Assembly, in framing our present version; but it and the other translations were regarded, only, in so far, as they followed the original: and after several years careful revision, that Assembly, and the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, (both composed of men, as eminent for talents, and piety, as the world ever saw,) solemnly declared, that this version was, a correct translation of the scripture psalms. Is it not inexcusable ignorance then, or great wickedness, to persist in terming this translation, "Rouse's Psalms," and then, assailing them with the weapons of infidelity? With as much propriety, they may term the rest of the bible, "King James' Bible," because, by his authority, and in his reign, our excellent version was made; and then, assail it with the ribaldry of a Paine, or a Voltaire. We protest then, against the disingenuousness which would clothe the scripture psalms with the mantle of Rouse, and then think to stab them with impunity. We lament the prevalence of this spirit, not only, because we love the truth, but because we long for the time, when *peace* shall be restored to the church. The rhymes of a Watts, a Wesley, and a Dwight, may have some good things in them; but let not Dagon be placed either by, or before the ark. Till professors learn, to give men's works there proper place, and cease to pollute God's worship with them, the church will be torn with dissensions. Peace is precious, O how inestimably precious! Holy Jerusalem, beautiful Zion—city of my God; I will say and pray; peace be within thy walls, and prosperity within thy palaces; may they prosper that love thee. But shall I break down



thy carved work, which bears the impress of heaven, and on which, the finger of the Eternal has written perfection:—shall I help to burn down the doors of thy temple of glory; that multitudes, no matter whether friends or foes, may tread thy courts? Ah! brethren, this would be buying, not the peace of the gospel, but a spirit of slumber, too dear. The church will never stand triumphant in the latter day of glory, till she brings together all human hymn books, like the books of magic, to be burned:—till all unauthorized modes of worship are forsaken—till her members trusting in the same Savior, confessing the same truths, and singing the same divine songs; thus, with one heart, and one soul, walk on, in the same way, to the heavenly Zion. Days of glory, years of triumph to my precious Savior, and his blessed truths, may you soon draw near. Hasten the time, O Lord, when thy word shall be obeyed, and thy will done, on earth, as it is in heaven.

---

#### ART. V. *The Christian World Unmasked.*

(Continued from page 173.)

Nay, Doctor, you must not take your gloves out yet; nor hand your staff, as if preparing for a march. I have a bag of foxes at my side, which must be let out, one by one, before we part. If you can hunt them down, it will be well: if not, they may spoil your sheepfold, and worry all your doctrine.

Sir, I am sick of foxes. My father gave me one, and I am bound to keep him during life. Every day I smell him, and scarce know how to keep him chained in his kennel, he is so crafty. His kennel and your bag, I suppose, are just the same, nothing but a human breast. And sure no fox is half so full of wiles, as the human heart.

Well, but Doctor, I must open my bag: pray, take a peep on this young cub, and listen to his chatter. "Faith, he cries, what is faith? Every simpleton, who has learnt his creed, may believe, though he cannot reckon twenty. Puh? I would not give a straw for all the faith of all your ancient and your modern saints; not I: give me a budget of good works. Faith? what can faith do? A poor empty thing, without a grain of *merit*. The other night I waited on friend *Sarle*, your honest neighbor, and supped in his hen-roost, amidst a deal of cackling music. When I marched off, a straggling goose was hard at hand, and I was much inclined to ask her to my lodging; for company is pleasant, and the night was dark: but my stomach being crammed well with poultry, and a barking dog appearing, I let the waddling dame go off quietly. This noble act of mercy, such as Christians often shew, must justify me more than a thousand of your piteous acts of faith." You hear, Doctor, how he chatters.

Yes, Sir, so I could chatter once; and we are apt to undervalue what we do not understand. But all possessors of divine faith esteem it highly, and call it, as St. Peter does, *precious faith*, (2 Pet. i. 1.) It brings a *precious* view of Christ, and draweth *precious* blessings from him. It is a grace, which quarrels much with human pride, and makes its only boast of Jesus; and is not meant to be our *justifying* righteousness, else it might learn to boast too. Faith says, *in the Lord have I righteousness*; (Isa. xlv. 24.) and tells a sinner, "I cannot save thee:"

*Thou art saved by grace through faith.* (Eph. ii. 8.) The *grace* of Jesus brings salvation, and *through faith*, as an instrument put in the sinner's hand, he is enabled to reach the grace; just as a beggar, by his empty cap stretched forth, receives an alms.

A pole held to a drowning man, and by which he is driven to land, saveth him, just as faith saves a sinner. In a lax way of speaking we are said to be saved by faith, and so the drowning man might say, he was saved by the pole; though in truth he was rescued by the mercy of a neighbor, who thrust a pole towards him, and thereby drew him safe on shore.

Faith could have no room in a covenant of grace, if it had any *justifying* righteousness of its own. For desert on man's part is not consistent with such a covenant; *Else grace is no longer grace.* (Rom. xi. 6.)

If any personal or relative duty, such as temperance or charity, had been made the instrument of obtaining gospel-blessings, we might fancy some peculiar worth was in that duty to procure the blessings. But when faith, which is only lifting up an empty hand or a longing eye to Jesus, is made the instrument of salvation, it is clearly shewn, that the covenant is of grace wholly, both in its contrivance and conveyance. *It is therefore of faith, that it might be by grace.* (Rom. iv. 16.)

God has chosen this foolish instrument, as the means of receiving salvation, *that no flesh might glory in his presence.* Yet foolish as the instrument may seem, it is of curious heavenly workmanship. No man, with all his wit, can make it; though many act the ape, and mimic it. *This foolishness of God is wiser than men:* they cannot comprehend it; but growl at God, as dogs howl at the moon.

Doctor, I must open my bag again: young cubs, I find, are not regarded by you. Pray, cast a look upon this old fox: see, what a marvelous length of grizly beard he has got! Sure he must have been as old as Cain, and hunted oft by Enoch. He bears a very decent countenance, you see; and though a secret thief all his days, will preach about good works, I warrant him; and hope to make a penny of them; but hear him.

"None can justly claim more merit than a fox. He nightly watches every neighbor's fold and henroost; and, like an upright justice, takes up every vagrant that he meets. Yet, notwithstanding all our vigilance, we are often vilified as evil-doers; and are told by the bawling methodists, that our good works will not justify us. Faith, you know, is not a fox's traffic: our commerce lays in works, and by good works we live. Yet some have lately laid us on so thick with texts of faith, that we were gravelled by them, till an ancient Reynard started up, and said, Why, sure the Bible can afford more justifications than one. This proved a lucky thought, and was happily pursued. One fox started a brace presently; another sprung a leash; and a third found two brace sitting.— You may think our hearts were much refreshed by these reports, and the justifications were on this order; first by faith alone; then by works alone, then by faith and works conjointly; and then by neither faith nor works at all. We are pretty sure of escaping, by one or other of these methods, and are determined to try them all around. In the mean time, we have fixed on works, for the first hearing; because the doctors tell us, that only faith can justify us upon earth; but they add, though *works* cannot justify us here below, they may chance to justify us in the world above. For, say they, who can tell what the next world is; and whether heavenly beings think so highly of good works,

as foxes do? Cain, Ahithophel, and Judas, one in each dispensation, are retained as our counsel, who have promised to exert their utmost. And we do not doubt it, because they have been cast into the first trial, for want of faith: and their next chance layeth like ours, in the merit of their works." Well, Doctor, you have heard this subtle orator: what think you?

I think, Sir, if he gives a testimonial, the fox may turn a Levite.—His creed might suit a modern pulpit, and a sheep-fold would suit him; it affords good picking: but to the business. The *obedience* of Christ, our surety, is the ground and *meritorious* cause of justification. Paul asserts, *We are justified freely by grace, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus*: (Rom. iii. 24.) He declares roundly, *By the obedience of ONE* (even Christ) *shall many be made righteous*; (Rom. v. 19.) and affirms, that *the righteousness of God* (the God-man surety) *is unto all and upon all that believe*: (Rom. iii. 22.) is imputed *unto* all that believe; and put *upon* all, as their justification-robe: David will *make mention of this righteousness, and of this only* (to justify him:) (Psal. lxxi. 16.) Isaiah tells you what the church's faith was in his day, *Surely in the Lord have I righteousness*; (Isa. xlv. 24.) and Peter writes to them, *who have obtained precious faith* (not through, but) *in the righteousness of our God and Saviour, Jesus Christ*; *δικαιοσύνη εἰς θεῶν καὶ σωτήριος ἡμῶν, Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.* (2 Pet. i. 1.)

On the other hand, Paul says peremptorily, *by the deeds of the law no flesh living shall be justified in God's sight*: (Rom. iii. 20—Gal. iii. ii. 16) and intimates, that a justification by works would destroy the covenant of grace, *To him that worketh, the reward is not reckoned of grace, but of debt*: (Rom. iv. 4.) that is, if any could justify himself by works, his reward would be a *legal debt*, and not the *gift* of *gospel grace*. This text alone, if there was no other, would exclude all justification by works, as inconsistent with a covenant of grace. For if we are justified *wholly* by works, the reward would be *wholly* of debt: if justified in *part*, it would be *partly* of debt. But God has no *debts* to pay in the gospel: *it is the grace of God, which brings salvation*; and *no flesh shall glory in his presence*.

Thus the Bible declares, that no man shall be justified *before* God by his works; that men are justified by faith; and that faith only justifies, by resting on the *obedience* of Christ, as the *meritorious* cause of justification.

But this matter may require some enlargement. The scripture comprehend all wicked men in the general name of unbelievers; and Jesus says, *He that believeth not, is condemned* already. (John ii. 18.) How is that? Why, every man is a sinner; and the law declares, *the wages of sin is death*. Of course, a sentence of death is passed on every sinner; and if he dies in unbelief, he need no *second* condemnation, because he is condemned *already*. But the sentence of the law is a *silent* verdict, not heard and felt by unconvinced sinners, else they would fly to Jesus: neither does the law declare the various measures of that death, which are due to various sinners; it only says in general, "Cursed are you, and ye shall die."

Hence we may learn what is the judge's office at the grand assize, not to pass a *second* condemnation on the wicked; but to make an *open declaration* of that secret verdict, which the law has passed; and then appoint the various measures of that death, which are due to sinners.

When a jury, in our courts of justice, find a culprit guilty, the judge

passeth sentence. But is the judge's sentence a *second* condemnation? Not at all. The jury do condemn the culprit, and the judge *pronounceth* sentence according to the jury's verdict, and then declares the punishment to be inflicted on the convict.

A sinner therefore is not first condemned on earth for want of faith, and then condemned in the clouds a *second* time for want of righteousness. No: his *state* of misery is finally determined by unbelief; *He, that believeth not, shall be damned*: (Mark xvi. 16.) but the *measure* of his misery depends upon the measure of his own iniquity. Unbelief *alone* condemns the sinner; and in consequence of that condemnation, he suffers punishment according to his crimes.

We may now consider, how it fareth with believers. Jesus saith, *Whosoever believeth in the Son of man, shall not perish, but have eternal life*. (John iii. 14, 15.) And it is further said, *He, that believeth in the Son, hath* (or possesseth) *everlasting life*. (John iii. 36.) Here we read, that faith gives a *present* possession of *everlasting* life; it is begun in the soul on earth, and shall be perfected in heaven; and to strengthen the believer's hope, it is added, *he shall not perish*. A full absolution from eternal misery, and a full promise of eternal life, with a *present* possession of it, is granted to believers on the mere account of faith. And what security can they further want, or have?

Again: It is said, *All, that believe, are justified from all things*. (Acts xiii. 39.) Now I ask, if believers are justified *already*, what further justification can they *need*? And if justified from *all things*, what further justification can they *have*? It is not possible to be more justified than from *all things*, and so far believers are justified in the present life.

The scripture speaketh of a *first* and *second* covenant, (Heb. viii. 7.) but no where speaketh of a *first* and *second* justification. Such a two-fold justification must suppose there are degrees in it; and that the latter increaseth the former, else it is needless: but this is quite repugnant to its nature. For justification is an individual whole, like an unit. Take any thing from an unit, or add any thing to it, and it ceaseth to be an unit. So the man, who is truly justified, is justified from *all things*; and such an one cannot possibly be *more* justified, nor can be *less* than justified.

Beloved John might have more of Christ's affection than Philip, and a brighter crown than Philip, but could not have more justification than Philip. Because, though there are degrees in the affection and rewards of Christ, there can be no degrees in his justification. A man must either have the whole or none at all; must either be justified from all things, or be condemned.

And now, sir, the justification which has passed *secretly* in a believer's breast, known indeed to him and declared, but derided by the world; this will be *notified* publicly by the judge at last, and degrees of glory be assigned to each, according to their various fruitfulness.

Thus a believer's *state* of happiness is finally determined by his faith; *Ye, that believeth, shall be saved*: but the *measure* of his happiness in that state, depends upon the *fruits* of faith. Faith *alone* saves a Christian; but his crown is brighter, according as his faith works more abundantly by love.

But another matter must be taken into this account, besides the declaration of the proper sentences, and assignment of the proper retributions. David says, *The Lord will be justified, when he speaketh* (sen-

tence;) and be cleared, when he judgeth. (Psalm li. 4.) The world neither know nor regard the faith, which is of God's operation, (Col. ii. 12.) but are content with one of human manufacture: and finding no advantage from this faith, they consider all faith as a trifling or a despicable matter. It appeareth such an idle business, as can never justify; and seemeth a reflection upon God, to assign that office to it: yea, and all that wear the gospel-cloke of faith, full and deep, are thought enthusiasts or impostors; men who have lost their wits, or lost their honesty, and only fit for Bedlam or for Newgate.

Now when Jesus judgeth, he will clear this matter up, and vindicate the credit and appointment of faith. He will shew what fruits have been produced by faith; and though they cannot justify the little flock before God, yet when openly proclaimed by the judge, they will justify him in the choice of the instrument, and will justify believers evermore from all aspersions cast upon them by the world, as if they were not zealous of good works, because they renounced all dependance on them.

Take notice, sir, how the judge speaks to the sheep on his right hand. A choice fruit of faith, the sanctification of the heart, our *meetness* for glory, is not even mentioned by him; because the world could be no witness of it: he only noticeth their *works* and only such of these as must be public and notorious. *I was hungry, and ye fed me; naked, and ye clothed me; a stranger, and ye took me in; sick or in prison, and ye visited me.* And what say the sheep to this honorable mention? Do they speak, as if expecting to be justified by their works? No: just the contrary. All think themselves such *unprofitable* servants, that they will not own a good work has been done by them. "Lord, say they, when did we so, or so, as thou hast spoken?"

Jesus next applies himself to the goats on his left, and takes no notice of their *unholy hearts*; for being strangers to the nature of holiness, they would have cried out, "Lord, we always had *good hearts*; much sounder than those rotten sheep upon your right, who were evermore complaining of their *loathsome hearts*." Jesus therefore directs his speech to their *morality*, and only maketh mention of good works, which they had some knowledge of, and expected to be justified by them. Here he shews they have been wanting, and confounds them in their own hope. Thus the *judge clears himself, when he judgeth*. The sheep were *justified* by faith; and that act is vindicated to the world, by the precious *fruits* of faith. The goats were condemned through *unbelief*, and are silenced by that *unrighteousness*, which unbelief produced.

It is observable, that not a single sheep expects to be justified by works; yet the goats do expect it, every one. When Jesus tells them, *I was hungry, and ye fed me not; naked, and ye clothed me not; sick, and ye visited me not, &c.* They answer briskly, *When saw we thee an hungered, or athirst, or naked, or sick, or in prison, and did not minister unto thee?* That is, when were we wanting in our service to thee? Thus they come with a full justification in their mouths, ready for the trial; yet are all confounded.

It is further observable, that Jesus does not charge the goats with never having done *any* acts of charity. No: some of them might have founded schools or colleges; and some have given largely to the Lock and Magdalen, or to assembly-rooms and playhouses; and some might have undone themselves by largesses before or at elections. But when

a goat is bountiful, he seeks to please his own humor, or glorify his own name, or promote a distant interest; no true regard is had to Jesus, nor to his little flock: these are always overlooked. The doctrines of the sheep are loathsome, and their bleating trade of prayer is nauseous, to a goat. He could wish the world well eased of them all. Therefore Jesus says, Whatever bounty ye have done, *inasmuch as ye did it not to the least of these my brethren, ye did it not to me*; in neglecting and despising my own family, ye have neglected and despised me. Therefore, "Depart, ye cursed."

Give me leave to twist another thread about a lash, you had before. If the glories of the next world are called *rewards*, they are affirmed to be rewards, not of *debt*, but of *grace*; not due for our works, but bestowed through the grace of Jesus. Eternal death, in all its various horrors, is the just deserved *wages of sin*: but eternal life, in all its various glories, *is the gift of God, through Jesus Christ our Lord*. (Rom. vi. 23.) And therefore, though the little flock may be rewarded *according* to their works, they cannot be rewarded for the *merit* of them. A man of plain sense may see a difference here with his naked eye, which yet is often not discerned by a scribe with his microscope.

Take an illustration. A tender-hearted gentleman employs two laborers out of charity, to weed a little spot of four square yards. Both are old and much decrepit, but one is stronger than the other. The stronger weeds three yards, and receives three crowns: the weaker weedeth one, and receives one crown. Now both the laborers are rewarded *for* their labor, and *according* to their labor, but not for the *merit* of their labor. You cannot say their work *deserves* their wages. And yet their work deserves their wages better, an hundred thousand fold, than our poor works can merit an eternal weight of glory.

Oh, Sir; God must abominate the pride, the insolence of human pride, which can dream of merit: it is enough to make a devil blush. Yea, and some would purchase heavenly mansions with such scraps of alms, as would not buy an earthly hog-sty.

(To be continued.)

---

#### ART. VI. Increase of Romanism.

Under the above title the following article lately appeared in the CH. INTELLIGENCER, a very valuable paper devoted to the interests of the Ref. Dutch Church. We have no doubt that the statement respecting the number of Americans in this city that have joined the Romish Church is greatly exaggerated, yet we know that some few such have received the mark of the Beast in their foreheads. We publish the article chiefly on account of the remarks made on the subject of *religious excitement*.

MR. EDITOR;—A Roman Catholic from Albany lodged with me last night, who told me that no fewer than eighty-six persons (all Americans) had been converted, as he was pleased to call it, and joined the Catholic Church he attends in the above city, during the last twelve months.

What says this for the boasted march of knowledge in this land? Eighty-six of these highly enlightened and well informed Americans duped by the learning and cunning of the Catholic priests of one individual church! Alas, for our boasted knowledge, our great information, with such a fact before us as this. If such be the success of the Catholic

priesthood in ENLIGHTENED Albany, what must it be in places more and far remote from the centre of information? If such the success of one church, and of a church, too, situated in the midst of a well informed society, what must be the annual amount of success attending *all* their churches and schools and convents, &c. &c.—spread over the union, and especially of those in the less privileged and darker corners of the land? Alas! is not the seed just sowing that is to yield an awfully calamitous harvest to the churches of America? They are far, very far, from being pure and innocent, (many of them) either in point of doctrine or practice; nor do they repent of their doings, or of their unscriptural doctrines, nor will they take the word of God for their rule or guide in either, but teach for doctrines the inventions of men; and who can tell but the Lord will yet judge and afflict the corrupted churches in this land by the scourge of Catholic power, and purify them from their false doctrines and unscriptural practices, in the flames of fires which Catholics shall kindle for them, as He has done to such like churches in other countries?

EXCITEMENT is the idol of the day. Even in the church of Christ, nothing can be done without it, nor is any thing considered *well* done, where it is wanting. And the Lord, it is to be feared, will bye and bye fill the backsliding churches with their own ways, by giving them just, but awful cause of *excitement*, by Catholic fires and racks. Churches of the living God, thy God is not the God of excitement, noise, and confusion, but the God of *peace* and the God of *order*. He dwells not in the *exciting* wind that rends the mountains and breaks in pieces the rocks, nor in the earthquake that desolates, nor in the fire that consumes and destroys—but in the *still small voice*. And have the ministers of Christ, and the churches of Christ lost sight of the CHARACTER and MINISTRY of their Lord and Saviour, while in his church on earth, and how they are called upon to *Behold Him*? Read Mat. 12—18, 19, 20. He never practised, countenanced, nor commanded such excitements, disorder, and confusion as is now practiced, encouraged, sought after, and gloried in by many churches calling themselves His, in the present day. And he forbade them, pointedly forbade them—“*When they shall say lo! here is Christ; or lo! there is Christ, believe them not.*” And when he taught the nature of his kingdom in the hearts of men, or grace in the soul of man, he showed it was not the product of an *excitement*; but an effect produced by a *living* and an *abiding* cause. “The water that I shall give you, shall be in you a well of *living* water, springing up into eternal life.” Again, said he, “it is like unto heaven.” Again, he compares it to the corn, “First the blade, then the ear, then the full corn in the ear.” Again, said he, “it is like the light that shineth more and more, unto the perfect day.” In all these, there is nothing to countenance or encourage that bustle, confusion and excitement, now in the churches, and thought so all important to the conversion and salvation of souls. No, says Christ, no such thing; “My kingdom cometh not with observation.” What *noise* does the spring water, the fermenting leaven, the growing corn, or the increasing light, make? This is God’s way of converting the soul—was the way Jesus pursued, his apostles trode, and the church (while in a state of spiritual health) walked in; and this is that to which ALL the churches of Christ shall be brought, even should the dungeons and fires of Catholics be the means. O, that the church of our fathers, our affections, and our prayers, may be preserved from turning to the right or to the left hand from keeping the ways

of her God. To secure her in these, let every Consistory rally around their Dominic, every Classis lift up its voice to the churches of their charge, and let the Particular Synod call upon the General Synod to pass resolutions, and send forth to the churches a synodical epistle, warning, exhorting and advising the churches against seeking after, desiring, or countenancing these *excitements*, got up in other churches, and which in the end have been found to do more hurt by far, than good. Let us as a whole church, stand up for GOD'S ORDINANCES, and GOD'S DOCTRINES, and cease, entirely cease, from both which are of men's divising, that God may say of us, "*Ye are my witnesses.*"

ALPHA.

---

ART. VII. *Barnes' Notes on the Romans.*

The following from the CHRISTIAN INTELLIGENCER, although *severe*, is, nevertheless, richly merited. Such plain dealing is worthy of imitation.

MESSRS. EDITORS:—Speaking as scholars who love accuracy and consistency, we beg to say that it is a disgrace to the taste of the age that such a book as Barnes' *Notes* should attain currency among any reflecting and well educated class of men. It is the effusion of a young theologian just attempting to form his theory. He contradicts in one page, what he very gravely teaches in another. And in his defence before the General Assembly, he contradicts what he says in his book.

Hence that great body got confused. Here is his book; there stands Mr. Barnes. This is the book he has written: and it does really teach those doctrines. But here is the living author, who says, I do not hold that doctrine which you condemn. They were puzzled by the Jesuitism of this half-fledged theologian; and the cunning craft of the packed jury of the new school men, who were fully drummed up to earn a vote; and defend their own creed in voting for Mr. Barnes.

"Shall we condemn *the book*, or *the man*?" said the grave assembly. The sound divines said *condemn both*, unless you have lost your senses, and zeal for the glory of truth.

No, say the new school men of the flourishing American Pelagian school, you cannot condemn the man: for he disavows what he teaches, —or *seems to teach*, in his book. Besides, you may fail in lack of a proper depth of penetration, to take up the meaning of this most erudite, and profound champion of ours, in his book. Here he is, 'as his own enlightened enterpreter. The book *seems* to teach error; but he sets it all right by the magic of his *vive voce* defence! Hence our conclusion is most logical. You can condemn neither the book, nor the man. Such is the substance of the defence set up for Mr. Barnes.

Error is eternally at war with all the elements of consistency. For reasons to us utterly inexplicable the two Corypheci of Mr. Barnes, namely, Messrs. Duffield and Skinner, moved and carried by their partizans' vote, what the Orthodox applauded: namely, that "the errors alleged against Mr. B. were not to be tolerated in the Presbyterian church." That is to say, they admitted that the doctrines, taught in the plainest and most explicit manner by Mr. Barnes, in his system of Pelagianism, in his Notes on the Romans, "are *not* to be tolerated by the Presbyterian Church."

Hence they moved, and voted a train of resolutions very orthodox, as being their creed.



They voted that "unregenerate men cannot convert themselves to God." Yet they constantly teach that men have power and ability to believe, and repent, and turn to God, when they will.

They voted that "Adam is the covenant and federal head of his posterity;" and that "the guilt of Adam's sin is imputed to all his posterity; and that Mr. Barnes' book does not deny or contravene this."

And yet, Mr. Barnes and his associates, Dr. Skinner and Dr. Peters, who declare their perfect unity with Mr. Barnes, do actually in the fullest and most explicit manner, deny Adam's federal representation, and the imputation of Adam's sin to his posterity.

Here are the words of Mr. Barnes in his Notes on the Romans, p. 128. On Romans v. 19, he says,—“Various attempts have been made to explain this. The most common have been, that Adam was the representative of the human race: that he was a covenant head; and that his sin was imputed to his posterity; and that they were held liable to punishment for it, as if they had committed it themselves. *But to this there are great and insuperable objections.* 1st. There is not one word of it in all the Bible, neither the terms representative, nor covenant, or impute, are ever applied to the transaction, in the scriptures.”

And yet the whole of the passage describes the covenant transaction; and declares, that by Adam, many were *made*, that is legally, and in law were constituted, made, and declared to be sinners. *In Adam all die!* Yet, says Mr. Barnes, there was no covenant, no representation, no imputation! Why, the very idea of our being legally *made*, and pronounced sinners, by God, in consequence of Adam's sin, is a most explicit declaration from God's throne that Adam was our representative, and that we all sinned in him and fell in him. For be it remembered, that we have this sin *imputed* unto us, in consequence of our being involved in it, and guilty of it. It is not made ours *by imputation*. It is ours in law, because we were in Adam; and thence it is imputed or charged legally unto us. I notice this because Barnes blunders egregiously on this. Sec. 1, p. 28.

In short Mr. Barnes denounces this standard doctrine, laid down in his own confession, to which he did, by his solemn ordination oath and vow, declare before God and man, his solemn and sincere adherence! A doctrine, moreover, believed and confessed by all the Reformed Churches; but rejected by Arminians, Pelagians, and Unitarians only. He denounces and execrates it as “a mere philosophical theory!” These are his own terms used when speaking of it.

In p. 10 of his Notes, Mr. Barnes utterly rejects the doctrine of our participation in Adam's sin. He denies in strong terms that, “men are held responsible (that is bound to suffer punishment) for a deed committed thousands of years before they were born.” In p. 128 he again denies that, “men are held liable to punishment for sin.” In p. 123 he affirms that “men are not held to be guilty of his sins, without participation of their own, or *without personal sin.*”

Yet in his defence he crouches so far beneath the rod, as to be constrained to make an admission that though “sin cannot be imputed yet the obligation to punishment on account of it, is charged to men.” That is, he denies original sin and guilt: and yet does not wish it, by any means, to be understood that he really denies it! He holds that a debt of money cannot properly, by any means, be imputed to a debtor; but he admits that *the obligation to pay that debt is imputed* and may be fairly charged on him!!

And yet this puerile drivelling, and jesuitical dissembling passes off with a goodly portion of sober people, as very deep, and very eloquent, and very holy, and very manly gospel instruction!! Heu tempora! Heu mores!

We have now, established two positions by these remarks. 1st. Mr. Barnes has embraced, and is now in the full career of teaching the most reckless system of Pelagianism. And, yet, many of his followers seem to be so ignorant of divinity and of church history, that they think him an *original*, and capital originator of a *new* and improved system! 2d. He is so little acquainted with his own real code of divinity that he does not yet seem to know what are his real sentiments.

The late well known and learned man, the Rev. Dr. Nesbit, President of Carlisle College, in his yearly visit to the General Assembly, at Philadelphia, used to ask gravely on his arrival,—“*Pray, what is Dr. R.'s theological opinions this year?*”

I hold out to Mr. Barnes' associates, his Notes in the one hand, and point to Mr. Barnes with the other; and beg to ask them,—“Which are Mr. Barnes' real sentiments? One thing he says before the Assembly at Pittsburgh: another thing, quite different, and distinct, he writes and publishes. He explains: and yet gravely declares, and thereby consummates the puzzle,—“*I have not changed one sentiment in all my charges of explanation!* I am with you, and I am not with you. Therefore you are bound not to condemn me, or my book!”

Such another phenomenon of a moral Proteus was never displayed, so far as I have ever heard of, either in Europe, Asia, Africa, or America before—in an assembly of grave and sober divines!!

I shall close this number with one remark on Mr. Barnes' idea of the theological word *impute*, as used in the Bible, and in our creeds.

He frequently asserts in his Notes on this portion of the fifth chapter of Romans, that this word *impute* is, “never used in the sense of transferring, or, of charging that on one, which does not properly belong to him.”

Now, apply this to the great and leading doctrine of our justification before God, through our blessed Redeemer's righteousness. In what manner does Mr. Barnes and his deluded followers imagine that we became interested in that righteousness, in order to our justification?

It must be ours either by our own *actual working out*—which is impossible; or it must become ours by virtue of our union with Christ, and thence, is imputed, or charged to our account.—But Mr. Barnes denies that the word *impute* is ever used in this sense! And as this is the only way in which, Christ's righteousness *can* possibly be ours; he does actually, in his Pelagian system, take away the possibility of our having an interest in the righteousness of Christ!

After this appalling disclosure, in his fatal *Notes on the Romans*, can any one wonder that Mr. Barnes, in his Sermon on “*The way of Salvation*,” has actually left out, and discarded the doctrine of justification of the sinner by faith in Christ's imputed righteousness!! And is it possible that any member of the Reformed Churches cannot see that Mr. Barnes is now busy in preaching and spreading in our Sabbath schools, throughout the land, one of the most fatal systems of error and heresy that is now abroad, excepting only the Unitarian's deistical creed!

We now solemnly appeal to every Minister of our Ref. Church, to every elder and deacon, to every Sabbath school teacher and superintendent.—And we say to them, in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, how can you

use, or countenance, or tolerate such a book in your families, or Sabbath schools! Will you bring the blood of souls on your heads!!

CALVINUS.

---

ART. VIII. *Religious Intelligence.*

*Religious state of Holland.*

(From the Correspondent of the N. Y. Observer.)

BOLBEC, (Lower Seine,) 4th July, 1836.

The religious history of Holland is remarkable in various respects. In the sixteenth century, the inhabitants of that country embraced with ardor the doctrines of the Reformation, which promised them a two-fold freedom, namely liberty of conscience and political independence. In the name of the gospel, and under the banner of protestantism, they combated for fifteen years against the Spanish dominion, and succeeded finally in placing themselves in the rank of independant states. The Dutch attached themselves the more strongly to Christianity, because they regarded it as the firmest bulwark of their political rights. They were animated for a long time with a living and ardent piety, and gave to other protestant nations the example of zeal for the truths of salvation.

The character of this people contributed also to keep up in their bosoms the power of the gospel. The Dutch were formerly simple and frugal in their mode of life, of serious habits, and patriarchal manners. They were obliged to toil, struggling against the encroachments of the sea and the barrenness of their soil; and busy men are, generally, more religious than those who live in idleness and ease. The Dutch combined a happy mixture of the studious tastes of Germany and the active habits of England. This explains why the Christian religion took deep root in Holland, and preserved until the eighteenth century a preponderating influence. The decrees of the famous Synod of Dort, (which I do not pretend to approve in every point,) are a striking proof of the feelings of piety which prevailed at the time when this Synod met. Seventy years afterwards, when thousands of French protestants were thrown into Holland by the revocation of the edict of Nantes, they found there much religious life, and rejoiced that their steps were directed towards that hospitable country. In the eighteenth century most of the writings of our infidel philosophers were printed in Holland. From the presses of Amsterdam and the Hague, were issued the works of Voltaire, Rousseau, Helvetius, and Diderot; but the Dutch sent us this poison without tasting it themselves. Few of them read these bad books, and they continued to go on in the gospel road, while sceptical opinions were making advances all around them.

But there was in the Protestant churches in Holland a germ of corruption which slowly developed itself, gaining ground, however, every day, and at last invading almost all consciences. I speak of *Arminianism*. God forbid that I should speak severely against the first founders of this sect! Such men as Arminius, Episcopius, Grotius, and Barneveld, deserve the respect of members of all christian communions. They may have imbibed errors in doctrine, and perhaps they carried too far the pretensions of human reason in explaining mysteries where it is wise to receive humbly the declarations of the word of God. If Arminianism had always remained within the limits prescribed by Arminius and his friends, it could not justly have been reproached with having been a source of cor-

ruption to Holland. Unhappily the Arminians soon passed over the bounds their leaders had respected. They abandoned the doctrines of justification by faith and of grace, after rejecting the dogmas of predestination and election; they gradually approached Socinianism, and some of them even adopted the infidel opinions of the rationalists of Germany.

At the time that Arminianism degenerated, it had a great many followers. The majority of professors, pastors and laymen, were Arminian. This retrograde movement was seconded by the wars of the French revolution, and by the domination of Bonaparte in Holland. The soldiers and public functionaries who came from France, brought among the Dutch their impious principles, and in spite of the resistance opposed by the naturally serious character of this people to the progress of infidelity, deep wounds were inflicted on religion.

When the house of Orange resumed the reins of government in Holland, the Protestant church was in a deplorable condition. King William of Orange manifested a great respect for religion; he practised with exemplary regularity the duties of religion; but it is allowable to believe that he was influenced in this respect more by political considerations than by feelings of personal piety. He aimed to satisfy the wishes of all religious sects; he caused new ecclesiastical laws to be promulgated, which were principally favorable to Arminians, and was intent especially on restoring the forms of religion.

Such was the state of the Church in Holland, when the revolution of Belgium burst forth in the month of November. The misfortunes which affected the king and his people exerted a good influence on the religious sentiments of the country. From all quarters, the Dutch raised supplicating hands to God, who governs and directs the destinies of empires. William of Orange knelt before the altars of the Lord, his head whitened by years and adversity. A generous enthusiasm extended through all classes of the population, and the standard of the reformation was displayed, as in the sixteenth century, upon the dikes and ramparts of Holland. But there was no longer the same vital religion; the hearts of men corrupted by a semi-socinianism, were not capable of the same devotedness, and soon enthusiasm gave place to the calculations of worldly politics.

Some souls, however, received permanent good impressions, and hence has resulted an important separation in the church of Holland. Two pastors Messrs. *de Cocke* and *Scholte* left that church, the past year, with a number of their fellow-citizens, and constituted a separate congregation. Since then, five other pastors have followed their example. The following is the account I have received of this important event.

The ancient discipline of the church of Holland was changed in 1816, under the direction of a majority of Arminian pastors. The general and provincial Synods established, by authority of the king, new forms in the liturgy and other new ecclesiastical ceremonies. Messrs. *de Cocke* and *Scholte*, being desirous of preaching the pure gospel of Christ, remonstrated against these innovations, which affected in several points, important principles of faith, and asked leave to conform to the discipline established in 1620, by the Synod of Dort. But, the general and provincial Synods, far from answering favorably, these requests, threatened Messrs. *de Cocke* and *Scholte* with being deposed, if they did not follow entirely the new ritual instituted in 1816. This discussion, founded apparently on questions of discipline really originated in a difference of doctrinal opinions. The Arminian or rather Socinian pastors, forbade

the preaching of the fundamental doctrines of redemption. On the other hand, the dissenting pastors regarded this faithful preaching as their first duty. The quarrel became more and more vehement and at last separation ensued.

Messrs. de Cocke and Scholte, with other christians, immediately made an address to the king, asking his protection and privilege of exercising full liberty of worship. They say in this document :

“As the political constitution of our country guarantees to all religious communions equal liberty in the public exercise of their worship, we cannot doubt that the same liberty will be granted to us. We hope so the more, because we do not wish to introduce novelties into the church, but to serve God according to the laws and regulations observed by our ancestors, when they sacrificed their lives and property under the guidance of the illustrious predecessor of Your Majesty, that they might shake off the Spanish yoke and the authority of the Pope. We will remain faithful unto death to our king, as did our fathers ; but we are not able to fulfil our great duties except as our fathers did, by adherence to the true faith. We desire, pastors and flocks, to live peaceably and tranquilly in the practice of piety ; but we cannot and ought not to submit to the commandments of men, which are contrary to the Word of God. This word forbids us also to have constant quarrels with ecclesiastical authorities. Now, if we separate, the synods can take all the measures they judge suitable, without troubling the congregations. For ourselves, we claim no other right than that of returning to the ancient discipline of the church of Holland, and we hope to show always that those who go in this way, will be firm supporters of the throne of Your Majesty, in the midst of political storms. \* \* \* Our love for the house of Orange is deeply rooted in our hearts ; but with this love we unite an inviolable attachment to the principles of ancient reformation, and we expect from Your Majesty a firm and effectual protection.”

This moderate and humble request did not obtain the good reception it deserved. The cabinet published on the 11th December 1835, a circular in which it is said, that his Majesty had seen with great displeasure the intention manifested by some persons of quitting the Reformed church and establishing separate congregations, which would be a source of disputes and sad controversies, a trouble to families and an injury to the education of children. The king therefore made no promise to protect these new assemblies, and he warned dissenters not to hold meetings, under pain of being prosecuted according to law. Orders were given to the king's attorneys and to the police officers to watch these separatists, and make them conform to the wishes of the government.

It should be known, in order to comprehend what follows, that the Dutch penal code borrowed from the French code the article by which every regular meeting of more than twenty persons is declared to be illegal, or at least, to be without the special sanction of the civil authority. This article was enforced against the meetings of Dutch dissenters, and the principal separatists were cited before three courts of justice. Several celebrated lawyers pleaded the cause of these new victims of religious intolerance, and maintained that the article of the penal code could not apply to *religious* meetings, because the constitution guarantees to all citizens liberty of worship. In two courts, sentence was passed agreeably to the will of the government, and the meetings of dissenters were forbidden under penalty of imprisonment and fine. But at Amsterdam, the court rendered, on the 21st of April last, a wholly different judgment, by

which it recognized that dissenters had the right of meeting together and serving God according to the old discipline, under the protection of the laws.

In general, public opinion was favorable to the cause of the dissenters, and there was seen with deep emotion an old man of seventy years, summoned before the tribunal at Amsterdam, because he had uttered a prayer in a meeting. When this old man was acquitted with the other accused, the numerous audience showed a strong sympathy for them. At Utrecht alone, violence was committed against the separatists, and it must be added that this city contains many Catholics.

While the trial was going on, Messrs. de Cocke and Scholte, and several other pastors were deposed by the national synods, and declared unworthy hereafter of performing ecclesiastical functions. All these deposed pastors assembled with double the number of elders, at Amsterdam, and there formed a sort of Synod which opened its session on the 2d of March last, and continued ten days. They published a new declaration to the king, in which is the following passage.

“Before we separated, we were called *obscure orthodox, Dortists, &c.* which proves that the neologists knew well that we had adopted the doctrines of the old Reformed church. But now, that we are separated, our adversaries no longer regard us as adherents to the old Reformed church, and pretend that we form a new sect! \* \* \* But we declare sincerely that we have not established, and do not wish to establish a new communion.”

The last accounts I have received respecting the religious state of Holland are, that king William and his council are not at all disposed to grant religious liberty to dissenters, and that they wish, on the contrary, to employ new means to hinder the progress of separation. It is difficult to foresee what will be the issue of these debates; for on the one hand, the dissenters are firm, full of zeal, disposed to make every sacrifice required by fidelity to God; and on the other hand, the king of Holland is of an obstinate disposition, and is confirmed in his tenacity by the bad counsel of the protestant ecclesiastics by whom he is surrounded. Alas! Holland will perhaps witness similar persecutions to those which have afflicted the christians of the canton of Vaud, and the prisons will be opened yet again to receive the faithful servants of the Lord!

A reflection presents itself to my mind, as I close this letter. Three centuries have already passed since the most enlightened and devoted men contended for the principle of liberty of worship, yet this principle has not thus far obtained a complete and decisive victory! Every day the question recurs, sometimes in one country and sometimes in another, and among protestants as well as among Roman catholics. But whence comes it, that the principle of liberty of worship finds it is so hard to triumph? Several causes, no doubt, may be pointed out to explain this moral phenomenon. But the principal cause, it seems to me, of the continual attempts against religious liberty, is the union of church and state. The reformers established the temporal prince as the chief or bishop of the church: *inde mali lates*. We must not blame the reformers; they yielded to the necessity of circumstances; for they needed the support of the political power to break the despotism of Rome, and they could not obtain this support but by making large concessions to the temporal authorities. But there is no doubt that this subordination of the church to the civil power has hindered for a long time the establishment of the principle of liberty of worship. Kings and governors do not readily

abandon the privilege of controlling religious opinions; they love to govern the souls as well as the bodies of their subjects, and every time that christians do an act of religious independence, they at once call it revolt against the laws of the country. In Switzerland, in France, in Germany, in Holland, everywhere, the political authority has opposed obstacles to the free exercise of dissenting worship, and it is asked often with pain, if all the blood which has been shed for the sacred cause of religious liberty has not run in vain. Oh! when will the time come, when will the day appear, in which conscience and worship shall be really free? Great revolutions and frightful catastrophes must perhaps occur, in order to attain this end.

The U. States of America gives to Europe, in this respect, a useful and noble example. You have separated religious matters from civil matters, and the christian from the citizen. You have drawn a strong line of division between the two powers. The country has its government which does not interfere in the affairs of the church, and the church has its government which does not meddle with the affairs of state. You have acquired by this means a liberty of conscience and of worship which is unknown to us. We often look to America, and ask of God to give us the same independence, the same rights in things which concern religion. Your ecclesiastical organization is not, it is true, exempt from all abuse, and what human institution is there that can boast of being so? But there are more advantages and fewer inconveniences in your religious rules than in ours, and French christians will hail with joy the day when the church shall be declared independent of the state.

Accept, &c. G. DE F.

---

*News from Missions.*

**TAMUEL MISSION.**—Rev. Mr. Poor is transferred from Ceylon to Madura. Mr. Hoisington succeeds him in the school. The demand for his labors at Madura were such, in the judgment of the mission, as to make their removal a duty. More laborers are needed. The Madras Missionary Register calls loudly for more missionaries from this country.

**MAHRATTA MISSION.**—The last reinforcement arrived in safety. The state of things is encouraging. Several native converts have of late joined the church. Mr. Simpson died Dec. 25, of consumption, the seeds of which he probably carried with him.

**GREECE, Argos, May 7.**—Mr. Meigs writes, the government has issued an order for establishing a national bookstore, which is to have a monopoly of the trade in school books. He thinks it will not be so enforced, as to interfere materially with the prosperity of the mission.

The Tract, "The Two Lambs," has been translated and published, and well received.

**Athens, May 10.**—Mr. King gives an account of the disturbances at Syra. As reported in the political papers, it was produced by a pamphlet prepared at Paris. The schools were interrupted but one day. They were principally under the English Church Missionary Society.

**Cyprus.**—Mr. Pease has travelled considerably and finds need of help, to do all the good for which there is opportunity.

**BEYROOT.**—The last reinforcement arrived in March. Mr. Lanneau was going to Jerusalem. Mr. Smith, March 17, gives an interesting account of the persecution of a Druse (Mohammedan,) who declared himself a Protestant. He appears to be truly pious. The Koran ordains that all who forsake that faith shall suffer death. He was seized, im-

prisoned, and urged to deny his Saviour, for seventeen days. But continued steadfast. Expecting death, he gave directions concerning his little property, and awaited the event. As he had been seized by the Governor of Bayroot, within the territory of the Emir Beshir, application was made to the Emir to demand his release. The Emir demanded it; but being informed that the man had become a Protestant christian and not a Roman Catholic, he gave him up. Application was made to Solyman Pasha, who governs that country under Ibrahim, through whose influence he was at length set free.

**SMYRNA.**—Rev. Josiah Brewer, who went out under the Western F. M. Society, in the Padang, arrived at Smyrna, June 6, after a passage of 66 days. In a letter to the editor, he confirms the account of the plague at Magnesia, by which 12,000 persons are said to have perished. It had also appeared in many villages beyond, and some cases in Smyrna, “causing considerable apprehension.” “This,” he says, “is increased by the fact, and thus far, few recoveries have taken place.” He adds:—

The oppressions of men and the judgment of God do not prevent, however, the enemies of the truth, from manifesting their opposition. A simultaneous and vigorous attack has been made upon the primary schools, books, &c., by the Patriarch of Constantinople, the editor of the Gospel Trumpet, one of the Bishops and some anonymous writers in Greece, and a newly appointed ecclesiastical committee in Smyrna.—These have called forth several replies from well disposed Greeks themselves, and the missionaries feel called upon to speak out in self defence. On many accounts we do not regret such an opportunity, and desire to look up with humble confidence to Him who sitteth upon the throne, and say, “Why do the heathen rage, and the people imagine a vain thing?”

**WESTERN AFRICA.**—Letters from Cape Palmas are to July 12; from Monrovia, to July 20. Concerning the health of the missionaries, there is “no news,” which “is good news.” Nothing of special interest had occurred.—*Boston Recorder.*

---

*Letter from Siam.*

We are indebted to Dr. Torrey of this city, for permission to publish the following extracts of a letter which he has recently received from Dr. Bradley, one of the missionaries of the American Board at Bangkok, in Siam. It was the success of the dispensary at Bangkok, our readers will remember, that induced the establishment at Canton of the Ophthalmic hospital, which, has already done much to exalt the reputation of the American name, and which bids fair to prepare the way for the introduction of the gospel into China. It is gratifying to find that the dispensary at Bangkok is the means of collecting crowded assemblies to whom the gospel is faithfully preached. Pious physicians, we think, must see in this and other recent communications from China and Siam, that they can render perhaps more important aid than any other class of men in introducing the blessings of christianity into those countries.—*N. Y. Observer.*

*Voyage to Chautabun.*

I presume that you are already acquainted with much of my narrative since I arrived on heathen ground. During the months of October and November it pleased the Lord to afflict me sorely with disease, which induced me to seek a change of air in an exploring voyage to Chautabun. I embarked for that place on the 12th of November, in company with brother and sister Johnson on board a new Siamese brig, which is their



first specimen of successful imitation of European ship building. Leang-Nai-Sit the most honorable son of the Prah Klang, and one of the first princes in the kingdom, had the goodness to invite us to make the voyage, and then to give us a free passage and many unexpected privileges while residing in that province. The hand of God was most remarkable in inclining this nobleman to do as he did. Never before had the missionaries been allowed to explore far beyond the bounds of Bangkok. If we had then asked permission of government to go on such an errand to Chautabun we should no doubt have been peremptorily refused.—Leang-Nai-Sit was induced to venture to take us thither in direct violation of all precedent, without asking permission of government, or even knowing that his father, then at Chautabun, would not frown upon him for the deed, and send us post haste back to Bangkok. Indeed, the son was not without great fear of the displeasure of his father on this account after we reached Chautabun. It rejoiced his heart greatly to see that we were favorably received by the Prah Klang, who invited us to visit at his house, and made a very pleasant entertainment for us. His jealousy was not at all excited by our appearance in the country. There was not only a willingness that we should explore, and make maps of the province, but Leang-Nai-Sit repeatedly prompted us to the work, and furnished us conveyances, and guides, and charts to assist us in it. It was my privilege to explore much of that territory in company with brother Johnson.

*Description of the country—Number of Roman Catholics—Christian colonization desirable there.*

The country is naturally a very pleasant one. The soil is rich and easily cultivated. Much of it is level, but there are a few charming mountains. It appears to have been much longer inhabited than Bangkok and the country about it. The town of Chautabun is situated about 15 miles up the river of the same name. It appears to be suffering the decrepitude of old age. The population is 10,000 or more, who are chiefly Annans, Nokien and Tachue-Chinese. They live in small bamboo houses, and seem to desire very few of the comforts of civilization and refinement, much less the blessings of christianity. In fact they are suffering, it is to be feared, an eternal famine of the bread of life and know it not. It was our privilege to dispense to them several hundred tracts, which we trust will be made instrumental in saving some souls. The Roman Catholics have a strong foothold in that city. All the Annans, who constitute about a third of the whole population, are under their exclusive control. They have a large house for public worship.—The country about the town is delightful. It would be very inviting to a colony of christians whose hearts are engaged in the blessed work of evangelizing the heathen. There they might support themselves comfortably by agricultural, mercantile, and mechanical pursuits, and at the same time exert a powerfully redeeming influence over the native population in the establishment of day schools, Sunday schools, Bible classes, and in the printing and distribution of tracts and periodicals. My heart is very much set upon this kind of christian enterprise. I trust that ere this hundreds of individuals in my native country are wide awake to the importance and practicability of such a work. I have enthusiasm enough to believe that it will not be long before there will be formed something like a christian colonization society for foreign lands, and when scores will embark under its banner, having for their object the supreme glory of God in the conversion of the heathen. Allow me to refer you for

my views more fully, to a communication to the American christian public prepared several months since, by the missionaries then at Singapore.

*Siamese fortifications—Preparations for war with the Cochinchinese—  
Cambodia needs missionaries.*

I would add a little more to my account of the province of Chautabun. There are many villages within a small circumference, and much of the land is highly cultivated. The Siamese government is building a battery two miles or more in circumference, four miles below the town of Chautabun. It encloses a beautiful rise of ground. I should not be surprised if it should prove to be the foundation of a new city. I cannot account for the policy of building the wall if this is not the secret design. The Prah Klang lives near the work, which he superintends. The Siamese are fortifying themselves on all hands against the Cochinchinese. It is their design to act on the offensive as well as the defensive. They have war vessels now building with which they intend to invade the territory of their antagonists. Cambodia, lying between the two countries, and being claimed by both nations, suffers dreadfully between the fires. How much her millions of souls need the consolations of the gospel! But, alas, there is not an ambassador of Christ to proclaim it to them. No doubt the way would be found prepared for hundreds of missionaries in that country if they would but knock for admittance. Oh, when will Zion do all she can to give the gospel to the heathen. What vast ability she possesses for this work which it has been most distant from her heart to exert.

*Return to Bangkok—Preaching the gospel to the sick—Door open for female missionaries.*

I left Chautabun in a small junk, Dec. 14th, and reached my dear home on the 20th, with health almost perfectly restored. I had none but native associates on my passage. We sailed so near the coast that I had a delightful scenery much of the time. Immediately on my return I resumed my medical business on a large scale, receiving my patients in a floating house near my dwelling. This makes an excellent dispensary, as it is generally comfortably cool, always cleanly, and on the great thoroughfare of Bangkok, which is the river. The time that I devote to the treatment of the sick is from 12 M. to 3 P. M. At this time daily I am thronged with the diseased. I think I prescribe for 80, on an average, daily. It is a great grief to me that I cannot yet talk to them freely of the love of Christ. The hope that I may soon do so cheers me in my work. Recently brother R. has commenced religious exercises on the Sabbath for the benefit of my Siamese patients. Our assemblies are crowded and interesting far above our anticipation. We have some of the company of the priests for our hearers. These exercises promise much good. Pray that the word of God dispensed here in weakness may be raised in power. I give christian books to all my Chinese patients who can read. I have no books for the Siamese, which is not a little trying to my feelings. Not more than one third of my patients can read. It is my intention to pursue the Siamese language a few months longer exclusively, and then take up the Chinese. My wife will confine herself to the Siamese, as she will be called to exert her influence upon the females, all of whom are Siamese. There cannot be a more favorable location for female missionaries than this. The females are numerous, interesting, and very accessible.

ART. IX. *Ecclesiastical.**Associate Presbytery of Stamford.*

STAMFORD, Aug. 23, 1836.

MR. EDITOR—

At a meeting of the Associate Presbytery of Stamford, held here on the 3d, inst., it was agreed that as our Presbyterial report, with accompanying papers had failed of reaching Synod, for causes yet unknown, that our brethren might know the state of our affairs, a summary statement of the principal occurrences in our Presbytery, should be sent to you for insertion in the Monitor. I accordingly send you the following, together with a statistical table, which, though not perfect, will give you a pretty correct idea of the state of this section of the Church. J. R.

The Associate Presbytery of Stamford, did not hold its first meeting at the time appointed by Synod, that time having passed before we were aware of our Presbyterial existence. The first meeting called by the Moderator, was held at Dumfries, on the 24th Feb., when Mr. David Coutts, a Preacher lately from Scotland, applied for admission to communion with us as a preacher of the Gospel. After hearing him preach, ascertaining his views of Secession principles, and receiving his accession to our subordinate standards, he was unanimously admitted and appointed permanent supply to Esquising. The supply from Synod, realized last year, enabled us to give, for a few sabbaths, sermon to each of our vacancies, but was not enough to enable us to attend to the long neglected missionary station in the western part of the Province, or to attempt the formation of new stations. One urgent application for sermon made several years ago, has never been attended to for want of supply. Presbytery has sustained two unanimous calls, one from Esquising, for Mr. Coutts, and the other from York, for Mr. David Strang. Mr. Coutts having accepted the call from Esquising, and delivered the usual trials to the entire satisfaction of Presbytery, was ordained to the office of the holy ministry, and pastoral inspection of that congregation, early in June. At the last meeting of Presbytery, Mr. David Strang accepted the call from York, and delivered the whole of his trials for ordination, which were sustained. His ordination is appointed to take place on Thursday, preceding the 4th Sabbath of Sept. By thus increasing our number, we trust the great Head of the Church has smiled on the commencement of our Presbyterial existence, but while we desire to thank God, and take courage. we regret, that owing in all probability to our report not reaching Synod, the supply allotted to us is so small. If our brethren in any other Presbytery, could spare a small portion of the supply allotted to them till next meeting of Synod, it would be a most acceptable expression of Christian kindness to this part of the church.

## PRESBYTERY OF STAMFORD.

John Russell,	Stamford,	80 Members.
James Strang,	Dumfries,	200 "
David Coutts,	Esquising,	55 "
David Strang,	York,	55 "
	London,	12 "

*Associate Presbytery of Miami.*

At a Meeting of the Associate Presbytery of Miami, held at Xenia, Aug. 16th, the following resolution was adopted, viz :

“Resolved, That the distribution of the Holy Scriptures to the destitute in this land, and throughout the nations of the earth, by the agency and instrumentality of the American Bible Society and its Auxiliaries, is an object worthy the attention of this Presbytery, and that it be recommended to the consideration of our fellow members in the several congregations under our care.”

On the 1st Sabbath of Sept., the Lord's Supper was administered at Xenia, on which occasion, the principal part of all the adjacent congregations united in the solemnity; and on the day following an opportunity was afforded of renewing our solemn covenant engagements under the direction of Presbytery, according to previous arrangements. The Bond was sworn and subscribed by about 260 Covenanters, in the presence of a large concourse of spectators; after which, a large number, some of whom had covenanted in the land of our fathers, and others on this side of the Atlantic, declared their adherence to their former deed, and their approbation of the present transaction. It was a day that we trust will be long and profitably remembered.

On the following day the Presbytery held its semi-annual meeting, and after a free discussion on the subject of foreign missions, the following resolution was adopted, viz:

“Resolved, That it is right and expedient for this Presbytery to endeavor to procure and send a Missionary to some of the Heathen tribes, and as far as practicable to support him.”

The question of location is not yet decided, but a report of a committee of Presbytery is on their table, recommending that the location be made in the Chinese empire, or in some region where the Chinese language is understood. The Presbytery have also appointed a committee to address the people under their care, on the subject of missions.

At a late meeting of Presbytery, Mr. George M. Hall, accepted a call from the united congregations of Madison and Big Creek, in the state of Indiana. His ordination is appointed to take place on the 16th inst. (Sept.)

A. H.

---

#### ART. X. *Miscellany.*

ONE MINUTE TOO LATE.—“When I was a young man, said an aged minister, another young man, not far distant from where I lived, kept a store. One night he was awakened by the alarm of fire. He awoke and ran; it was his own store. He came to it; the flames were spreading. He went in at a risk once and again to bring out goods, where no others would venture. The last time he went in, the men at the door all cried out, Come out! Come out! He leaped towards the door: the building fell, and crushed him dead. He was one minute too late.” So there are many sinners, busied about worldly cares, who ought to be escaping the flames: but who will be one minute too late; for they will not awake to their danger till death has overtaken them. Then, amid the hurry and agony of the dying hour, they will be unfit, and they will have no time to flee from the coming wrath. One minute too late.—*N. H. Obs.*

---

BREAKING UP OF THE HAREMS IN THE EAST.—A revolution is taking place in Persia, calculated to exert more influence than any other

single movement, upon the character, habits, and institutions of Mahomedan countries. A German paper states that the Schah of Persia, in order to give a proof of the advancement of civilization, had suddenly thrown open the gates of his harem, and given their liberty to all the female slaves that it contained. All the great men of the empire followed the example, and the inhabitants of Teheran could scarcely believe their eyes when they saw the gates of the palace opened for the first time for the unhappy victims. This news causes an extraordinary sensation all over the east. It was believed in Pera that the sultan would follow the example.

What a day of jubilee and rejoicing it must have been to the female part of the Schah's family.

---

**DEPENDENCE ON THE HOLY SPIRIT.**—Were our revenue equal to the wealth of both the Indies; were our missionaries as numerous as the armed legions which cover the plains of Turkey; were they possessed of all the literature, and all the science of Christendom, without the Spirit of Cod they could do nothing towards the establishment of that internal dominion which is designated by the Kingdom of God within us. We may as well think to arrest the sun in his course, give laws to the winds by the words of our mouths, impede the torrent by the interposition of our foot, or control the movements of the majestic ocean by our commands, as think to change the state of the world, and bring it under the law of love, the perfect law of liberty, by any thing short of the omnipotent power of the Divine Spirit.—*Rev. Dr. Phillips' speech before the London Miss. Soc.*

---

**NEGRO EMANCIPATION.**—The following paragraph from the Journal of Commerce is worthy of consideration:

“The English papers contain the returns of exports from several of their West India Islands, which exhibit a considerable increase, instead of the diminution which was feared, in their products. It is the opinion of many intelligent persons interested in West India property, that the negroes are quite as valuable to them as they were while held as slaves, and that the indemnity money they received was clear gain.”

---

**UNION OF SCOTCH AND IRISH PRESBYTERIANS.**—On the 25th of May a report was made in the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland on a plan of union with the Synod of Ulster. From the report it appeared that all candidates for the ministry in that Synod are required to subscribe to the Westminster Confession of Faith without exception or explanation, and are also obliged to pass through a full course of literary and theological preparation for the sacred office. The committee recommend that ministerial and brotherly communion be established between the two bodies. The whole case was after discussion, referred to a committee of conference.—*N. Y. Observer.*

---

**AMERICAN BOARD OF FOREIGN MISSIONS.**—The annual meeting of the American Board of Missions commenced on Wednesday, 14th, at Hartford, and closed on the 16th inst. The receipts of the year amounted to about \$176,000, and the expenditures to about \$238,000. The operations of the Board, it seems, have latterly increased more rapidly than its means.

THE  
RELIGIOUS MONITOR,

AND

EVANGELICAL REPOSITORY.

---

NOVEMBER, 1836.

---

ART. I.—*Review of an Account of the Secession from the Established Church of Scotland, and of the principles of the Seceders, contained in the first and second numbers of the Biblical Repository, for 1835.*

(Concluded from page 209.)

THE OPPOSITION OF THE SECEDERS TO MR. WHITEFIELD, AND TO THE SUPPOSED REVIVAL OF RELIGION PROMOTED BY HIS MINISTRY.

For about two years a correspondence was carried on between the principal ministers of the Secession, and Messrs. Wesley and Whitefield; and it has been frequently stated by others as well as by the Repository, that Mr. Whitefield was invited by the Seceders to come to Scotland. This, however, is denied in the writings published by themselves, and we have seen no proof of it, but mere assertion. The views and feelings with which this correspondence was conducted, may be learned from the following account of it in Mr. Ralph Erskine's preface to a pamphlet, entitled "Fraud and falsehood discovered, &c."

"The correspondence I had with Mr. Wesley was but little, and seldom in comparison of what I had with Mr. Whitefield, before he came first to Scotland; but while I maintained it with them both, I confess I had then very favorable thoughts of them, as persons in whom God might have begun a good work, and by whom I imagined he was beginning to work wonders, and who I thought were aiming at soundness and orthodoxy, and were advancing toward reformation in doctrine, worship, discipline, and government, and gradually abandoning all the principles of their corrupt education. Such was my too great credulity, arising from the strange accounts I had from themselves and others of the powerful presence of God with them, and the remarkable success of their labors. I had hopes that God might be about to make their light to grow, and their zeal to increase in all things that pertained to the house of the God of heaven. This hope spirited me to endeavor, by my letters in answer to theirs, to inform and reform them more and

more, especially when by their answers, the freedom which I used with them seemed to be very acceptable to them, which also moved me to write in the most loving and kindly strain I could. I was not indeed, so much of the opinion my Reverend brother, Mr. Gib, is supposed to be of, (wherein I doubt not but in due time he will further explain himself) as to think they could be no ministers, when miracles of success in their ministry were spread abroad through the christian world."

How far Mr. Erskine had ground for such encouragement, he shows by extracts from the letters received from these men. The following from Mr. John Wesley, is given as a specimen :

*"London. June, 26, 1740.*

"DEAR SIR.

I delayed answering your welcome letter, till I could have time to read over and consider the Tracts you was so kind as to send me. Of one point which I knew not before, it has pleased God to convince me by them, viz. that every christian congregation has an indisputable right to choose its own pastor. If it be not yet given us to agree as to some other points of discipline, yet it is a great blessing that we can love one another, and bear with another, till it seems good to our Lord, (whichsoever of us is mistaken) to reveal even this unto us. I greatly rejoice in the simplicity and plainness of speech wherewith you testify to the truth, and against those who are either utter strangers thereto, or hold it in unrighteousness."

JOHN WESLEY.

The remainder of the letter refers to the state of things in England, and what Mr. Wesley thought to be the duty of the friends of truth there under present circumstances.

Sometime after this, Mr. Erskine heard a report of certain errors imputed to Mr. Wesley, and wrote a friendly letter, in the close of which he mentioned this report, and desired him to give him a true account of this matter. To this letter, dated Jan. 31st, 1741, no reply was ever returned. In Nov. 30th, 1742, nearly two years afterwards, Mr. Wesley again wrote to Mr. Erskine, but only to complain of the opposition of the Seceders, and to advise them to "Let these men alone," that is, himself and his coadjutors.

A letter from Mr. Erskine, dated "Dunfermline, Sept. 28th, 1739," in answer to one of Mr. Wesley's, dated "Bristol, Aug. 24th, 1739" was afterwards published by Mr. Wesley, in his journal, in such a mangled state that he makes Mr. Erskine a favorer of those very bodily agitations, which even at that time he made no scruple of separating from what he supposed to be the work of the Spirit, and of attributing to the agency of Satan. By omitting some things and altering others, he had quite perverted the meaning of the letter; and this was the occasion of the above mentioned Tract, entitled "Fraud and falsehood discovered." In this Tract, Mr. Erskine gives a genuine copy of his letter, distinguishing by Italics, and notes the parts suppressed and altered; and though it is somewhat long, we cannot forbear copying it, as it affords a curious specimen of the cunning of Mr. Wesley, and contains in connexion with the letter to which it is a reply some important information respecting the wonderful effects of the preaching of Messrs. Wesley and Whitefield. It will appear from it, that the revivals under these men were from the first characterized by all the same disorders, bodily agitations, and convulsions which attend the new measures of the present day; and that the same view was entertained of these things by the Seceders from the first. Mr. Wesley in his letter to Mr. Erskine,

had spoken of the outward manner in which the subjects of their revivings were affected. "Some of them," says he "drop down as dead, having no strength nor appearance of life left in them. Some burst into strong cries and tears, some exceedingly tremble and quake, from some great drops of sweat fall to the ground, others struggle as in the agonies of death, so that four or five strong men can hardly restrain a weak woman or a child from hurting themselves or others."

The following is the most material part of Mr. Erskine's reply, in which the altered and omitted passages are distinguished by Italics :

"*Dunfermline, Sept, 28, 1739.*

"REV. AND DEAR SIR,

I desire to bless the Lord [*Mr. Wesley has it, My Lord.*] for the good and great news your letter bears about the Lord's turning many souls from Darkness to light, &c.

As to the outward manner you speak of, wherein most of those were affected, who were cut to the heart by the sword of the Spirit, no wonder that it was at first surprising to you, since there are indeed so very few who have been thus pricked and wounded ; yet some of the instances you give, seem to be exemplified in the outward manner in which Paul and the jailer were at first affected, as also Peter's hearers, Acts ii. The last instance you give of some struggling as in the agonies of death, and in such a manner that four or five men can hardly restrain a weak woman or a child from hurting themselves or others [*Mr. Wesley omits the mention of a child, and has it, herself or others.*] this is to me somewhat more inexplicable, if it do not resemble the child spoken of, Mark ix, 26, and Luke ix. 42, of whom it is said that "when he was yet coming, the Devil threw him down and tare him;" or what influence sudden and sharp awakenings may have upon *sudden bodily convulsions*, [*Mr. W. has it, the body.*] I pretend not to explain, but I make no question, Satan so far as he gets power, may exert himself on such occasions, partly to mar and hinder *the beginning of* the good work in the persons who are [*Mr. W. inserts, thus*] touched with the sharp arrows of conviction, *the enemy being unwilling to quit his old possession, and partly also to prevent the success of the gospel on others, while he seeks thus* to disparage the work of God, and bring it under contempt and reproach, as if it tended to lead people *only to madness and distraction. And in the meantime a holy sovereign God may permit it for hardening a wicked generation, justly leaving them to stumble, and for trying the faith and constancy of his own children whom he has called effectually.* However, the merciful issue of these conflicts, in the conversion of these persons thus affected, is the main thing ; when they are brought by the saving arm of God, to receive Jesus Christ, to have joy and peace in believing, and then to walk in him, and give evidence that the work is a saving work at length, whether more quickly or gradually accomplished, there is great matter of praise.

*As to the work of God among us, an account of which you seem to desire ; though we cannot deny but we sensibly feel now and then some remarkable breathings of the Spirit of God, in praying and preaching, and frequently hear of savoury impressions made by the word upon the hearts of people, and of some good fruits following ; and though any instances of his powerful presence this way seem at this juncture to relate more to the carrying on of the good work where begun, than to the remarkable conversion of others ; yet we want not instances of his power and pity this way, though not appearing outwardly in such sudden and visible effects*



*as these you mention.* All the outward appearances of people's being affected among us, *in time of preaching, and especially at sacramental occasions, in time of communicating, or other such solemn seasons,* may be reduced to these two sorts. One is, hearing with a close, silent attention, with gravity and greediness, discovered by fixed looks, weeping eyes, joyful or sorrowful like countenances, *evidencing tenderness in hearing.* Another sort is when *the word is so affecting to the congregation as to make them,* [Mr. Wesley has, they,] lift up their voice *and weep* aloud, some more depressedly, others more highly, and at times the whole multitude in a flood of tears, all, as it were, crying out at once, till their voice be ready to drown out the minister's, so that he can scarcely be heard for the weeping noise which surrounds him. *And though we judge that the more solid and judicious of the auditory are seldom so noisy as others, though perhaps as much or more affected inwardly; yet of these that are thus outwardly affected, we conceive some to be under a more common, and others under a special gracious influence of the spirit of God, which we can know only by the fruits and effects that follow. The common influence,* [Mr. W. has, The influence on some of these,] like a land flood, dries up, we hear of no change wrought, *the other,* [Mr. W. has, But in others it,] appears afterwards, in the fruits of righteousness and the tract of a holy conversation."

The remainder of the letter consists of a description of these fruits of righteousness, such as being divorced from the law, depending wholly on Christ for justification, living by faith on him, and being denied to all dependence upon "frames, tears, enlargements, influences, and attainments;" all which Mr. Wesley has omitted.

If the reader after perusing the whole letter, will take the trouble of going over it again, omitting the parts printed in italics, and inserting the alterations of Mr. Wesley, inclosed in brackets, he will see how easily the same letter may be made to speak two very different languages, and how a modest exposure of an evil may be converted into a defence of it. He will see how the same kind of art which can convert David into a Christian, the devil's tunes into sacred melodies, and old heresies into modern discoveries; can also convert Ralph Erskine into a Wesleyan methodist, and make his ascribing a work to the devil, to mean an ascription of it to the Holy Spirit.

In respect to the correspondence between Mr. Ralph Erskine and Mr. Whitefield, the following general account of it is given by Mr. Erskine, in the aforesaid tract. "Had I time for transcribing just now, I would satisfy the desire of those who wish to see the letters which passed between Mr. Whitefield and me, or at least, a sum of our epistolary correspondence, in which it would appear how freely I dealt with him about our Presbyterian principles and covenanted reformation in opposition to Episcopacy, ceremonies in worship, &c. And what ground I had to think by his kindly returns, that he was drinking in these principles, and advancing towards reformation. Which, by the by, puts me in mind, that the author of the late apology for the hearers of Mr. Whitefield, p. 21, asserts, that Mr. Whitefield says, he never so much as heard of the Solemn league, until he came to Scotland: Whereas I have under his hand, more than a twelvemonth before ever he saw Scotland, letters, answering with approbation, some of mine, in which I open up the nature of the Solemn league at great length."\*

---

\*A specimen of this correspondence will be found in a separate article.

The following is an extract from one of Mr. Whitefield's letters to Mr. Erskine :

*"London, April 2, 1741.*

"Rev. and very dear Brother.

God is sifting his church here. The Mr. Wesleys scarce preach one principle agreeable to the gospel of Jesus Christ. I'm obliged to separate from them. They load the doctrine of election with the most heavy curses, and plead up for an absolute sinless perfection. Some already blaspheme.

GEORGE WHITEFIELD."

How agreeable this was to the catholic love and general communion which Mr. Whitefield advocated, is obvious without remark. It is only introduced here to show that even when the eyes of the Seceders were opened to the errors of Mr. Wesley, Mr. Whitefield's opposition to these errors was calculated to raise him in their esteem, and give him a favorable introduction among them : though in the end they discovered that while in doctrine there was some difference, the supposed revival or reformation effected by these two men, was essentially the same. The advocates of their work identified the defence of the one with the defence of the other.

When Mr. Whitefield came to Scotland his first visit was paid to Mr. Ralph Erskine, and the latter reckons it as a great mercy that the snare laid for him by two years friendly correspondence, was broken in less than two weeks after Mr. Whitefield's landing. At a meeting of the Associate Presbytery, held soon after his arrival, he attended, and a conference took place between him and them, of which very inaccurate accounts have frequently been published. The members of the Presbytery used the precaution of taking down minutes of what took place, and the substance of these is given by Mr. Fisher, in his "Review of the preface to a Narrative of the extraordinary work at Kilsyth," &c. From these minutes it appears how little reason there is for the charges against the Presbytery, made by Sir H. Moncrieff, the Repertory and others.

The substance of the account given by Sir H. Moncrieff is, that "the Seceders invited Whitefield earnestly to Scotland,\*—that by means of his popularity directed by them, they might gain both attention and influence to their infant sect." His correspondents among them, "had not concealed from him the scheme which they had formed, that his ministrations in Scotland should be confined to their own sect. Nor, on the other hand, had he disguised from them his general resolution to preach without distinction with every order of ministers, who should invite him, and to all who were willing to hear him." Yet the leaders of the Secession, as Sir H. M. represents it, had almost brought themselves to identify Christianity with their own sect, and hoped that when he would come, they could persuade him to enter into their views. "Mr. Whitefield preached first of all in their pulpits, and on one occasion, Mr. Ralph Erskine, one of their most considerable leaders, accompanied him to the pulpit of the Canongate church of Edinburgh. But they soon began to perceive that his general views were not likely to coalesce

---

\*It is true, that in some of the letters of the Seceders to Mr. Whitefield, there are expressions which viewed by themselves, would look like invitations given him to come to Scotland ; but considering that this is disavowed, it is no more than fair to regard these as only seconding the purpose of such a visit, previously avowed by himself. In this way we may understand the letter of Mr. E. Erskine to Mr. W., dated, "Hilldown, near Dunbar, June, 1741," in which he expresses an earnest desire that he would come to their help.

with theirs, and they held a solemn meeting at Dunfermline on purpose to reason with him on the subject. Their conversation on this occasion began with a weak and useless attempt to persuade him of the unlawfulness of Episcopacy; and to give him their own ideas of church government.\* And when nothing which they could say on these topics made the least impression, it terminated in what they had chiefly in view, in a direct proposal that in Scotland he should at least, for the present, preach only for them. "Why should I preach only for you?" said Mr. W. "Because," replied Mr. R. Erskine, "we are the Lord's people." "But," said Mr. W. "has the Lord no other people than yourselves? And supposing that all others were the devil's people, have not they so much the more need to be preached to, and shall I say nothing to them?" This conference issued in a final breach. The Repertory, we are happy to find, has not altogether followed the above account of it, yet they go so far as to say, that proposals were made to Mr. W. to join himself to the Associate Presbytery, which he rejected in the most peremptory manner, and that, "immediately upon this refusal, the Seceders rejected him and his ministry, and pursued him with as much bitterness of persecution as he received from any other quarter."

The true design of Mr. Whitefield's visit to Scotland, appears to have been very different from any scheme to build up the Secession.—It appeared evident, in the end, that it was the design of some of his chief friends to use his influence to break down the Secession, and build up the Establishment. The reader will perceive, from what has been related, that there were a number of ministers in the Established Church, who had once contended in conjunction with the Seceders, against prevailing corruptions. But, though at the first they approved of the Secession, they soon found that their own influence would be lost, if they continued in the Established Church, and yet testified with the Seceders against her defections. The people would very naturally take part with those who honestly separated from the church, rather than with those who from secular motives, preferred her corrupt communion, to the communion of those with whom they agreed. In consequence of their finding that many of the most enlightened and serious christians in the land were deserting their ministry, and joining the Secession, they began to defend the church beyond what they had formerly done, and to cry up the distinction of doctrines into fundamental or essential, and circumstantial or nonessential, in order to justify their continuing in the Establishment, and in opposition to the Seceders. It was to propagate this last principle, and so to break down the Secession, that Mr. Whitefield was selected as the fittest instrument. And the writings of Messrs. Webster, Robe, and other friends of Mr. Whitefield, and his work abundantly testify, that this use was made of his success.—Now, they alleged, God was owning the ministry of the Establishment far more remarkably than that of the Seceders. He was taking part with them, against these their enemies. Thus Mr. Robe addresses himself to the Associate Presbytery; "Can you be so unaffected with the glory of infinitely sovereign grace, appearing toward a judgment-deserving generation, as to say, *you do well to fret and to be angry*, because you find your glory is lessened by it, and your credit beginning to suffer." So Mr. Webster speaking of the Seceding ministers

---

\*What Sir H. M. thinks of disputes on this subject, may be seen in a former paper.

says, "What then, if God is now testifying his displeasure, by not crowning their own labors with the wished success? Or, may he not even in pity to them *remarkably countenance* the ministry of some they despised, that they may henceforth learn not so rashly to call these God has sanctified, *common and unclean*." And again, "It may teach the Associate Presbytery not to limit the Holy One of Israel in the dispensations of his grace, and that God has yet made choice of our Zion, and delights to dwell within the gates of our Jerusalem. And should make them more cautious in separating from these whom the great master of assembles condescends to countenance so remarkably with his presence." The above quotations show that management and trick are not the discoveries of modern revivalists. Of old time, the revival spirit was resorted to for the support of a sinking cause. Nor is it a modern discovery that men and doctrines are to be proved by their influence in promoting revivals. If Mr. Whitefield came advocating prelacy, and a blessing attend his ministry, then we must not oppose prelacy. If Mr. Wesley come and advocate Arminianism, and the same fruits attend his labors, it is God's giving his countenance to Arminianism, and they must not separate from Arminians; and so on to the end of the chapter.

But to return to the conference between Mr. Whitefield and the Associate Presbytery. Mr. Whitefield, as Mr. Fisher affirms, never gave a proper account of this conference, but only of the construction which he put upon it. Mr. W. had said the Associate Presbytery would have been glad of his help, and would have received him into communion with them as a minister of Christ, without any other terms, but his promising to preach only at their invitation, or the invitation of their people. "Now," says Mr. Fisher, "by the copy of the conference written by the brethren there present, just now before me, it appears, that they were so far from being glad of his help, upon no other terms, than his preaching at their invitation, that the first subject of conversation proposed by them, was concerning the government of the church, that they might know whether he was lying open to light upon that point or not, before they could entertain thoughts of hearing or employing him. He wanted to shift this conversation entirely, and to talk about toleration principles. [That is, allowing of diversity of doctrines among communicants in the church.] When the brethren urged by several arguments, a conversation upon the former subject in the first place, then he told them plainly, that he had no difficulty about it, that he was of the communion of the church of England, and was resolved to continue so till they thrust him out. Whereupon the question was stated, whether, in these circumstances, when Mr. Whitefield declared himself of the communion of the church of England, and his resolution to continue in it, and refused to lie open to light on that head, the brethren could hold ministerial communion with him? After one of the brethren had at great length, upon this state of the question, shown the opposition both of Episcopacy and Independency to the word of God, and the solemn oath of the three nations, and Mr. Whitefield, after all [continued] utterly averse to receive light upon that subject, the brethren thereupon resolved, that they would neither hear him preach, nor employ him. This is only a short account of the plain matter of fact." [*Fisher's Review*, pp. 65, 66.]

It is not denied that Mr. Whitefield had great gifts, and the cause of truth generally appears under much disadvantage in the eyes of the

world, when it is arrayed against the gifts of men. Yet we hope our brethren of Princeton, as well as our brethren of Scotland, love Presbyterianism too well to sacrifice it at the feet of a popular preacher. The gifts of the man made no difference as to the proper course to be pursued. He was an Episcopalian in principle. He had, as a priest of the church of England, taken the oath of supremacy, that is, acknowledged the king as supreme, in all causes, ecclesiastical as well as civil. He had abjured the solemn covenants of the nation. He was in favor of the superstitious rites of the church to which he belonged.—He was obstinate in adhering to these things against all attempts to convince him of error. He was besides, extravagantly latitudinarian in his sentiments. In a letter to the religious-societies of England, reprinted also with an address to the religious societies of Scotland, he subjoins an extract from another author, as exactly expressing the language of his own heart, which contains, among other things of the same nature, the following supposition: “That if each church could produce but one man a piece that had the piety of an Apostle, and the impartial love of the first christians, in the first church at Jerusalem, a Protestant and Papist of this stamp would not want half a sheet of paper to hold their articles of union, nor be half an hour before they were of one religion.” Now this can have no meaning at all, if it mean not that both Protestants and Papists might drop all the things about which they differ, and yet find that they held in common enough to be a proper basis for union and church fellowship. This scheme of catholic love was also extended by some of Mr. W’s followers so as to embrace within its broad circumference christians, Jews and Gentiles.\*

It is not necessary to call in question the piety or zeal of Mr. Whitefield. Though it is probable little would have been known of them had it not been for his uncommon eloquence. Yet after all the celebrity which he has attained, there is just reason to call in question the soundness of his views, both of doctrinal and practical religion. In proof of this, we may refer to “An account of the first part of the life of the Rev. Mr. George Whitefield, from his birth to his entering into holy orders: written by himself;” one reason of his publishing which was, the benefit he had received from reading the lives of good men. Mr. W. according to his own account, appears to have been a good man of a different kind from such as Halyburton, Boston, and others of the same class. After he had reduced his body by a kind of popish austerity to extreme weakness, he gives the following account of his relief and conversion:

“One day perceiving an uncommon drought and a noisome clamminess in my mouth, and using things to allay my thirst, but in vain; it was suggested to me that when Jesus Christ cried out, *I thirst*, his sufferings were near over—upon this I threw myself upon the bed, crying out, *I thirst, I thirst*. Soon after I perceived my load go off, a spirit of mourning was taken from me, and I knew what it was truly to rejoice in the Lord—At first after this, I could not avoid singing psalms where ever I was; but my joy gradually became more settled, and, blessed be God, has abode and increased in my soul, saving a few casual intermissions, ever since.” [*Account of the life of Mr. Whitefield, Boston, 1740, pp. 32, 33.*]

---

\*For Mr. W’s favorable opinion of the Quakers, and for other sentiments which he held, see the subjoined letter.

We hope that Mr. Whitefield's conversion was founded on something better than this, but this is all the account he gives of it. Now the spirit never intended these words of Christ, *I thirst*, to be a promise to the sinner, that when his mouth is dry and clammy, and he repeats these words, "I thirst, I thirst," he shall obtain relief. Nor can we think that the Spirit in his work will pervert the scripture, or give any blessing to the perversion of it; and are obliged, therefore to look on this relief of Mr. W. and all the comfort flowing from it, as delusive.

It does not seem necessary to enter into a labored defence of the Seceders in refusing to hold communion with Mr. W. It is not properly a question about an individual, but resolves itself into a general one.—Should Presbyterians unite with Episcopalians? And it involves another. Should the Presbyterians of Scotland have submitted to Episcopacy, when tyrannically imposed on them, and so have saved the immense sufferings and bloodshed endured in opposing it? Nor does it seem necessary to dwell upon the work at Cambuslang, Kilsyth and other places in Scotland, promoted so much by Mr. W's ministry. This work was in substance the same with the modern revivals effected by Methodists, and New-measure men. All the most authentic accounts represent it as attended with the same disorders, outcries, faintings, convulsions, voices, visions, and revelations; only in a much greater degree. It is said by a friend of the work,\* in his account of it, that at Cambuslang, in the congregation of Mr. M'Culloch, "his hearers in considerable numbers, were on different occasions, so violently agitated while he preached on the christian doctrine of regeneration, as to fall down, in the midst of the multitude under visible paroxysms of bodily agony."—This continued during the winter, and great crowds were attracted from the surrounding region. Similar effects soon began to appear at Kilsyth, and other places adjacent. "Something less remarkable, but of the same kind, had been before observed at Edinburgh, and other districts of Scotland, where Mr. Whitefield had preached. He imputed more to these agitations, than men of a less sanguine temper would have readily admitted." He subsequently visited Cambuslang, where he gathered together vast multitudes, and the work appeared suddenly to have reached its greatest height. "The visible convulsive agitations exceeded every thing of the kind which had yet been observed." These astonishing appearances were regarded by many, not excepting so good and sensible a man as Dr. Erskine, to be an evident signal of the glory of the latter day. In Mr. Wesley's account of this work as it appeared in England, he represents the bodily agitations as so violent that "four or five strong men could hardly restrain a weak woman or a child from hurting themselves or others."

Many of the subjects of this work seemed to have as little power over their minds as over their bodies, being filled with the wildest imaginations, such as that they had sights of hell, of the devil, and of Jesus Christ. They were distinguished by their opposition to all contending for the faith; they were too spiritual to condescend to the little things by which christians were divided. Those who managed the work numbered their converts, boasted over them, and regarded all who entertained any doubts about the character of these influences, as heaven-daring blasphemers, and as not far from the sin against the Holy Spirit. The Repertory represents the work "as of the same kind and under the

---

\*Sir H. Moncrieff.

preaching of the self-same truths," with the extraordinary out-pourings of the spirit in former times, at the kirk of Shots, and divers places in the west of Scotland; and with the success of the gospel among the persecuted Covenanters, when driven by the Cavaliers to worship on mountains and in the open fields, which the Seceders had recognized in their Testimony as the appearance of God for his church. And the editors express their wonder that the men who had spoken so favorably of those appearances, should condemn the work at Cambuslang. It may be a sufficient reply to this to say, that there is no evidence that the disorders attending the work at Cambuslang, attended the former work, but on the contrary, it was without any noise or parade either on the part of its subjects or instruments. Nor were the doctrines preached the same. In the former work the church was contending against prelacy and corrupt doctrine; and appearing under much persecution for her covenants and the cause of truth. In the latter work, both the instruments and subjects of it were either advocates of prelacy, or despisers of all differences about church government; they were against a particular testimony for the truth; they befriended the cause of corruption and oppression in the Establishment; and they were unmindful of the solemn covenants of their fathers.

The Repertory however, gives us a reason for the opposition of the Seceders to this work, altogether different from any persuasion of the evils of it. Their account is as follows: "The Associate Presbytery, by solemnly declaring that the judicatories of the Established Church were no judicatories of Jesus Christ, committed themselves in such a manner, that they were led to the adoption of many dangerous opinions, both doctrinal and practical, merely out of opposition to the acts of the Establishment. Their bitter feelings and expressions in regard to Mr. Whitefield, must be ascribed to this cause: For his preaching having been attended with extraordinary success in many of the churches of the Establishment, the Seceders were led, upon the principle above stated, to view all the effects of his preaching, as a delusion of the devil.—So powerful is the influence of prejudice, even over the minds of persons of eminent piety!" The opposition to the work at Cambuslang, &c. it is said, "can only be accounted for, on the principle stated above, that the National Church being no longer a true Church, could not be the subject of special divine influences, until she confessed her backslidings, and by sincere repentance returned to her covenanted God." After some proof that the Established Church, notwithstanding her defections and remissness, was yet a true church of Christ, it is added; "But the Seceders having prejudged this matter, in the height of their excitement, were afterwards obliged to judge of every thing that related to this church, in conformity with their first solemn act. Here was the true source of all their consequent mistakes; and they were not few."

If every piece of information about things before unknown, laid us under obligation to our instructors, we could not be otherwise than much obliged to our brethren, for this important discovery of the radical error of the Seceders. But seriously, though we had often heard such illiberal views attributed to them, we were not prepared to see them sanctioned by any such respectable authority as that of the Repertory. We hardly know how to meet the charge, not because it is difficult to disprove it, but simply because it is so utterly destitute of proof. The Repertory says that the Seceders solemnly declared the

judicatories of the Established Church to be "no judicatories of Jesus Christ," and this is the foundation of all their reasoning on this subject, yet the Seceders made no such declaration, and of this we know not how the Repertory could be ignorant, for they have more than once given the precise words of the act to which they refer.

The Seceders regarded the National Church as a true church, though not pure and faithful; they believed that there were in it many godly people, and also "faithful ministers" with whom, says Mr. Erskine in his appeal, "I reckon not myself worthy to be compared." They always distinguished between the church and its judicatories, and they never even pronounced the judicatories to be no courts of Christ, but admitted that they were only "not lawful or rightly constituted courts." If proof that the above charge is groundless were necessary, we might quote abundantly from the writings of the Seceders; we shall however only adduce a few words from Mr. Fisher's Review, where the same charge is noticed and answered. Mr. Webster had insinuated that it had been charged upon the *gentlemen* of the Secession, as he calls them, and drawn as an inference from their writings, "that not one soul can be converted within the pale of the Established Church of Scotland." To this Mr. Fisher replies, "None of these *ministers* ever said so, and I believe never thought so."

Another circumstance quite at war with the theory of the Repertory, seems to have been overlooked in this place, though elsewhere they mention it. It is the fact, that the opposition of the Seceders to Mr. Whitefield commenced almost immediately after his landing in Scotland, and before his success in the churches of the Establishment had appeared, or could have been certainly anticipated; so that this success, being subsequent to the opposition, could not be the reason of it. Their honesty and integrity in this affair, appear in that they unanimously refused ministerial communion with him from the very first, when he was seeking connexion with them, not to the exclusion of the Establishment, but in preference to it. They did this while they had the most flattering accounts of his success in other places, and the fairest prospects of turning his great influence to good account in the promotion of their cause in Scotland. They did this while his popularity was at its height, and when their opposition to him would subject them to the greatest reproach. They did this while many others equally opposed to him, were silent through fear of the great, among whom Mr. W. had admirers and friends. And, what can any one see in all this, but a candid, christian preference of truth and duty to the increase of a party, and the favor of men.

In the preceding extract from the Repertory, the Seceders are accused of regarding all the effects of Mr. Whitefield's preaching as a delusion of the devil. This, however, we feel constrained to say, they never did, either in relation to Mr. Whitefield's or any other man's preaching, or in relation to any supposed revival of religion. They pointed out particularly what things they judged to be a delusion; and these were, according to the concurring testimonies of both the friends and enemies of the work, "faintings, hysteric-fits, convulsions, bodily agonies and strugglings" regarded as evidences of the gracious operations of the Spirit. The Seceders never denied that the Spirit of God might attend the ministry of men where such things occurred, and dwell in the subjects of these bodily convulsions; they only denied that these convulsions proceeded from the Spirit and were proofs of his gra-



scious presence. They looked upon these things from the first as means used by Satan to mar and hinder the work of God, and to deceive men. If they were severe in this judgment, yet not more so than the great promoter of these disorders. However much stress Mr. Whitefield may at times have laid on these outward appearances, yet when he is speaking his deliberate opinion in his Journal, he says, "These bodily convulsions, I believe, come from the devil, who wants to bring an evil report upon the work of God, now going on among us, by such fits."

As to the bitter feelings and expressions of the Seceders, in regard to Mr. W., we have no apology to offer for them wherever they may be found. Mr. Gib's Warning, though containing many good things, is admitted to be unduly severe in its language. It will, however, be no more than justice to him to add, that when he speaks of Mr. W. as "no minister of Christ," he refers to his episcopal ordination, which he regarded as not valid, because not scriptural: and when he ranks him among the "false Christs," it is according to such a general view of these words, that they might be equally applied to all teachers of error. It has been said by acquaintances of Mr. Gib still living, that though he never altered his mind as to Mr. W., yet in maturer life he was accustomed to speak with regret of the harsh manner in which he had written against him in his youth. Mr. Gib's writings in general are characterized by severity. He is remarkable for correctness and good sense, yet not without his faults; and it is not improbable that what has often happened in other cases may have happened in this; some have imitated his faults who were quite unable to follow him in his excellence. It is also admitted that the controversial writings of the Scots, though generally abounding in sound judgment and accurate discrimination, are often characterized by asperity of manner; while in this land, many run to the opposite extreme, and mingle all their hard sayings with so much suavity, that as some one lately remarked in a speech, we might be glad of an occasion to provoke them in order to elicit so much kindness and compliment. Yet after all we are as unwilling to believe, that all the good nature in the world is to be found with others, as that the Seceders suppose all the influences of the Spirit, to be confined to themselves. If Mr. Gib, as the Repertory alleges, proved himself no prophet, by predicting the exposure of Mr. Whitefield's work, Mr. Whitefield showed that he had as little of this gift as his opponent. With oracular solemnity he declared, "That the Associate Presbytery were building a Babel, and that he believed it would soon tumble down about their ears!"

If some of the Seceders were unduly severe against Mr. Whitefield, they were not alone in this fault. Though the Established Church was willing to make use of him for a time, as some thought, for the purpose of breaking down the Secession; yet from the first, some of her ministers opposed him as firmly as the Seceders, and some from motives less defensible than theirs; because his popularity eclipsed them, and his fervor reproved them. And, at the last, when his popularity was on the wane, and his success not so remarkable, they passed an act in general terms, about foreign preachers, the particular design of which was to exclude him from Scotland. The Synod of Glasgow, in the bounds of which Cambuslang lies, enacted "That no minister within their bounds, should employ ministers or preachers, not licensed or ordained in Scotland, till he had sufficient evidence of their license and good character, and should be in readiness to give an account of his

conduct to his own Presbytery when required." The avowed object of this act, though Mr. Whitefield was not named in it, was to exclude him; and in the debate upon passing it, many follies and imprudencies were imputed to him. Dr. Erskine of Edinburgh, though at the first, one of the warmest advocates of the Methodists, became at last a signal opponent of Mr. Wesley, and spoke against him as severely as the Seceders had spoken against either of the great leaders of that society. Dr. Robertson was from the first, an opponent of Whitefield, and so hotly was the dispute respecting him managed, that it broke up a literary association in the University, of which he and Dr. Erskine were members, and interrupted their intercourse in private life.—[*Life of Dr. Erskine*, pp. 128, 129, 133, 496.]

The "True Presbyterians," supposed to be the followers of Mr. M'Millen, published a declaration concerning Mr. George Whitefield, and the work at Cambuslang, under the following title: "The Declaration, protestation and testimony of the suffering Remnant of the *Antipapish, Anti-Lutherian, Anti-prelatic, Anti-Whitefieldian, Anti-Erastian, Anti-Sectarian, true Presbyterian Church of Christ in Scotland*; published against Mr. George Whitefield, and his encouragers; and against the work at Cambuslang, and other places." In this declaration, Mr. Whitefield is called "an abjured, prelatic hireling, a scandalous idolater, a self-seeking prattler, a self-exalter, a boar and a wild beast from the anti-christian field of England, to waste and devour the poor erring people of Scotland, a thief and a robber," &c. &c. Mr. Gib's Warning is rather tame, compared with this declaration of the "Suffering Remnant."

Neither did the work of Mr. Whitefield escape opposition in America, nor can our brethren of the General Assembly plead entire exemption from the supposed guilt of setting themselves against "this great evangelical preacher." A protestation was presented to the Synod of Philadelphia, June 1, 1741, signed by twelve ministers and eight elders, in which speaking of Mr. Gilbert Tennent, and others of Mr. Whitefield's adherents, they testify against "their preaching the terrors of the law in such manner and dialect as has no precedent in the word of God, but rather appears to be borrowed from a worse dialect; and so industriously working on the passions and affections of weak minds, as to cause them to cry out in a hideous manner, and fall down in convulsion-like fits to the marring of the profiting both of themselves, and others, who are so taken up in seeing and hearing these odd symptoms, that they cannot attend to hear what the preacher says; and then after all, boasting of these things as the work of God, which we are persuaded do proceed from an inferior worse cause." This protestation takes the same view of the preaching and success of Mr. Whitefield and his imitators as Mr. Gib does in his "Warning," and we suppose will be classed by our brethren with that, as they call it, "unfortunate production." Mr. Gilbert Tennent himself, though forward in promoting this work at the first, afterwards made an open and candid recantation of his independent and enthusiastic principles and practices. [*Fisher's Review*, pp. 29, 30, 68.]

It would be easy to add other specimens of opposition to Mr. Whitefield and his associates, and to the reformation, supposed to be effected by their labors. It would also be easy to show that these Reformers were not at all behind the Seceders and their other opponents in the use of severe language, that they indeed, went far beyond them, employing the harshest denunciations against all who made any question about

the nature of their work. But this will not be necessary to any careful observer of the spirit of the present day. It was in former times as it is now : the enemies of the truth can see no bitterness,—nothing but lamb-like meekness in all the excesses of their own vituperations ; yet nothing can be said against their doctrines and measures, however mild and pacific, but it is at once arrayed in dragon-like fierceness ; it is sedition, prejudice, bigotry, persecution, and every thing that is evil. It has been the lot of the writer to witness a great part of the proceedings which have occasioned so much trouble in the Presbyteries and Synod of Philadelphia, and in the General Assemblies, for several years past ; and he thinks without any partial bias on account of a greater agreement in principle, he can honestly bear testimony to the uncommon degree of calmness, patience and firmness of those who have appeared on the side of the Standards of the church, and that whatever there has been of intemperance and passion, by far the greater portion has been upon the side of their opponents. Yet the friends of the Standards are accused on every side as butchers, persecutors, blind zealots, and mad men : while if you would believe their accusers, all the meekness, candour, prudence, zeal and charity, as well as all the wisdom of the church is with them. Might not the present state of things lead to a suspicion that bitterness has been found on the side of the Seceders, and moderation and charity on the side of their opponents, in the same way ; while these opponents were in reality employing the most bitter reproaches, and the Seceders in general, like some of their brethren of the General Assembly, were bearing these things with meekness and patience ? It is at least by no means uncommon to find the cause of truth sustaining itself in the meek spirit of the truth, and an evil cause seeking support from violence and abuse.

We hope the Repertory did not lack moral courage to speak out their minds freely and openly, without the shelter of any man's name. They have, however, seen proper under the ostensible design of defending Mr. Whitefield, to bring forward all their heaviest charges against the Seceders, such as the charges of prejudice, bigotry, bitterness, harshness, numerous mistakes, and "many dangerous opinions, both doctrinal and practical adopted merely out of opposition to the acts of the Establishment." Such of the dangerous opinions, and prejudices as are specified, have been noticed. It will be time to consider others, when stated in less general terms.

#### THE CONTROVERSY AND BREACH OCCASIONED BY THE BURGESS-OATH.

Our brethren of the Repertory, though we hope with no evil design, revert to the affair of the Burgess-oath, about as often as they find the Seceders reverting to the case of Mr. Simpson. They mention this affair in the close of their former article, and then conclude by saying, "But our paper has already exceeded a reasonable limit ; so that we are reluctantly obliged to stop short of the object which we had in view." The particular object of these articles according to their own statement, appears to have been, "to give an account of the troubles" about the Burgess-oath, "which terminated in a schism of the Seceders," and in the deposition of Mr. E. Erskine, "by the majority of that very ecclesiastical body which he had been the chief instrument of forming." In their second article, this affair is again introduced quite out of the series of events, between the account of the opposition to Mr. Whitefield, and of the "Act concerning the doctrine of grace," and then is

dismissed to make room for the latter subject. There is also such frequent allusion to it as makes it evident that our brethren had not lost sight of their particular "object." After repeatedly taking up this affair, and dismissing it for want of room or want of a proper place, they take it up once more in the conclusion of their second article, and give us a long account of it; though declaring, after an extract from Mr. E. Erskine's protest, that "the very ground of this controversy being now removed there would be no utility in entering further into the arguments on either side."

Their history of this affair is altogether favorable to those who were called Burghers, from their advocating the lawfulness of the controverted oath. With this we are not at all surprised. It is natural for churches to take part with those who approximate to themselves, and every one acquainted with the history of this event must be aware that the Burghers made a considerable approximation to those churches which are less strict in doctrine and discipline. All the main arguments of the Burghers are noticed, and then we are told, that "there would be no utility in entering further into the arguments on either side." All the things done by the Anti-Burghers for which they have been most reproached, are particularly mentioned, and then, we are told there is "not room at present to give any particular account of the Burgher Synod, and the acts which they passed in relation to the Anti-Burghers." It is all along taken for granted, that the Burghers were right, that they were the majority, and constituted the true Associate Synod? while our brethren who profess "to act as historians rather than censors, of these transactions," yet so far forget themselves, that they pronounce the Anti-Burghers "a self-constituted—a newly formed—and a self-styled Associate Synod." And when they say of the proceedings of the Anti-Burgher Synod that they were "a burlesque on ecclesiastical government" it seems almost as if they had designed a burlesque on their own profession.

The question about the Burgess-oath, came before the Associate Synod, Oct. 10, 1744, the next day after the act was passed, dividing the Presbytery, and constituting a Synod: and this question was referred to the several Presbyteries, with a view to some action upon it at the ensuing Synodical meeting. Two of the Presbyteries sent up reports to that meeting, one particularly respecting the oath, the other in general terms, yet explained as having a reference to the same thing. It is of some consequence to observe this regular entrance upon the question, to which no objection was made at the time, as in the opposition subsequently made to what was done, it was objected, that the question had not been regularly before the Presbyteries; and the act which occasioned the breach contained in it a reference of the question to the Presbyteries, as if this step had not been already taken. At this time there was no agitation of mind on this subject, nor were there any fears of evil consequences. And it is probable that no evil consequences would have followed, if this affair had been managed in the same spirit with others of greater difficulty, which had been settled with entire unanimity. The Repertory appears not to have been so sharp sighted in detecting the radical evil in this case as in the case of Mr. Whitefield. Or, if they discovered it they have not seen proper to mention it. We would after their example, pass it over, were it not that this portion of history cannot be properly understood without the knowledge of it: and as they say in another place, "all parties, may derive useful

lessons from a calm consideration of the transactions of former times." It is now we believe generally conceded by those who have the best opportunities of knowing the truth, and the least reason for publishing what they assert, if it were false, that the radical cause of the breach about the Burgess-oath, was personal hostility between two prominent ministers of the Synod. The individual who first introduced this oath to the notice of the Synod, was Mr. Moncrieff, one of the four original Seceders; another of them, Mr. Fisher, appears to have entertained a personal dislike to him. The question about the oath furnished an occasion of dispute between these two men, in which it is probable that these bad feelings were both indulged, and strengthened. The other members of the Synod became ranged under these two as their respective leaders, and the contest appears to have been for victory as well as for principle. We are not willing to admit that principle was forgotten, or was not chiefly regarded by most, if not by all the disputants; yet it is impossible to conceive how the ministers of the Secession, if they had retained their former spirit, could have failed to devise some way of settling the matter of dispute which would have been at the same time scriptural and satisfactory. The history of this breach clearly shows that those who were the leaders in the Synod, were in some measure, left to themselves, and acted under the influence of their own spirits.

After this question had been debated warmly at several meetings, on the 6th of April, 1746, the Synod adopted an act declaring it unlawful, under present circumstances, for any in their communion to swear the following religious clause in some Burgess-oaths; viz. "Here I protest before God and your Lordships, that I profess, and allow with my heart, the true religion presently professed within this realm, and authorized by the laws thereof: I shall abide thereat, and defend the same, to my life's end; renouncing the Roman religion, called Papistry."

This act was adopted, as a healing measure. It had been privately submitted in this character to Mr. Ralph Erskine, one of the leaders in the opposition, who cordially approved of it, and rejoiced in the prospect of harmony, being restored by this means; but, owing to the aforementioned cause, when the Synod met, he was induced to oppose it. The act did not go as far as many of its advocates desired, yet they yielded something in the hope of securing peace. Some objected to any religious clause in an oath, framed with a reference to civil privileges; some objected to the magistrates of burghs imposing such an oath by their own authority; some objected to the penalty, which was a sum of money the swearer agreed to pay for the breach of the oath; others had other objections. But the act was so modified that nothing was condemned but the *present* swearing of this *particular clause*, by members of the *Secession* under *present circumstances*.

It is hardly worth while to spend time in vindicating this act. The case is so plain that reasoning appears only to darken it. The Seceders professed a present Secession from the Established church, and testified against her as guilty of many corruptions in doctrine, government, and discipline, particularly specified in her judicial deeds. Among these corruptions were the sinful terms accepted by the church at the *Union*; her *toleration* of such as had abjured Presbyterianism for Episcopacy without giving satisfactory evidence of repentance; the *act* respecting "The Marrow of Modern Divinity;" as also, the imposition of ministers according to the system of *patronage*, and the exercise of *Erastian* power by the magistrates, to which things the church had submitted: all

which had been condemned by the Seceders, and assigned as grounds of secession. Can any one then suppose it consistent to profess a secession from the Established Church on such grounds, and yet swear to a profession of the religion presently professed within the realm and established by its laws? As to the term, "True Religion," on which the Burghers insisted so much, it is evident that it is defined and limited by the words following, and could no more justify the swearing of this oath, than a Turk or Heathen's calling his the "true religion," would justify us in swearing the same profession with him. The Repertory, at least in this case, is bound in honesty to take the part of the Anti-burghers. The great argument of the Burghers was, that they differed not from the *true* religion professed by the Established Church, but only from the *faulty manner* of professing it, so that in taking the oath they were only swearing to the same thing professed by themselves. The Repertory however supposes that the Seceders were desirous of making the difference between them and the Establishment as great as possible, and that in consequence of this they made a divergence from the Standards. They must therefore admit that it would have been inconsistent and sinful in the Seceders to make the profession which they did, and yet, at the same time swear that they professed the same religion with the Establishment. The argument of the Burghers, that it was "the *true* religion itself professed and authorized in Scotland, that was sworn to in the oath, and not the *faulty manner* of professing and settling it,"\* would justify a swearing to the true religion as professed at Rome, if the same exception as to the *faulty manner* might be admitted. It would be very difficult to find any thing in all Mr. E. Erskine's writings so extremely weak as his reasoning on this subject quoted by the Repertory. The substance of it is, that the oath was originally lawful, therefore no change of circumstances can make the swearing of it sinful. Our brethren appear to have been imposed upon by this specious though inconclusive argument, for they not only quote it at length, but in the introduction of this part of their history, give in substance the same view of the question. "This," say they, "was no new affair; but an oath which had for a long time been exacted of all persons accepting public office, and which had never until now attracted attention, or occasioned scruples of conscience." The oath, we believe, was peculiar to less than eight burghs, and was not exacted of *all* persons accepting office, nor perhaps administered particularly, if at all, to such persons. Our understanding of it has always been, that it was in a few places exacted of persons desiring to become citizens, or to enjoy what is called the freedom of the city.— This passage however, was not quoted to correct these mistakes, but to show the fallacy of the argument. The whole of this reasoning of Mr. Erskine and the Repertory is built on the supposition, that no change of circumstances can change the character of an oath. If this principle were correct; then, as it was once lawful for us in this country to swear allegiance to the king of Britain, it must be lawful for us to do so still: and if it were once lawful to swear to the profession of a particular church, no degeneracy of that church can render it sinful to swear to her profession with all its corruptions. A cause must be hard pressed which calls in the aid of such arguments. It appeared almost impossible to get the Burghers to attend to the words "presently *professed*" contained in the above religious clause. They were always for interpreting it, as

---

\*Re-exhibition of the Testimony, p. 260.

if it bound the swearer, not to any religion *presently* professed, but only to the true religion *formerly* professed and established.

We have no hesitation in saying, that every impartial person will admit the views of the Anti-burghers in this controversy to have been correct. Nor is there any reason to suspect the Seceders in the United States of being under any particular bias in their favor, for they have never allowed this controversy to occasion any disturbance among them. As to formal connexion, they have always been united with the Anti-burghers; but as to practice, they have so far acted on the principle of the Burghers, as to make differences of opinion on this subject a matter of forbearance. If in other things there were no difficulty, the act respecting this oath was never allowed to obstruct the entrance of Burghers into their communion.

There was no irregularity or haste in adopting the aforesaid act. The Repertory states, and it is believed, accurately, that "the consideration of this subject occupied the Associate Synod long; and the discussions were attended with intense interest, and great solemnity. Before a final decision, this subject [had been discussed at four meetings of the Synod, and had] absorbed the attention of the body for thirteen *sederunts*, most of which were very protracted. Three public fasts were observed on account of this affair. Thrice, meetings for prayer were held by the Synod; and during the discussion, seven brethren were called upon at different times, to offer up prayer to God for direction." The minority in favor of the oath were always for preventing a vote, by which they foresaw that they would be defeated, and the majority still yielded to them in the hopes that they would ere long be convinced, and satisfied. It is much to be regretted that the minority did not follow the same prudent and pacific course when they had greater advantages on their side, instead of hastily and violently urging on a vote which they were warned would cause a breach.

At the time when the act was passed, Messrs. R. Erskine, Fisher, Hutton, H. Erskine, and M'Cara, ministers, together with two elders, protested. Messrs. E. Erskine, and Horne, ministers, protested at the next meeting of Synod, in September. A chief ground of complaint on the part of the protestors was, that one half of the constituent members of the Synod, and as Mr. E. Erskine says, more than one half were absent. Mr. Gib, whose account of these transactions we have generally followed, states that the highest number in attendance at this meeting, was forty-three: Of these, thirty-seven had been present on the first week, and twenty-six on the second, when the act was passed. So that, though the argument were not futile in itself, it was in this case founded upon a mistake. The same writer shows that the thin state of the meeting was in favor of the protestors. There were thirteen votes in favor of the act; nine voted for a delay: of these nine, there were two who were against the oath, though for delaying the question. There were three silent who were of the same mind, as was also the moderator; making in all nineteen against the oath, and only seven in its favor. But if there had been a full assembly of all the ministers composing the Synod, the case would have been still more unfavorable to the minority, for it was ascertained at their next meeting, that of thirty ministers belonging to the Secession, twenty-three were against the oath, and only seven in its favor. And if the general sentiment were in proportion, more than three fourths of the whole church were with the majority in this decision.

The next meeting after the act was passed, was in the following Sep-

tember. At this time, vigorous efforts were made to set aside the act, from being a term of communion, but without success, there being thirty-seven members in favor of it, and only ten against it.

These attempts were renewed at the next meeting, which was held in Bristo Kirk, Edinburgh, and commenced April 7th, 1747. The members at this time consisted of twenty-nine ministers, and twenty-four elders. On the second day, the answers to the reasons of protest which had not been prepared at the former meeting, were reported to be in readiness; but, instead of allowing them to be heard, which was evidently the proper course, the protestors urged their former question about the act being a term of communion, as if the act itself had left this point in doubt. The form in which their question was now proposed was as follows:

“Whether the decision concerning the religious clause in some burghs-oaths, passed by this Synod in April, 1746, shall now or afterwards be made a term of ministerial and christian communion; aye, and until the making of the same to be so shall be referred, by way of overture unto Presbyteries and Kirk-sessions, in order to their giving their judgment thereupon: that so there may be in the mean time a friendly dealing among the members of this Synod with one another, in a way of conference and prayer, in order to their coming through the Lord’s pity to see eye to eye in the matter of the said religious clause:—Or, not?”

After some debate, a previous question was proposed, viz: “Proceed to call for the Reasons of protest, and the Answers thereto, for having them read and considered: Or, not?” And the question being on which of these two the vote should be taken, it carried by twenty-nine against twenty-two, in favor of the first. Thus, partly by the management of the minority in the question proposed by them, and partly by the indiscretion of the majority in the question which they submitted as an opposite, the Anti-burghers laid the foundation for their subsequent defeat. They regarded themselves as not at liberty to vote on the first question at all, yet by proposing an opposite question, they enabled the other party to secure a majority in favor of having their question put: and then not being at liberty, according to their views, to vote upon it, a minority was able to decide it according to their pleasure.

The next day (April 9th) thirteen ministers and ten elders protested against the vote of the preceding day; and again, protested against the Synod’s proceeding to put the aforesaid question. The debate continued till past mid-night, and a breach which had been feared for a considerable time seemed now to be inevitable. There was at the same time an unwillingness to act, and an unwillingness to yield. The moderator, Mr. James Mair, though repeatedly and vehemently urged, refused to put a vote which was to put asunder brethren who had so long taken sweet counsel together, and who had stood side by side in days of trouble, contention and reproach. He entreated a delay, and being urged once and again to call, or order the calling of the roll, he made no reply. Mr. William Hutton, the clerk pro tem. and one of the protestors, was repeatedly required to call the roll, but he held down his head upon the table and made no answer. What a pity that men like these, who cannot be unsettled and driven about by the violent agitations of the storm, are so rare, and that their example has so little influence! In the midst of this confusion, Mr. John M’Cara took upon himself without any authority to call the roll, and Mr. Henry Erskine in the same disorderly way marked the votes. It is not necessary to comment on these facts. They



evidently made the proceedings as null and void as if an armed force should come into the meeting of a church court, and control or usurp their business. Would any one think that such a disorderly band constituted the court, or that either a majority or minority of the members would be presumptuous, if they retired and regarded themselves as the true court, though expelled in a violent manner?

The Repertory supposes the Burghers to have been the majority because the vote was carried on their side. For the same reason they might have supposed that they made up the whole Synod, for the vote was unanimous. Those who had protested against putting the question all declined voting, as they judged the question disorderly in itself, and put in a disorderly manner. Of these there were as has been mentioned, thirteen ministers and ten elders. Nine ministers and eleven elders carried the question against them; that is, that the act should not be a term of communion, but should be referred to Presbyteries and Kirk-sessions. Seven of those who voted thus, were protestors against the act, and on this ground were regarded as parties who had no right to vote on this question; but even including these, the whole number was but twenty who carried this measure against twenty-three. It is true, the Burghers reckoned thirty as on their side, but the way in which they made up this number was by counting the vote of the Moderator, who, though agreeing with them, was not entitled to vote in the case. They added the vote of an absent member, who was against them, and also the votes of eight silent members, who would of course be reckoned to them had they been the majority, but could not be added to them to make a majority. Thus they raised their vote from twenty to thirty.—After the ministers of each party had become regularly ranged on the different sides, there were found to be nineteen in the Anti-burgher, and only twelve in the Burgher Synod; so that all the reproach cast on the former as a minority actually taking upon themselves to constitute, and claim the authority of the Associate Synod, may be legitimately transferred to the latter!

The inconsistency of the swearing of the burgess-oath by Seceders has been noticed already, but this was doubted by the resolution passed on the night of the breach. This resolution did not affect, but virtually acknowledged the integrity of the original act, so that it was in so many words, allowing members of the church to swear an oath judicially declared to be sinful and inconsistent with their solemn covenants.

After the question was put and carried in the manner stated, Mr. Thomas Mair, the moderator of the former meeting, who had presided at the opening of this, and agreeably to rule was entitled to officiate when the regular moderator declined, read a public intimation, that those who had voted for the resolution had been guilty of a virtual renunciation of their Testimony, that the proper authority of the Synod was with those who had opposed them, and these were notified to meet the next day, at 10 o'clock, at Mr. Gib's house. Accordingly, the next day the two parties met in separate Synods.

These proceedings terminated in this mournful breach at 2 o'clock on the night of the 9th of April, 1747. As the union between these brethren had been most intimate, so it was not severed without much and violent struggling. Yet, on the same account when the breach was once made it was the more difficult to be healed; and it was not healed till all that generation which was concerned in it had passed away; and even now, we fear that it is healed but slightly, both as respects principle and affection.

In the account of these transactions contained in the Repertory, there is no notice of these irregularities of the Burgher-party. There is no mention made of the refusal to hear the Reasons of protest and the Answers; but from an indistinctness in the account of the different meetings in September and April, the impression is left on the mind that the answers were all along purposely withheld, instead of being refused a regular hearing. The question which occasioned the breach is merely said to have been, "Whether the case should be referred to the Presbyteries, and Kirk-sessions, for their judgment:" there is no mention of its having been already before the Presbyteries; and the main point of the question about the act being a term of communion is omitted. Nothing is said of the final vote having been taken without either a moderator or clerk, by two private members of the court acting without the least shadow of authority. Nor is any thing said of Mr. Thomas Mair's right to officiate as moderator, when the acting moderator declined. One would suppose from the statements of the Repertory, that the vote had been taken by the regular officers, and the adjournment announced by a mere private member, whereas, the case was exactly the reverse. There is nothing said of the actual majority declining to vote, but on the contrary, Mr. Mair is made, in his declaration at the adjournment, to assign the majority to the other side, a statement for which we can find in that declaration no authority. Mr. Mair speaks of those who opposed the vote as "a considerable number of elders and a majority of the ministers in the meeting;" the Repertory makes him to say that "the majority had passed the vote." How the former declaration could be the same with the latter, or how the latter could even grow out of the former, it is difficult to comprehend.

Here the Repertory raises a difficulty about a minority, as they suppose the Anti-burghers to have been, withdrawing and declaring themselves "The Associate Synod," which, if right, would have warranted another and another minority to withdraw and do the same, "till only one person had been left to constitute a *Synod*." We are well satisfied with their own answer to this difficulty. They say, "But it may be asked, what are the minority to do, when they are fully persuaded that the majority are in error? If the error be such that they cannot conscientiously submit to it, their duty no doubt is to secede, or leave the body and form another. But when secession once begins, where shall it end?" True, where shall it end? but that is not our concern, seeing they have admitted that in the case supposed it is our duty. According to their own supposition, it might be the duty even of one man to secede, though he were not numerous enough to constitute a Synod. Our brethren seem to entertain a great antipathy to minorities; and regard their acting in opposition to majorities as "a burlesque on ecclesiastical government." The view which they aim throughout these articles to illustrate and defend is, that either the minority must have a right to rule, or must submit, right or wrong. They regard every thing else but this implicit submission as subversive of all ecclesiastical control and government. But not to dwell on many scriptural examples, such as those of Moses, Caleb and Joshua, Elijah, Christ and his disciples, who all opposed themselves to majorities, what shall be said of the Protestant church? If a minority may not refuse submission, may not withdraw, and even in the language of our brethren, "constitute the identical body of which they were found to be in the minority," how shall it be made to appear that our Protestant Secession was right, and that the Protestant is the iden-

dential church of Christ, though a minority in that church when she separated from it ?

In the former article, those who deposed Mr. E. Erskine are said to have been "the majority of that very ecclesiastical body which he had been the chief instrument of forming." The blow was the heavier upon him that the hand of the majority inflicted it. But now when there is a question about the legitimacy of the Anti-burgher Synod, they dwindle down, as by magic, to the minority : and there, regarding themselves as "the identical body of which they were found to be in the minority,"—"their meeting and proceeding to transact business as the Associate Synod,"—in other words, their regarding themselves as "the very ecclesiastical body which he, [Mr. E. Erskine] had been the chief instrument of forming," is considered as "a burlesque on ecclesiastical government." It is now the minority which "actually excommunicated the majority." There seems to be a great convenience in disputed points of history, as we can take either side, or both sides, according as we shall find it most suitable.

In a note appended to this part of the second article, it is said after all, to be probable that the Anti-burghers had a majority of the members of the whole Synod, absent as well as present ; "for," says the Repertory, "we find it repeatedly asserted by the Anti-burghers that while they had with them twenty-nine members, the Burghers had only twenty-three." This statement which our brethren have found so often repeated, we have not been able to find at all. If it refer to the whole number of the ministers of the two Synods, "absent as well as present," it is not correct, for the Anti-burghers never pretended that they had more than nineteen, or the Burgher, that they had more than twelve. If it refer to the members who composed the two Synods, it is the reverse of the truth, for it is admitted by all that there were only twenty-two\* constituent members of the Anti-burgher Synod after the breach ; and according to the most authentic accounts on both sides, the Burgher Synod consisted of twenty-nine or thirty members, according as the Moderator was included or not. The reason of their having a greater number at this time was, that one who was absent at the time of the vote, the Moderator, and the eight silent members remained with them after the breach, though several of them soon withdrew and connected themselves with the other party.

#### PROCEEDINGS SUBSEQUENT TO THE BREACH.

The separation of the Associate Synod into two parts took place on the 9th of April. The next day, agreeable to the appointment announced by Mr. Mair, the brethren who had withdrawn met at the house of Mr. Gib, and proceeded in the transaction of business. During this and the succeeding week, they passed several acts asserting the legitimacy of their own powers, and the irregularity of the conduct of their brethren ; and in the conclusion, they pronounced these brethren to be "highly censurable, and fallen from all right and title to any present actual exercise of the keys of the kingdom of heaven." On this procedure the Repertory remarks, "Thus the minority of the Associate Synod actually excommunicated the majority, or suspended them from the exercise of all government and discipline in the church, without the shadow of a

---

\*Mr. William Mair, one of the twenty-three who had withdrawn, was excused from attendance at this meeting.

trial, or even a regular citation to appear at their bar. This was truly a most extraordinary proceeding." According to our views of this proceeding, nothing is more common. It is quite usual when a charge of an aggravated nature is brought against ministers or members of the church, to suspend them immediately; and this is not regarded as excommunication or any censure whatever, but only as a matter of expedience, like the imprisonment of a person indicted, preparatory to his trial. The above mentioned act was evidently of this character, for afterwards the Synod proceeded to a formal process against these brethren.

This process was continued according to the rules usually observed in such cases, and in 1749, the highest censures of the church were inflicted on them, and 1750, on the rest of those ministers of the Burgher Synod who had withdrawn, and refused to return to their duty. It is not our purpose to enter upon a defence of these proceedings, though perhaps they are more defensible than many imagine. It is, however, but justice to those who employed the censures of the church in this case, to say, that they proceeded deliberately, and appear to have done what they were persuaded was their duty. Whatever difficulty there might be in the way of others, there could have been none in the way of the Repertory in defending these measures, provided it be granted that the Anti-Burghers had the majority. We think it is no perversion of the reasonings of our brethren to say that majority is with them a vital point, much more so, than the question, who were right, and who were wrong. Let it then be supposed that the Anti-Burghers were, as they certainly must have been the majority; and it will be no difficult matter to make out their defence from the reasonings employed by our brethren in defending the proceedings of the Established church, against the Seceders. If we only change the parties, the thing is done at once; according to them, majorities must rule, and it is absurd that the minority should take upon them to judge in their own case, and refuse submission. When process is entered, and sentence is not submitted to, deposition becomes unavoidable. "The very nature of government," say they, "requires that men who will not submit to the supreme authority of any society ought to be separated from it." It seems strange that the Repertory could see so much force in reasonings of this kind, when the question was between the Establishment and the Seceders, but seems quite to have lost sight of these arguments in the question between the Anti-Burghers and Burghers. It seems strange, also, that they should see so much of the horrible in the sentence of excommunication, issuing from an Associate Synod, for what was highly censurable conduct; and yet they could see little or nothing awful in the same sentence against the same men, pronounced by a Commission of the General Assembly, for no crime, but that of pleading for their liberty. We are, also, sorry they did not, after relating these proceedings of the Anti-Burghers, occupy so much more room, as to tell us, that the Burghers did much the same thing against their Anti-Burgher brethren, only in a more summary way. They passed an act, not only in its spirit, excommunicating, but in the very letter of it, "nullifying" the whole Synod which met at the house of Mr. Gib.

The question which occasioned this breach, was far from being of a trifling nature. It related to an oath, which is of great weight, both in civil and ecclesiastical proceedings, and both in the sight of God and men. The offence charged against the Burghers, was not therefore, a small matter; it was the sin of allowing what the church had determin-

ed to be false swearing or perjury, according to the ignorance or knowledge of the swearer. It is true that some had professed doubts about the sinfulness of this oath, but this is not uncommon in the clearest cases of sin and duty. In the present instance, this alone was sufficient to justify the Anti-Burghers and condemn the Burghers, for it could not be right to encourage the taking of an oath, the lawfulness of which was questionable. "He that doubteth is damned if he eat." Is not he then that doubteth, guilty if he swear? The offence charged against the brethren of the Burgher Synod, was considered by those of the other side, as in many respects aggravated; and, though it might have been better for them to have taken different steps against it, yet the measures which they employed were adopted deliberately, and proceeded in with the greatest care. Among other things, they had a meeting for *privy censures*, April, 1749, which the Repertory notices but not in this light. According to the ancient rules of such meetings, they confessed their faults one to another, and were admonished or rebuked according to the degree of their guilt. They appear to have resorted to this ancient usage through a sense of the sins contracted by them in the course of these contentions, some by being too backward, and others by being too forward and passionate. They appear, also, to have been desirous to manifest to their brethren an example of humility, and to convince them that they were not influenced by pride or passion in the process conducted against them. While they called on them to return from their errors, they proved that they were willing, both to acknowledge and renounce their own.

It may be regarded as a high compliment to Calvinists, that the beginning, middle, and end of the reproaches cast on them is in the hackneyed accusation that Calvin killed Servetus. This is the great proof of the intolerant, horrible spirit of this system of doctrine; this is set over against all those torrents of blood shed by its enemies; and this one thing is so magnified, that men can hardly see any thing excellent among the advocates of this system, or evil among its opponents! The much that has been made of the breach about the Burgess-oath may be regarded in the same way as an indirect testimony in favor of the Secession. Breaches after breaches taking place among others, are hardly noticed at the time, and are speedily forgotten, but the memory of this breach has been cherished for generations after it happened, and is not forgotten after it is healed. This is cast up to the Seceders as a reproach, almost as if the like had never happened among any but themselves, yet, how few churches have escaped such afflictions? After all that our brethren of the General Assembly have said upon the divisions of the Seceding sects, even they cannot plead exemption from this evil more than others. They have had their contentions with individuals, and there have been repeated Secessions from their communion. In 1741, a few years previous to this breach among the Seceders, they also were "split into two, nearly equal parts," by a rupture between the Synods of New York and Philadelphia, and it was about seventeen years before a re-union was effected. Another breach among them of more recent occurrence gave rise to the Cumberland Presbyterians. Their present divisions in sentiment if they produce not another breach, are yet not less an occasion of reproach to adversaries than actual separation. It is not for the purpose of triumphing over the troubles of others that these things are noticed. Our sympathy is with those who are honestly contending for the truth against the power and art of its enemies. These things are only noticed to show our brethren, that there is no just cause to speak of divisions as if they had

been peculiar to the Secession, and an uncommon blot upon her history. It is sometimes the unhappiness of the best of men to fall into sin, and to fall out with each other. The eminent men who formed the Secession showed themselves to be "but men;" so did Moses and Aaron, and the Apostles of Christ, the eminent leaders and founders of the Jewish and Christian churches. Some of the first of these Seceders did not hold fast their integrity, and thus involved themselves in contentions with each other; but neither was this any strange or uncommon thing. Peter dissembled, Barnabas was carried away with the dissimulation, Paul withstood Peter to the face, and Paul and Barnabas contended sharply and parted asunder.

This breach in the Secession is said by the Repertory to have "had an obvious tendency to lessen their influence in the country, and to retard the progress of their sect." It is said that it "shook the new ecclesiastical body to its very centre." "Obscured the bright prospects of this new and gowing church, and greatly retarded its advancement." Though these things appear very plausible, they are not in harmony with facts. The increase of the Secession was more rapid after this event than before it. During the fourteen years between the Secession and the breach, only twenty-seven ministers were added to the first four, which is less than two, each year. From the time of the breach, 1747, to 1774, a period of 27 years, the Anti-Burghers alone had increased from 19 ministers to 100. If the Burghers had an equal increase, which was probably the case, the whole addition of ministers in these 27 years would be 162, or an average of 6 during each year, an increase threefold greater after than before the separation. Since 1774, the average increase has probably been in every 2, or at most 3 years, more than equal to the whole increase in the first 14 years. Sometimes the things which threaten a hindrance fall out to the furtherance of the gospel.

The next thing noticed is a small subsequent division of the Anti-Burgher Synod, occasioned by a dispute respecting the power of the civil magistrate in matters of religion. This, they say, took place in 1799. This division was in consequence of the enactment of a New Testimony in 1804, and did not take place till May, 1806. The General Associate Synod having prohibited those ministers who were opposed to the New Testimony from making use of the former bond for covenanting, and formula of ordination; and declared that it was expected that they should, neither from the pulpit or press, impugn, or oppose the principles now stated by the Synod; four of their number, Professor Bruce of Whitburn, Mr. Aitkin of Kinnemuir, Mr. Hog of Kelso, and Mr. (late Dr.) McCrie of Edinburgh, protested against these proceedings, and withdrew. These formed themselves into a separate body, not under the name of the "Original Associate Synod," as the Repertory says they denominated themselves, but under the name of "The Constitutional Associate Presbytery." It is probable that our brethren have been led into these mistakes inadvertently, by some account of a breach in the Burgher Synod which took place in 1799, and gave rise to the distinction of New, and Old-light Burghers.

In the conclusion of this article, mention is made of the union of the Burghers and Anti-Burghers in 1820. "Thus," it is said "after the lapse of 70 [73] years was this schism healed; but as all on both sides did not consent to this union, it has not diminished but rather increased the number of the Seceding sects." In this also, there is a mistake. There was no opposition to this union on the part of the Burgher Synod,

as indeed, there could not be with any reason, for every thing was conceded to them, so that though some of the General Synod, or Anti-Burghers, refused to accede to the union, the number of Seceding sects was not increased by this measure; and soon after this general union, those of the Anti-Burghers who protested, united with the Constitutional Presbytery, under the denomination of the "Original Associate Synod," so that ultimately, the number of sects was actually diminished. Considering how much is said in these articles about divisions of the Seceders, and the number of seceding sects, it is not improbable that our brethren will be surprised to find that after all these divisions and subdivisions and multiplications, the whole number of Seceding sects, amounts only to two,—the original and the united Seceders. A small party, called the "Old-light Burghers" may possibly still exist in a separate state, but it was confidently anticipated according to late accounts that they would return to the Establishment. There are a number of different societies of Seceders in different countries, but they are not different sects, but are ranged under one or the other of the above general denominations. Some of them in different countries are formally united as one body; others are regarded as sister churches without any formal union.\*

The editors of the Repertory intimate that their "attention may hereafter be given to these other transactions connected with the *Secession*, both in Europe and this country." If so, it is to be hoped that their history of events will be more accurate, and then we trust their decisions will also be more impartial. In the present instance, if credit be given to the authorities which we have cited, it must be evident that they have been betrayed into numerous mistakes. These we have studied to correct in a manner as little offensive as possible,† though we fear that the number and nature of these corrections will give our remarks something of an opposite appearance in spite of all effort to the contrary. We have only, therefore, to add in conclusion that no unkind feeling is indulged towards these brethren. If we have not been excessive in compliment, yet neither have we designedly been severe or contemptuous. If any thing should appear to partake of this character, we trust it will be attributed to oversight, and not to design. We would be sorry to measure our brethren by the character of the articles reviewed; and are not without hope, that, if they feel satisfied that in any of the things noticed they have fallen into mistakes, they will be prompt in correcting them. And in things wherein we may have erred, while endeavoring to point out the errors of others, we shall be willing, when convinced, to do the same.

---

## ART. II. *The Love of Novelty.*

[From the Presbyterian Magazine.]

"For all the Athenians, and strangers which were there, spent their time in nothing else, but either to tell or to hear some new thing."—Acts xvii. 21.

The apostle Paul was now at Athens, the ancient seat of learning and philosophy. Here he had a very different set of people to deal with, and a different sort of opposition to encounter, than what he had

---

\*For a more full account of the controversy concerning the Burgess-oath, see Gib's display, Vol. II. pp. 17, 111, and Alexander and Rufus, by Rev. J. Anderson, D. D. pp. 366, 386.

†A number of corrections have been made without being specified as such.

ever before been accustomed to. Here was no infuriate rabble, threatening to stone him or tear him in pieces, and who would listen neither to reason nor Scripture. Here he came into contact with men of cultivated minds, who took a delight in speculating on every topic of human knowledge. Here he had to wage war, not with bigotry, but with a strange compound of infidelity, idolatry, and unhallowed liberalism. The philosophers of Athens, though they despised in their heart the superstitions of the vulgar, found it expedient to conform to them in practice; and it was truly pitiable to behold men who had reached a high degree of excellence in the arts and sciences, and in some cases to very sublime attainments in philosophy, descending from their lofty aspirations, falling down to stocks and stones, and saying to them, Ye are our gods.

The Athenians, however, aimed at a species of liberality even in their religion. In Ephesus, Diana was the presiding deity. At Athens, there was a sort of general convocation of gods. The Athenians were, what would be termed in our days, a liberal-minded people, and shewed great toleration to different forms of religion. It would have been considered a grievous proof of bigotry among them to have had one established religion; and to have set up one privileged sect, and bestow on it the exclusive patronage of the state, would have been considered as offering an insult to all the rest. They had therefore as many altars erected in the city as there were gods among the nations; and all were placed on a footing of the most perfect equality. Nay, so afraid were they to incur the charge of exclusiveness, or run the risk of displeasing any religionist, that they had an altar dedicated "To the Unknown God," to whom worship might be paid under any name that might happen best to suit the worshipper.

This scene of human folly, under the name of wisdom, deeply affected the sensitive mind of the apostle. "His spirit was stirred in him, when he saw the city wholly given to idolatry;" and he publicly protested against it. His peculiar sentiments soon attracted the notice of the philosophers, who liked nothing better than to hear some new system broached, on which they might exercise their powers of reasoning or ridicule. "Certain philosophers of the Epicureans and of the Stoics, (two rival sects,) encountered him. And some said, what will this babbler say? Other some, he seemeth to be a setter forth of strange gods: because he preached unto them Jesus and the resurrection. And they took him, and brought him unto Areopagus, saying, may we know what this new doctrine, whereof thou speakest, is?"

It is plain that it was no evil design against Paul, and no hostility to his doctrine, that actuated the philosophers on this occasion; but as little was it a sincere desire to ascertain the truth. The real secret of their anxiety to hear him is given in the following verse. "For all the Athenians, and strangers which were there, spent their time in nothing else, but either to tell or to hear some new thing." This is given in the form of a parenthesis, as much as to say, do not suppose these men were anxious to learn the truth; no, what induced them to hear Paul was the mere love of novelty. The terms he employed, and the strain of reasoning he adopted, were altogether novel to them. They looked on him as a setter forth of strange gods—as bringing a fresh importation from some foreign nation of deities whom they had never heard of, and for whom he was claiming a place in their comprehensive and well-stocked Pantheon. Little did they imagine that he was come to attack



the whole system. But mark the reproof conveyed in these words. They not only imply a severe satire against the trifling, gossiping manner in which these Athenians spent their time, but condemn the spirit which dictated their present conduct. Though it was Christianity they sought to hear about, yet it was from an unworthy motive—the very same indeed which had led them to adopt the gods of other nations, and produced the strange, heterogeneous worship in which they indulged. The excessive love of novelty is here condemned, even when the truth was its object; and the spirit of innovation in religion is reprobated, even though manifested at a time when there was never a louder call for a change.

The love of novelty is inherent in our nature, and, when properly regulated, is an allowable and useful disposition. It soon manifests itself in children, to whom at first every thing is new, and pleasing so long as it is new. It is this principle that urges the infant to acquire knowledge, and without which the human mind would remain stagnant and motionless, like some lonely lake in the hollow of the mountains, unruffled by the wind, and reflecting only the image of the clouds that pass over it; whereas, actuated by curiosity and the desire of knowledge, it may be likened to the stream that pushes its way through all the varieties of hill and dale, catching in its progress the diversified shades and forms of the objects which it passes. Men are, in this respect, but children of a larger growth; the objects of their infant curiosity are exchanged but the principle remains, and the indulgence of it within certain bounds, contributes both to their happiness and their advantage. It relieves the monotony of ordinary life—prompts inquiry—encourages to research, and by exciting a demand for information, indirectly adds to the stock of human knowledge by inducing others to supply it. We are so wonderfully formed, that while we are, in one respect, the creatures of custom, the slaves of habit, we are, at the same time, vehemently fond of novelty. But it is the nature of things which hold us by custom to affect us very little whilst we are in possession of them, and very strongly when deprived of them. Even the most ordinary enjoyments of life, which from their familiarity, have ceased to convey to us any sensible pleasure, may become sources of exquisite delight when, after a long suspension, they come recommended by the charm of novelty. The person who, after having been long confined by sickness, emerges for the first time from the close atmosphere and gloomy precincts of the sick room, to the cheering light, and gladdening sounds, and refreshing fragrance of the open fields, can well understand this.

The common earth, the trees, the skies,  
To him are opening paradise.

This disposition, however, though kindly intended by the Author of our frame for the wisest and best of purposes, man has most shamefully abused. Like every other department of our fallen nature, it has been made subservient to sin, and subject to vanity. And various are the ways in which it has been abused, so as to become both a dangerous vice and despicable folly.

The love of novelty ceases to be innocent, when its indulgence encroaches on the time which ought to be devoted to active pursuits. It is mentioned, to the disgrace of the ancient Athenians, that they “spent their time in nothing else, but either to tell or to hear some new thing.” From being the relaxation of a vacant hour, it had become the serious business of life with them. To gratify their vain curiosity, they would

neglect their lawful avocations, and spend the precious hours of life in getting and retailing the news of the day. Can we conceive any thing more contemptible, more preposterous? And yet this is the way in which many still continue to spend the greater part of their time. The news room is the ordinary lounge, the newspaper their only book; they can talk of nothing but the politics of the day; they seem to live as if life were spared for no other end than to see how others live, and as if speech had been given for no other use than to talk about one another.

This absurd perversion of an innocent propensity would be inexcusable, to whatever objects it might be directed; but it becomes doubly so, when, as is generally the case, the objects are of the most trifling and useless description. A well-regulated curiosity, like a well-governed appetite, will seek for gratification in solid, wholesome, and nutritious food; but the lust of novelty, like the ravenous and indiscriminating maw of the savage, will satiate itself on any sort of garbage, or, like the diseased stomach of the libertine, requires the lightest of all viands, and the lighter the better, provided they be highly seasoned. Nothing, in short, comes amiss to the devoted lover of novelty, provided it can be said, "Lo! this is new!" O, with what airy nothings, with what unsubstantial vanities, with what childish stories, foolish pageants, and ridiculous amusements, will *great men* condescend to be gratified, simply because it is "some new thing!"

Even when the object of our pursuit is lawful and praise-worthy, the mere gratification of curiosity, for its own sake, is a very inferior motive, and requires to be strictly guarded. Religion itself has been converted into food for this insatiable propensity. It was from the sheer love of novelty that the children of Israel came to hear Ezekiel. The prophet, good man, no doubt imagined from their devout appearance, as they sat before him, that they came with the best of motives; but God undeceived him. "Thou son of man, the children of thy people are still talking against thee by the walls, and in the doors of the houses, and speak one to another, saying, Come, I pray you, and hear what is the word that cometh forth from the Lord. And, lo, thou art unto them as a very lovely song of one that hath a pleasant voice, and can play well on an instrument; for they hear thy words, but they do them not." If the question were put to all that have been at church, "what went ye out for to see?" how few could sincerely say that they were not actuated, in one degree or another, by the principle of curiosity! Many perhaps went from no desire to hear the preacher at all, but to meet with their companions, "either to tell or to hear some new thing." But even of those who wished to hear the sermon, how many went, not to be edified or comforted, but with the expectation of hearing the preacher "tell some new thing!" Something in his style or manner of delivery, has awakened their curiosity, and the same motive which leads others to the theatre, leads them to the church, with this difference, that while the former seek their gratification in the avowed form of amusement, the latter veil their's under the solemn pretext of divine worship.

But if the love of novelty is blameable, when indulged for its own sake and without regard to useful purposes, it becomes positively sinful when it tempts us to have recourse to improper and dangerous means to gratify it. When Dinah, out of idle curiosity, "went out to see the daughters of the land," she returned dishonoured, and was the

occasion of the cruel slaughter of a whole city. And might we not go farther back, and trace to an inordinate and unhallowed love of novelty, the act of our first mother, which "brought death into the world, and all our woe?" How often, since that fatal act of curiosity, has the same disposition led men to tamper with temptation to their ruin? It has formed the first inducement to the young man to enter the scene of dissipation, and the den of profligacy. It has held the door, and chained him to his seat, when he would otherwise have fain made his escape; and after successfully inveigling him into the paths of vice, it has resigned the reins into the hands of "tyrant custom," under whose management the lively fascinations of novelty soon degenerate into the morbid cravings of inveterate habit.

Vice is a monster of such frightful mein,  
As to be hated needs but to be seen;  
But, seen too oft, familiar with her face,  
We first endure, then pity, then embrace.

That we are in danger of indulging the same vain curiosity in matters of religion, appears from the apostolic rebuke given to those who "intrude into those things which they have not seen, vainly puffed up by their fleshly minds." Religion, like the ancient temple, has its *penetralia*, into which we are forbidden to look, on the penalty of being smitten of the Lord for our presumption. It has its "deep things" into which human reason cannot wade without going beyond its depth, and on which is inscribed in legible characters, the divine prohibition, "hitherto shalt thou come, but no farther." And those who seek to be wise above what is written, if they do not make shipwreck of the faith, vainly wander in their own counsels, without star, or compass, or chart, to guide their course, or a friendly beacon to warn them of the dangers to which they are exposed.

The love of novelty is carried to a vicious excess when it leads us to despise what is truly good, merely because it may be common. There are some things which, though common, we are kept from despising, solely because they are necessary to our daily subsistence. How soon would we tire of our daily bread, were it not that nature, by keeping up a constant demand for it renders it too precious an article to be slighted! Esau despised his birthright, and sold it for "one morsel of meat." But "man liveth not by bread alone;" and the spiritual food which God has provided for us, because we are not so sensible of its necessity, is liable to be despised just because it is so common. When the children of Israel saw the manna rained from heaven, they were quite struck with the novelty of the thing, and said to one another, "it is *manna*, (what is this?) for they wist not what it was." But no sooner did they become familiar with it, and found it every morning around their tent doors, than they began to loathe the heavenly food. Fit emblem of a people, who, having been long and plentifully favored with the means of grace, despise them for the very reason which ought to excite their gratitude, wait upon them with ill-disguised weariness, and will hardly swallow the plain gospel unless it has been seasoned to their taste by a plenteous admixture of human condiments.

Where there is strong demand we may expect a steady supply; and to the prevailing thirst for novelty as much as to the vanity of appearing singular, we may trace the oft-recurring efforts of our preachers and orators at what is called *originality*. The ordinary idea attached to this term is precisely the Athenian one—"telling some new thing—

bringing certain strange things to our ears." And it would be a hopeless task to refute a notion which has prevailed so long in the world as to appear almost constitutional. D'Alembert, it is true, has remarked of those that excel in the art of writing, that, "in reading them, every body is apt to imagine that he could have said as much himself." And Dugald Stewart has applied the remark to philosophy, observing that "the wider an author deviates from truth the more likely are his conclusions to assume the appearance of discoveries. I may add," he continues, "that it is chiefly in those discussions which possess *the best claims to originality*, where he may expect to be told by the multitude that they have learned from him nothing but what they knew before." This is equally true, in fact, as to preaching; but it is needless to attempt reasoning on the point, when we reflect that we have to contend with prejudice on the one hand and vanity on the other; that the love of novelty opens so sure and easy a road to popular applause; and that real originality can only be attained at the expense of forfeiting its reputation.

But in nothing perhaps is the spirit of novelty more remarkably displayed, at least in our day, than in contemning what is old, and of long standing, merely because it is old. We will not be suspected of pleading for antiquity as the test of truth. Old age will not sanction error any more than vice; and we are aware of Cyprian's adage, "that custom, without the truth, is the old age of error." We are no antiquarians who love all ancient things, simply because they are ancient. But whilst we protest against the childish habit of admiring every thing new, because of its novelty, we condemn the equally absurd disposition to despise what is old, because of its antiquity. This is no fanciful antagonist whom we have conjured up. We meet with the disposition in its manifestations every day. It is seen in the scornful despite of ancient authorities and precedents, in the curling of the lip and shooting out of the mouth at the mention of such things as the wisdom of our ancestors, long established institutions, or ancient national engagements, and in the restless and reckless spirit of innovation which has seized on all ranks, leading to the formation of new theories on every subject connected with legislation, morals, and religion, and to confident boastings in the success of their visionary and untried speculations. We beg to be understood as drawing a distinct line between the spirit we now refer to, and that of a rational and well directed reform. We speak of that class of modern philosophers, of whom Jeremy Bentham, we believe, is the oracle, who go on the express principle of despising whatever is old, and maintain that those who reverence antiquity are laboring under a fallacy. *We*, say these wisecracks, we moderns are the true antiquity; our fathers were the children, and we are the old men; they lived in the infancy of society, we in its maturer age.— This reasoning, as plausible as it is pleasing to the pride of man, is considered quite conclusive on the point with such as take it up only in so far as it suits their present purpose. In one sense it is perfectly true, though in a sense very unpalatable to those who are so fond of quoting it. It asserts, what we are constantly maintaining, the moral identity of human society, as one body subsisting from generation to generation, and consequently susceptible of moral and descending obligation. It is allowed, too, that as a generation, we are in many respects in advance of our forefathers. But when this is pleaded as a ground for despising antiquity, it seems to be forgotten to what we owe our advancement. Is it not to that very "wisdom of our ancestors" for

which such contempt is manifested? For, by this phrase, when properly used, we must understand not the wisdom which they possessed at any particular period of their history, but the accumulated stock which they have handed down to us, and which, though it may be said figuratively to be in our possession, is not really so, except so far as we have made it our own by diligent and reverential study. The fallacy, (for it is a genuine fallacy) lies in supposing every individual belonging to the present generation to come into the world with all the wisdom of his ancestors in his head, as if it could be inherited like a property, or transmitted in the blood; whereas that wisdom must be acquired by every individual, either by personal search or through means of those who have studied it, before he can take a single step in advance of his progenitors. And the great advantage of the present age is, that instead of having the task of searching out that wisdom for ourselves, we may have it for the gathering, and can add to the vigor of youth all the experience of old age. We are therefore indebted to the wisdom of our ancestors, even for that superiority of which we boast; independent of them we would have been mere babes; and if we could suppose that all their researches had been lost, we have no reason to conclude that we would have been in any other state than that of simple barbarians.

If these remarks hold true as to other sciences, they apply with double force to religion. Religious truth differs from every other species of knowledge in this, that as it did not flow from human wisdom, it does not depend for its perfection on the advance of natural science. "God has hid these things from the wise and prudent, and has revealed them unto babes." Other sciences rise from small beginnings, and are gradually brought to perfection; religion sprung perfect at its birth from the hands of its Author. Other systems are the slow product of induction; religion is a direct revelation from Heaven. To bring any system of human science to perfection, whole ages may be required, and many of them still admit of various modifications and improvements; but the system of religion was perfect when the canon of scripture was completed; and its earliest students, there is reason to believe, understood it better than we do. In all its essential elements it has remained unchanged in every age, and, like Him from whom it came, "is the same yesterday, and to-day, and for ever."

It is obvious, therefore, that the rules which may be applied with perfect correctness to other sciences, must be inapplicable to religion, and may even be reversed. Its principles are clearly laid down in the scriptures, "which he may run that readeth," and which the most simple and unlearned, under the direction of God's Spirit, may comprehend as easily as the learned, if not more so. The progress of learning may throw light on a disputed text, arrange the doctrine of scriptures in regular order, and vindicate the truth against the cavils of infidelity; but it is not necessary to the understanding of the Christian system. Nor are we warranted to anticipate any new discoveries in religion, in the same way as we have reason to look for discoveries in natural science. No *new truths* will be found in the scriptures, as new stars may be discovered in the heavens, although much additional light may be thrown on the truths already discovered. "Though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached, let him be accursed." In studying the scriptures, we are scholars, learning the science which they teach us; not philosophers investigating principles with the view of forming or improving a sci-

ence. The primitive church learnt this science to perfection, and was pure in doctrine, worship, and government.

She soon degenerated, indeed, and then the call addressed to her was, not to seek after new light, but to return to old works. "Remember from whence thou art fallen, and repent, and do the first works." In after ages, the gospel has been more or less understood in different times, and among different churches; but there is nothing in the nature of religion itself to have prevented the church, during any part of her past history, from reaching the same degree of purity as in her primitive times. We do not say, for example, that our ancestors, at the period of the reformation, reached the highest point of purity attainable by the church; but we do say, there is nothing impossible in the supposition, that they had. If they had their errors and defects, let the charge be substantiated by proof; but let none have the effrontery to allege that they must necessarily have been blind and mistaken, and, with the whine of pretended commiseration, ascribe this to their having lived two or three centuries back, and been far behind in "the march of intellect." In religion they may have been giants, though in other sciences they may have been, in comparison with us, mere pigmies.—With respect to the "latter day of glory," of which some seem to entertain very extravagant notions, it may be only remarked, that when we have regained what we have lost, and attained to something like the purity, the knowledge, the fidelity of our fathers, it will be time enough to talk of what we intend to do farther. In the mean time it would be well for us if we would "ask for the old paths, where is the good way, and walk therein, and find rest for our souls."

TITUS.

---

### ART. III. *The Christian World Unmasked.*

(Continued from page 225.)

What comes from God is *gift*, and much he has to *give*; but nothing that he *sells* for work which we can do. He disdains such paltry commerce, and the saucy tribe of merit-mongers, who can fancy God will *sell* his heaven, and that their works may *purchase* it.

Sir, remember, traps are laid around every fundamental doctrine; and I perceive your lips are heaving an objection to the present doctrine. Poor John, disguised, in the beard of Moses, and beloaded with the Sinai tables, is suborned to betray his master, and *compelled* thus to speak, *Blessed are they, that do his commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life.* (Rev. xxii. 14.) But Sir, if rewards are not of *debt*, as Paul affirms, they are not *due* for our works; and if not *due*, our works have *no right* to the rewards, *no right* to the tree of life: neither does St. John assert it. A mask is put upon his face, to hide his look and meaning.

The word, (*ἐξουσία*) which we translate a *right*, signifieth here, as frequently elsewhere, a *gracious privilege*. Thus in his gospel, John says, *As many as received Christ, that is believed on him, to them he gave (ἐξουσίαν) the privilege* (as you read in the Bible margin) *to become the sons of God*: (John i. 12:) a privilege, not claimed as a *right*, through the *merit* of faith; but bestowed freely, as a *gift*. *To them he gave the privilege to become the sons of God.*

Jesus says, *He that believeth, possesseth everlasting life.* Then by be-

lieving, he must surely enter the city gates, and taste of the tree of life. For if a believer should miscarry, the life he possesseth, proveth not an *everlasting* life, but temporary; and the word of Christ falls to the ground.

But a general answer may be given to all objections of this kind.—St. John says, *They, that do his commandments, have a privilege to the tree of life.* If you ask what is meant by *doing* his commandments, I answer in one word, *believing.* Nay, Sir, do not start, like a young colt; but hear and judge, like a man. *Working* for life, is the law of Moses: *believing* for life, is the law of Jesus. And where divine faith is truly found, it will effectually justify, really sanctify, and surely glorify; will bring a sinner out of Egypt, through the wilderness, into Canaan, and fairly perch him on the tree of life.

Hear St. Paul's account of faith: a choice apostle, but no great favourite of the scribes. Human telescopes do not *magnify* Paul; he is not within the compass of their glasses; no moon-light planet, but a star: and take the matter in his own words. *Made wise to salvation by faith—become children of God by faith—justified by faith—receive forgiveness of sins by faith—sanctified by faith—receive the Spirit thro' faith—access to God by faith—Christ dwelling in the heart by faith—work righteousness through faith—obtain promises by faith—walk by faith—stand by faith—saved by grace through faith.* And St. Peter adds, *kept by the power of God through faith unto salvation.* (2 Tim. iii. 15. Gal. iii. 26. Rom. iii. 28. Acts xxvi. 18: xv. 9. Gal. iii. 14. Ephes. iii. 12, 17. Heb. xi. 33. 2 Cor. v. 7. Rom. xi. 20. Ephes. ii. 8. 1 Pet. i. 5.)

Thus the *Christian life*, is a *life of faith in the Son of God*; (Gal. ii. 20;) and the *Christian work*, is to *fight this good fight.* Believing is the Christian's trade and maintenance; through Christ it obtaineth pardon and holiness, creates his present peace and future prospects, makes him steady and valiant in fight, and brings him triumphantly to glory.

And now, Sir, when you hear the Philippian jailor asking Paul, *What he must do to be saved?* You need not think the answer was defective, *believe in the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved.*—(Acts xvi. 30, 31.) This answer of Paul is transcribed from his master's copy, *Goye into all nations, and preach the gospel to every creature. He, that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved.* (Mark xvi. 15, 16.) But if Paul's answer was not defective, it is plain, that as *doing* was the sum of the law, so *believing* is the sum of the gospel. It is the *total life* of all duty, and the *total term* of all salvation; including and producing all obedience, yet crucifying all merit. Faith owes its birth and growth and blessings, all to Jesus; and it resteth wholly on him, renouncing self, and glorying in the Saviour, as the all in all.

However, since professors frequently amuse themselves with fancies instead of faith, and think a mere assenting unto scripture doctrines is believing in Christ Jesus, something is often joined with faith, to prevent deception. Thus Paul declares, *In Jesus Christ, nothing avails but faith, which worketh by love.* (Gal. v. 6.) The words *worketh by love*, are added, as the genuine fruit and evidence of faith. If works of love are not produced, the faith is not of God; yet when produced, they do not justify.

Perhaps you might be pleased to know St. John's thoughts, about *keeping the commandments*, because the text was quoted from him; and his mind is intimated in his first epistle. *Whatsoever we ask, we receive*

of him, because we keep his commandments; and this is his commandment, that we should believe on the name of his Son Jesus Christ, and love one another. (1 John iii. 22, 23.) Does not the latter clause declare, that believing on Jesus is *keeping the commandments*? Love indeed is added here, as before by Paul, yet only as an evidence of faith, and a guard against delusion.

Jesus Christ explained the moral law, for the *conviction* of sinners, and for a *rule* of life to believers; but when he declares the *terms* of salvation, nothing is mentioned but *faith*. It is never said, *He that believeth and obeyeth shall be saved*: but absolutely, *he that believeth, shall be saved*. Here, obedience is designedly kept from our eyes, and withdrawn from faith to prevent our resting on obedience, as a *condition* of salvation, or a *ground* of justification.

The apostles also give many rules to direct the walk of faith; and often couple faith with love or obedience; and declare that the faith which produceth not good works, is a dead faith, the cold product of an human brain, and cannot justify. If faith is *alone*, unattended with works, it is not the faith of God, and does not unite the soul to Christ, and cannot draw life from him. But when the apostles speak expressly of justification, you hear of nothing else but faith; then it is *justified by faith—saved by grace through faith—believe in the Lord Jesus, and thou shalt be saved*. At such times, like their master, they purposely drop obedience, to prevent a reliance on it for justification.

When Paul is largely handling the point of justification, he quotes a passage from the Psalms, and introduceth it with this preface, "Even as David describeth the blessedness of the man, unto whom God *imputeth* righteousness *without* works, saying," *Blessed are they, whose iniquities are forgiven, and whose sins are covered, blessed is the man to whom the Lord will not impute sin*: (Rom. iv. 6, 7, 8:) Here Paul breaks off the quotation, and omits the latter clause of the verse, *in whose spirit there is no guile*. (Psal. xxxii. 1, 2.) And why does he omit the latter clause? Because it describes the *renewed nature* and the *fruit* of a justified person, which were not to be considered in the matter of justification, but wholly withdrawn from our eyes.

We are not justified *before God*, because our natures are renewed: but God *justifies the ungodly through believing*. (Rom. iv. 3, 4, 5.) A sinner can be saved no other way, because the *wages of sin is death*; yet it proves a most offensive way, through the pride of a sinner's heart.

Effectual and final justification by faith, is the capital doctrine of the gospel, a most precious grace of the new covenant, and the everlasting glory of the Redeemer. A man may steal some gems from the crown of Jesus, and be only guilty of *petit larceny*; he may escape at last, like the cross-thief; escape through the fire, when his house is in a flame: but the man, who would justify himself by his own works, steals the crown itself, puts it on his own head, and proclaims himself a king in Sion by his own conquests.

Since therefore faith is the *law* of the gospel, the *term* of salvation, the *instrument* of obtaining every blessing, and the *general commandment* including all the rest, it must utterly exclude all justification by works. And the man, who seeks to be justified by his passport of obedience, will find no passage through the city-gates. He may talk of the tree of life, and soar up with his paper-kite to the gates of paradise, but will find no entrance. The gates belong to the prince of life, who



is the real tree of life ; and only they shall enter, who own him for their liege-lord, and place their *whole* dependence on him, and seek a passage through his grace *entirely*. Such shall have a cheering taste of the tree below, and a joyous seat above.

You are peeping on my bag, Doctor, for another fox, and here he is; a pretty brisk fellow, truly ! How sharp he looks, and casts a gloating eye on you, as if he had a message for you ; and now he opens. "Doctor, I have listened to your talk, as I lay in the grazier's bag, and believe you are a greater fox than myself. Let the grazier look well to his purse, or he may find your fingers in it presently. I have many works to boast of ; but you have none, it seems ; and therefore raise a racket about faith. I must speak my mind freely, else my conscience will be loaded. All the honest foxes look upon you methodists, as a set of crafty villians ; and they would not trust a pullet's neck in any of your hands, notwithstanding all your sheepish looks. None can peep into a breast, you know ; and there the instrument of faith is kept, which *hooketh* down salvation. But these *hooks*, instead of being gospel hooks, may chance to prove fish-hooks ; and I suppose you are angling for the grazier now, to catch him. The other night, as I was sauntering to a neighbor's henroost, I overheard some people talking of a slippery trick, lately played by a juggler. It seems, he talked high of faith, and called himself a deep professor, and he proved much too deep for shallow people there. His nimble tongue first gained their admiration, then their confidence, and then their purses. He borrowed many pretty sums, and having fairly caught them with his fish-hook, he prudently retired. This may prove a caution to the grazier, not to snap at your baited hook, but to rest upon his good works, as the foxes do." Why, Doctor, this fox is quite a master of arts, and seems a notable advocate for good works. And I must confess, some check seemeth wanting in the covenant of grace. Cheats will arise : and how must we deal with them, Doctor ?

Deal with them, Sir ! why, hang them, when detected ; as Jesus hanged Judas. He had one religious cheat among his twelve, who made a penny of his master, but did not live to spend it. This Judas bids you guard against such cheats, but not be scandalized at the gospel, when they happen. You would not sure renounce honesty, because you have been cozened by a man, who made a false pretence to it ; nor would I renounce my creed, because a sly professor proved a thief, and has been hanged.

But, Sir, you quite mistake the matter, in supposing that the gospel does not guard against licentiousness. A covenant of grace cannot allow of legal conditions, which may procure a *right* to life, in whole or part : this would destroy the nature of the covenant. But it abounds with gospel-checks, which answer the same purpose ; and where they do not prove sufficient, nothing else would.

Naked faith, or a whole and simple trust in Jesus, is the gospel-instrument, which brings salvation. But though faith *alone*, apart from its fruit, is the saving instrument ; yet it cannot be alone, or without its fruit, where it is saving faith, as St. James declares. And the gospel, to prevent delusion, shews what is the fruit produced by faith. It bringeth heavenly peace, purifies the heart, and overcomes the world. Faith is genuine, where these fruits are found, The believer is a real branch of the true vine, and receives his fruit from it. The fruit *shows* the branch to be alive, but does not *make* it so : it beareth fruit, because it is alive.

Where these fruits are neither found, nor truly sought, faith is not of God's operation; it is a dead, and not a living faith. It may be clear in scripture doctrines, but has no real union with Christ, and of course no influence from him. It is not grafted in the vine, but tied to it with profession-thread, and so is dead and withered. But, Sir, the fruit of faith does not justify a sinner; and this must be oft repeated, to check a legal heart, which is only moved by legal fears and hopes.

None feel the force of gospel motives, till they taste of gospel blessings. Hell and a gallows (proper checks in their place) keep some out of mischief, who find no comfort, nor expect any in God's service; and a fond hope of making purchases in heaven, puts some on almsgiving, fasting, and prayer. Such only make account of obedience, as of a thing whereby they must be *saved*; and being told; it cannot save them, because it is not *perfect*, they ask in much surprise, what then is it good for? Why Sir, it is *good* to glorify God for the mercy of a rich and free salvation; a grateful homage paid to a gracious God. And it is further *good*, to evidence the truth of faith to ourselves and others.

When *joy and peace are found through believing*, and the sweet atonement is sealed on the conscience, a Christian crieth out, *I am bought with a price, and must glorify God with my body and my spirit, which are God's.* (1 Cor. vi. 20.) With Paul, he can say, *the love of Christ constrains me*, and feel its sweet compulsion. Gratitude begins to act, and love sharpens gratitude; and sights of glory, fetched in by faith, quicken both.

The legal hope of being saved by our doings, is rooted deep in every human mind, and never can be rooted up, till grace has overcome it. It made a busy stir, when the gospel first appeared; and has raised ferments ever since. Very early, some cried out, *Except ye be circumcised, ye cannot be saved.* (Acts xv. 1.) Had they suffered circumcision, as believing it a duty still required, and purposing by such obedience to *glorify* God; or had they had used it, like Timothy, at Paul's instigation, for a more convenient spreading of the gospel, no harm at all had been done. But when they seek to be *saved* by this doing, Paul takes fire, throws his hat up, and begins to bellow. *Behold, I Paul, say unto you, that if ye be circumcised (with this view,) Christ shall profit you nothing. For I testify again to every man, that is (thus) circumcised, he is a debtor to do the whole law. Christ is become of no effect to you, who are justified by the law: ye are fallen from grace.* (Gal. v. 2, 3, 4.)

The Galatians did not seek to be *wholly* justified by works: no, they blended the two covenants together, as modern Christians do, and sought to be justified from both; partly from their own works, and partly from Christ. This appears from Paul's saying *Christ is of no effect to you who are justified by the law: Christ shall profit you nothing.*—Which implies, that the Galatians did expect *some effect and some profit* from Christ, as well as *some* from their works. Again, when Paul says, *Ye are debtors to do the whole law*; this also shows, they did not count themselves *such* debtors, but only sought a *partial* justification, by *sincere* obedience to the law.

The apostle's meaning in the fore-cited passage is plainly this; Whoever seeks to be justified in *any measure* by his works, such a one falls from grace, and becomes a debtor to do the *whole* law. Christ will justify you *wholly*, or *none* at all. Either take him as a *whole* Saviour, or he profits you *nothing*, is of *no effect* to you.

It matters not, whether the work be ritual or moral, that we seek to be *saved* by; whether it be parting with our cash in charity, or parting with our flesh in circumcision, which is the sorest work of the two; if we seek at all to be *saved* by any work of our own, *we fall from grace*.—Therefore, when Paul had spoken first of circumcision in particular, he next affirms of the whole law, in general, that *whosoever is justified by it, is fallen from grace*.

Paul was eminent in ministerial labors and Christian holiness: yet in the point of justification, *he counted all things but loss, in comparison of Christ*. His labors and his holiness, if rested on in any wise for justification, would have brought him loss instead of gain, and made Christ of *no effect* to him. He therefore desires to be *found in Jesus, not having his own righteousness* (to justify,) *but that which is through the faith of Christ, the righteousness of God by faith*. (Phil. iii. 7, 8, 9.) In other words, he desires to be found at the bar of God, not in his own *personal* righteousness, but in the righteousness of his heavenly surety.

But you are waiting for more gospel-checks, I perceive, to prevent the abuse of faith. What think you, Sir, of this, *Faith working by love*? It passed muster lately, yet wants to be reviewed; good troops are often exercised. It is a two-edged sword, which sliceth off the wanton ears of an antinomian, and the saucy hopes of a legalist. Faith is here described as a *working* principle, an heavenly root producing heavenly fruit; and thus it slays Herodians and Sadducees. But though a working faith, it worketh not for hire like a laborer, but like a son for *love*. A Child of God does not hope to purchase heaven by his works, but seeks with *loving* heart to glorify an heavenly father for the mercy of adoption; and thus faith crucifies a pharisee.

If you enquire of Habakkuk and Paul, who are lodged in the same apartment, both the Old and New Testament saint will tell you, *The just shall live by faith*, (Habak. ii. 4.—Gal. iii. 11.) Here they give you a believer's character, he is a *just* or righteous man; and yet declare he does not *live* by his righteousness, does not gain a title unto *life* by it, he lives by *faith*. His new nature makes him hungry for *im- planted* righteousness, as a *meatness* for heaven; but his faith bids him seek an *imputed* righteousness, as his *title* to heaven. He follows after righteousness, as his proper business and delight; but sings at his work with Isaiah, *In the Lord shall all the seed of Israel be justified, and in the Lord shall glory*. (Isa. xlv. 24, 25.)

Again, you read, *without holiness no man shall see the Lord*. (Heb. xii. 14.) A legalist would see the Lord *by* his holiness, by the merit of it, but he cannot: and an antinomian would see the Lord *without* holiness, but he must not. Thus a Christian man can neither see the Lord *with- out* holiness, nor *by* it. Which, though a truth, may seem a mystery to many.

Lastly, The gospel declares roundly, that *whosoever liveth in the works of the flesh, in adultery, fornication, uncleanness, wantonness, idolatry, witchcraft, hatred, variance, emulation, wrath, strife, sedition, heresy, envyings, murders, drunkenness revellings, and such like, shall not inherit the kingdom of God*. (Galat. v. 19, 20, 21.) For all, who live and die in such works, plainly shows themselves destitute of that faith, which *purifies the heart, and works by love*.

[To be continued.]

## ART. IV. Ministers' Salaries.

[From the New York Observer.]

*Messrs. Editors.*—Notwithstanding the clear right of ministers to introduce their own just claims to the notice of their congregations, and that too from the sacred desk, yet, you are aware, how they have rather chosen to suffer in silence, than seem to plead indelicately for their own support.

Will you allow me, then, the use of your columns, for a few hints to the churches on this point?

The Apostle Paul has distinctly treated upon this subject, (1 Cor. 9, 4—14.) and has laid down the law of Christ, in these words: "Even so hath the Lord ordained that they which preach the gospel, should live of the gospel."

What is more reasonable than that the man who as a physician, a mechanic, a merchant, a lawyer, &c., might acquire fortune, but, who, at the call of a congregation, devotes his time and talents to their service, should, at the least receive from them a full support, and be entirely "free from worldly cares and avocations?" This claim is the more reasonable because in addition to their spiritual advantages, the services of the ministry have an important moral influence on the causes which promote the temporal prosperity of the people among whom they labor.

But how are ministers commonly requited? Their compensation is ordinarily adjusted to the lowest possible estimate of their presumed wants; it is sometimes the scantiest provision for the supposed necessities of life. And even this is often complained of as a burden, and is reluctantly paid—if it be not sometimes actually withheld—or at least retained long after it is due. But out of this a minister must be always ready to exercise the rites of hospitality, and be an example of benevolence in giving to the support of the poor, and toward the spread of the gospel; and perhaps his own congregation are the foremost in exacting from him compliance with these scriptural demands! Under the circumstances actually existing, it is a general rule that ministers get into debt; are reduced to the most mortifying straits; lay out their money at the worst advantage; and make no provision for old age, or for their families when they are called to leave them by death.

Surely this is wrong; especially when in this country and particularly in this city, it is so completely in the power of the churches, to make an adequate compensation.

There is another thing which congregations do not properly consider. It sometimes happens that by the erection of a commodious house of worship they become somewhat in debt. In this emergency, they settle a minister, and in order to relieve themselves from the pressure upon their funds, they pay their minister less than they would *otherwise* be willing to do. What is this, but to make him virtually pay the *interest* and perhaps the *principal* of their church debt, instead of nobly dividing the burden among themselves? And by the time they have relieved themselves and liquidated or reduced the debt, through the privation of the minister—and it would become very proper to consider him, why it happens that people find out that it is easier to pay a smaller than a larger salary, and so they continue the former; or the minister dies, and his family are left without provision, if not in debt; or the congregation feel strong enough to employ a minister of more elo-

quence, at a higher compensation, and so the incumbent is *induced* to resign and vacate the place for a more favored successor. This is "to plant a vineyard and eat not of the fruit thereof; to feed a flock and eat not of the milk of the flock" (see 1 Cor. 9 : 7.)

But to let this pass. There is one aspect of this whole subject, which it is highly incumbent on the churches to consider at the present time.

The increased activity of business and other causes, have enlarged individual wealth, and *enormously advanced the price of every article necessary to the support and comfort of life.\** Hence all persons, who can control the price of their own labor and service, have found it necessary, and have availed themselves of the necessity, to meet the extraordinary demand, by a corresponding rise in their own wages. But there is one class of men who have not the power to adjust their incomes to this new and increasingly trying state of things. These are all, who live on a fixed annual salary, adjusted some time back. Many of these, as cashiers, clerks, &c. can more easily than others, secure an increased compensation. But of all others, the most helpless are the ministers of the gospel. They are the last to be considered, and the last to press their own wants. But how shall they who barely subsisted before, now meet the excessive demands upon their means? Shall they meet, and "combine," and "strike?" *This* will not do. And yet, while all others raise their prices upon each other, the accumulated increase falls heaviest on the head of the clergyman, who pays, or contracts to pay, from 25 to 50 per cent. more than he did five years ago, for house rent, fuel, provisions, &c. How shall he be relieved?

This is the business of the churches. Let them, then, assemble, and take this matter into consideration. Let them consider the law of Jesus Christ on this subject; let them feel that if ministers "have sown unto them spiritual things, it is no such great matter that they should reap the carnal things of their people." Let them consult the proper dignity and comfort of their ministers.—and permit them not to be embarrassed, mortified and pained by unjust penuriousness. They do not live on charity. They must not be left to capricious generosity. Let the true ground be taken which justice and honor require from those who are gaining wealth, and are providing for their own necessities,—by increasing the price of their labor, products and merchandize,—nor forget that this provision for themselves is unjust unless they put it into the power of their ministers to pay the advanced prices which they do not hesitate to require from them. Let the landlord, who has perhaps advanced his own minister's rent, and the merchant who has advanced the price of the goods which he sells to his own minister, ask himself how he is to be paid, and whether it is perfectly safe to sell or to lease to him, till he has seen that his congregation will enable him to pay all proper demands.

It may be objected that congregations cannot raise a larger salary without raising the price of pew rents. *Then let it be raised.* It is as proper a thing to be raised, as house rent, wages, beef, or flour! If it be right to pay \$5 or \$10 or \$20 a year, for pew rent to support a clergyman,—and this be the preferable mode of raising his salary, it is right to add 25 or 50 per cent. if necessary, in order to meet his actual

\*This is seriously felt, by all those who live on small incomes received for daily labor. Those who have large incomes,—revenues, which always more than meet their necessary expenses, feel nothing of the inconvenience produced by exorbitant prices.

wants. There are some people who object to such a proposition as if it were something out of all reason. But do not they raise their own prices, and saddle the burden upon their own pastors, without hesitation, when they deal with them?

I am happy to state that some congregations have nobly moved in this matter; and have justly judged in a common sense mode, that if it takes almost 50 per cent. more to support a family than it did five years ago, then *ministers* cannot, any more than other men, live as cheaply as they did then; and if it be right to raise the price of provisions and houses, there can be nothing very foolish or sinful in meeting the rise, by taking the most convenient way to assist their ministers to pay it.

PAULOS.

---

ART. V. *Catholic Communion in the present state of the Christian Church inconsistent with a due regard for truth.*

The above is the title of a "Lecture, delivered before the students of the Theological Seminary of the Associate Reformed Synod of the West, Feb. 11th, 1836, by John T. Pressly, D. D." For a copy of this Lecture we are indebted to a friend, to whom we owe an apology for not having noticed it sooner. And we have only time at present to say, that this seasonable production does honor to its author. We are much pleased with the sentiments which it contains. They are certainly scriptural, and the publication of them, at present, much needed. We hope they meet a hearty response from all the members of the same Synod, to which Professor Pressly belongs. The following extracts will show our readers the character of this excellent little pamphlet.

"But according to the doctrine of what is termed Catholic communion, the church ought to receive into her fellowship those who hold the essentials of Christianity, though they may differ from her in their views with regard to doctrines of comparatively subordinate importance. In opposition to this view suffer me to offer for your consideration the following objections.

1. This plan of communion leads practically to the rejection of creeds or confessions of faith. A creed is an exhibition of what the framers of it consider the great doctrines of the Bible. One leading design of a creed, is the preservation of the purity of the church. When an individual desires to be received into the communion of the church, she presents to him her creed, to ascertain whether he is agreed to walk with her in adherence to the truth as it is in Jesus. If he is willing to embrace this formula of the faith, which the church has adopted as her testimony to the truth, they can walk together in love and peace, being united in the truth; and he is therefore cordially received. But if men are received to the enjoyment of the highest privileges of the church, who are not willing to embrace her creed, but in many important particulars reject it, does not this amount to a virtual declaration, that men may reject or embrace the creed of the church according to their pleasure? And of what practical advantage is a creed, for the purpose of preserving the purity of the church, if men may enjoy all the distin-

guishing privileges of the church whether they are pleased to reject or embrace it? It would manifestly be of no practical utility. And the church might just as well throw away her creed at once, as to receive into her fellowship those who are not willing to embrace it.

2. This scheme of communion tends directly to produce indifference in relation to the truth. A particular branch of the church professes to receive a certain system of doctrines as taught in the sacred scriptures, and to this system her members are required to subscribe. But here is an individual who does not receive some of the doctrines comprehended in this system, but on the other hand rejects them and testifies against them. And yet he is received into the fellowship of the church upon the ground of his adherence to the essential doctrines of the gospel.—What is this, but a practical declaration by the church in her official capacity, that diversity of opinion in relation to these doctrinal truths is a matter of little or no importance. They who reject them may enjoy the same privileges in the church as those who embrace them. And consequently the conclusion to which such a course of conduct naturally leads, is, that it is a matter unimportant, what particular system of religious opinions a man may embrace. The difference betwixt truth and error, is thus represented as a matter of trivial importance, and the minds of men are prepared to embrace whatever doctrines are most popular or most congenial to their own taste.

3. If the principle of catholic communion carried into practice, does not produce indifference in relation to the truth, it cannot fail to introduce discord and strife among brethren. One regards this doctrine as a precious truth, while another considers it as an absurdity. Now if men maintaining these discordant views, are brought together into one ecclesiastical fellowship, is it not manifest that in the present state of imperfection, animosity rather than brotherly love, must be promoted? So long as professing Christians entertain different views with regard to doctrinal truths, there is a better prospect of peace, and some degree of harmonious feeling by maintaining distinct ecclesiastical organizations. To bring together those who maintain discordant opinions, is to convert the church of Christ into a Babel, a scene of confusion rather than a city of peace. Let therefore each particular branch of the church operate within her own sphere, according to the light to which she has attained, until that time shall come when we shall no longer see through a glass darkly, but shall see face to face and shall know as we are known. And in the mean time, let brotherly love be cultivated, and let each one in his own proper place, endeavor so far as his influence extends, to spread the light of evangelical truth. No union can promote the peace and prosperity of the church, which is not established upon the basis of truth. He therefore who does most to promote the reign of the truth as it is in Jesus, labors most efficiently to establish that union, which will prepare the way for communion among all the followers of Christ."

We should indeed be glad, if this Lecture, containing such sound views on the subject of communion, were disseminated among the members composing the Associate Reformed Synod of New York. The following extract from the *Christian Intelligencer*, will at least show that one member of said Synod, (Dr. Proudfit) needs some light on that subject. The communion season referred to took place on a week day during the late annual meeting of the American Board of Foreign Missions.

“At half past two o'clock, an immense concourse collected in the spacious church of Dr. Thornes, to celebrate the love of him whose blood was shed to save a lost and ruined world. The exercises were deeply interesting. Perhaps no circumstances can be conceived of more solemn and appropriate for the administration of the Lord's supper, than such an occasion as the annual meeting of the American Board presents.—Here were the servants of Jesus convened to devise means for the universal spread of that salvation which their Divine Master died to purchase. Here were Christian hearts beating high with holy emotions of love towards God and man. Here were missionaries in the Providence of God, returned to their native land. Here were the youthful and ardent aspirants for that glorious work. These are the friends of missions from every section of the country. Oh what a convocation!—What a delightful meeting! How full of joy! How well calculated to fire the soul, and kindle to workings of that expansive benevolence which knows no bounds, which encircles all, feels for all, labors for all, and rejoices in the spiritual and eternal welfare of all! Surely if at any period this side eternity, we can realize obligation, can put dependence on the mighty energies of God, and can glory in this strength, *it is, it must* be at a Communion table of our blessed Lord spread in circumstances so interesting as these.

Dr. Humphrey invoked a blessing. Dr. DeWitt gave out the bread, and addressed the table with great feeling and tenderness. Dr. Beman distributed the cup, and made a solemn address, on renewed, and unrenewed consecration to God, in the great work which had called us together. Dr. Proudfit gave out the hymn on “Christian love.”

“Let party names, no more  
The Christian world o'erspread,” &c,

And after some enrapturing remarks, on the banquet we shall have in Heaven, broke out in joyful exclamation,

“O sweet employ, to sing and trace  
Th' amazing heights, and depths of grace!  
To spend, from sin and sorrow free,  
A blissful, vast eternity!

“O what a grand, exalted song,  
When ev'ry tribe and ev'ry tongue,  
Redeem'd by blood, with Christ appear,  
And join in one full chorus there!”

The effect was thrilling.

The whole congregation then rose, and united in the sweet and harmonious song of praise, after which a solemn and comprehensive benediction was pronounced by Dr. P.

#### ART. VI. *Religious Intelligence.*

IRISH PRESBYTERIANS—WESTMINSTER CONFSSION.—The Dublin correspondent of the London Times, in a letter dated August 16th, gives the following account of the decision, by the General Synod of Ulster, of the question respecting the unqualified subscription of the Westminster Confession of Faith, which has for some time produced much excitement in Ireland, and it is still feared may end in a new division of the Presbyterian body in that country.—*N. Y. Ob.*



On Friday I forwarded you a report of a very stormy discussion which took place on Tuesday, at a special meeting of the General Synod of Ulster, regarding the necessity of an unlimited subscription to the Westminster Confession of Faith.

After four days debate, the Synod, by an immense majority, have declared unlimited subscription indispensable on the part of candidates for the ministry.

The minority on the question, which was led by the Rev. Mr. Carile, one of the members of the Board of National Education in Ireland, contended that the Westminster Confession, if adopted should be accompanied by explanations of ambiguous passages relative to heresy, and other points.

The majority, with Dr. Cooke, energetically opposed any compromise : but, in consequence of the turn which the debate had taken, a private conference or interlocutory meeting was agreed upon, to commence at half past seven on Tuesday evening.

At that hour the Synod re-assembled, but the most rigid system of exclusion was adopted in regard both to reporters and the public.

At seven o'clock of Wednesday morning the private discussion was resumed, and was continued with equal secrecy until midnight.

At the same hour on Thursday morning the question "whether the declaratory overture for unqualified subscription should be passed," was resumed in open Synod. Another very protracted debate took place, in which ministers and elders from various parts of Ireland, took part.

Mr. Dill, of Dublin, (one of the party opposed to unlimited subscription,) deprecated any thing like separation. He said he did not at all object to the Confession of Faith, but contended that an unlimited subscription might prove injurious to the conscience, and an infringement on the natural liberty of the human mind. Man should only insist on such confessions of faith as the Word of God requires. Mr. Dill then alluded to a former attempt to effect a junction with the Church of Scotland, which had totally failed; and even now, when the prospects, perhaps, seemed more satisfactory, it was but a Scotch compact; the whole benefit was on the other side. The General Assembly required unequivocal subscription to the Westminster Confession, and then the General Assembly would admit them to certain privileges if they produced a certificate. And what was the church which dictated so haughtily? Was she perfectly immaculate?

Here Dr. Cooke, Mr. Browne, and Dr. Stuart, protested against reflections upon the Church. Mr. Dill bowed to the decision of the House.

Mr. Gibson, of Ballyboy, replied to the last speaker, alluding briefly to the deficiencies and imperfections under which the Church of Scotland still labors, and the indications of her improvement. He dwelt on the kindly spirit with which she now sought to link other churches in a union with her, not only in England and Scotland, but in Ireland. A safe and healthful spirit of reformation was going on favorably in the Church of Scotland. They disavowed the connexion of several bodies in the South, who usurped the name, but were in reality not Presbyterians, and thus was the Church of Scotland waving the old banner of the Covenant once more.

The discussion continued all Thursday and Thursday night. About half past four o'clock on Friday morning the roll was called, when there appeared :

For unqualified subscription, Ministers	94
Elders	31—125
Against it, Ministers	20
Elders	8—28

Majority for the Westminster Confession, 97

The Synod then adjourned until the 2d of September.

I thought it necessary to send you the preceding abstract of the proceedings of the Synod, because that body has at length disposed of a question which has for a considerable time agitated a very important and numerous class of Dissenters—the Presbyterians of Ireland. The result may lead to further secessions from the General Synod of Ulster, the governing body of the great majority of the Presbyterians of this country. The Unitarians seceded from the General Synod some years since, and are now represented in what is termed the Remonstrant Synod; but the vast body of the Calvinistic Presbyterians are in connexion with the General Synod, which appears to be upon the eve of a junction with the Church of Scotland. The subscription to the Westminster Confession will facilitate this amalgamation.

**PROHIBITION OF MISSIONS IN RUSSIA.**—The following article from the *Missionary Herald*, is an official order from the Russian Government prohibiting the labors of the Basle Missionary Society :

“Gentlemen—In consequence of a memorial from the commander-in-chief of Georgia, addressed to the minister of the interior, and forwarded by him to the committee of Ministers, respecting your Missionary establishment at Shoosha, the committee, learning by the real state of things, that you, gentlemen, since the time of your settlement at Shoosha, have not yet converted any body, and, deviating from your proper limits, have directed your views to the Armenian youth; which, on the part of the Armenian clergy, has produced complaints, the consequences of which may be very disagreeable, have concluded to prohibit you all missionary labors, and for the future, to leave it to your own choice to employ yourselves with agriculture, manufactures or mechanical trades.

“To prevent any cause of further complaint on the part of the Armenian clergy, they forbid you to receive the Armenian youth into your schools.

“It has pleased his majesty, the emperor, to confirm this decree of the committee of ministers.”

At present, says the *Missionary Herald*, there are five missionaries, four clergymen, and one priest, connected with the Shoosha mission; weeping, as you will readily suppose, over the desolations of Zion, whose walls they are thus peremptorily forbidden to repair.

“On the north side of the Caucasus mountains, at a place called Karass, is a Scottish missionary colony. It was established under the patronage of the late Emperor Alexander, who gave to that establishment the prerogatives and form of a colony, for the sole purpose of avoiding the opposition which he apprehended would immediately be roused by the Russian church against a Protestant mission.

“About the time the government order was issued, forbidding the Shoosha missionaries to proceed with their labors, a similar one was forwarded to Karass, commanding the Protestant missionaries there, six in number, one Scottish and five German, to cease entirely from their

missionary labors, and stating that missionaries of the Russian church were soon to take their places."

**INTOLERANCE IN HOLLAND.**—The Dutch government on the 5th of July, issued a decree declaring that the dissenters of Holland, in not submitting the regulations and organization of their religious community, contravene the laws. The decree therefore forbids the future assemblies of the Dissenters. In Holland, it seems religious worship cannot be practised until it has received the sanction of the state. Permission must be obtained to form a religious community, and without that permission the law will not recognize the existence of such a community, and declares it unlawful. There has prevailed considerable excitement on the subject of the measures of government, and several legal prosecutions have been commenced under the new decree. The *Journal de la Haye* tells the following story:—

"One of these young Pastors (says that Journal) whom the ecclesiastical authority had suspended from his functions, forgot himself so far as to repair, accompanied by a great number of his partisans, to the Church, in order, by force, to make himself master of the pulpit where his successor was at the moment preaching. The latter gentleman, seventy years of age, was so seriously ill-treated by the multitude of fanatics who surrounded his young antagonist that a very little farther violence would have converted the Church of God into a place of murder."—*Rel. Intelligencer.*

---

#### ART. VII. *Miscellany.*

[From the Boston Recorder.]

"**CHURCHES—PREACHERS—SMART MEN.**"—Mr. Editor—I hear much said in the churches about smart men—men of talents, great men, powerful preachers, &c. &c., and this more particularly in reference to candidates for settlement. The question asked by churches in want of pastors, are not, is the candidate a good man? sound in the faith? eminently pious, devoted and active?—but is he a smart man? a man of talents? a popular preacher? This has become universal, from the aristocratic city congregation with its salary of two or three thousand a year, down to the feeble society with its stipend of two or three hundred. Indeed, the feebler the church, the more unwillingness is often manifested to take up with a sound, pious, faithful minister of ordinary talents. This feeling is doing immense mischief both among the wealthy and feeble congregations; but more especially the latter. I have a few things to say to small churches and feeble congregations on the subject. I am not about to detract an iota from the smart men. Would to God all the Lord's prophets were ten times more gifted, provided they were all a little more pious than smart. But then there are evils connected with having one of our present race of smart men, of which feeble churches little dream. Wealthy congregations can afford to bear these evils perhaps, because they must have great men at all events; though some of them are dying under their popular preachers. But feeble churches should look well to this matter. For

1st. Many who pass for smart men, are more showy than sound—more brilliant than deep. They can let off a few sermons and speeches wonderfully well, and their pond is out.

2. Smart men are often more learned than pious, and by their levity and worldly conformity, and want of spirituality, spoil all their Sabbath ministrations.

3. If your preacher is a smart man, very possibly you will be proud of him, and will worship your preacher more than God; and then God will blast both him and you.

4. If you obtain a smart man, most probably he will be ambitious, and soon think, that such talents as he possesses ought not to be confined to such a humble sphere.

5. If your minister is a smart man, and has the reputation of it abroad, then the large churches and colleges will most probably entice him away. He will have *call* upon *call*, till at last he becomes satisfied that the providence of God *calls* him to leave. And then

6. You will find that having once had a smart man, you will not be willing to take up with any thing less than just such a smart man again. These smart, strong men, make churches fastidious. I know a small church that is now dying from this cause. It has had one or two smart men, and they have broke away suddenly, and now this church is not willing to take up with any thing *much less than Dr. Beecher*.

7. Many of our smart men (I grieve to say it) do not preach the gospel plainly, pungently, fully. They sacrifice sound doctrine and faithful dealing to popularity. They wreath the sword of the spirit with so many rhetorical flowers, that it does not "pierce even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit." This sacrificing at the shrine of popular applause is killing the orthodoxy and piety of many congregations. The poor leave the church because they are not fed. And when *God's poor* leave a church for such, *or any other cause*, orthodoxy and piety will soon follow.

8. Smart men make churches fastidious. Like children fed on condiments, they have no relish for sound, wholesome instruction. Their gospel must come to them through a richer tube. They spurn at the "sincere milk of the word," unless it is dealt out with a silver spoon highly ornamented, and from a silver bowl set round with gems and brilliants. No preacher is popular with them, whose ministrations enlighten their understanding, mortify their vanity, humble their pride, correct their bad tempers, reprove their sloth, exalt their Saviour, and make them forget their preacher in their love and admiration of his Master. But a minister is sure to be very popular with them, respecting whom they can say, "what a fine speaker," "what a fine voice," "what beautiful figures," "what eloquent sentences," "what striking illustrations," "what correct taste," "what powerful reasoning;" in short, "what a charming *man* and preacher he is"!!! Thus the man is loved, praised and followed, instead of his divine Master. O how some of these smart men, swollen by the breath of human flattery, will shrivel up, when they come before the judgment seat! Feeble churches, can you afford to have a smart man?

PAUL.

**THE SABBATH.**—The interest in behalf of the Sabbath is rapidly increasing in England. The established church is taking an efficient part in various efforts to increase this interest. The Bishop of London is actively engaged. The House of Commons had endeavored to coun-

teract the evil of Sabbath desecration by incorporating in the charters of railroad companies and similar associations for public accommodation, the express proviso, their cars, &c. "Shall rest on the Sabbath." The proviso has in several instances, however, been rejected by the House of Lords.

---

**THE ASSOCIATE REFORMED SYNOD OF NEW-YORK.**—The annual meeting of this Judicatory took place at the city of New-York in the early part of September, but we have not received a copy of the minutes of their proceedings. We have learned, however, to our great surprise, that they tendered an invitation to our *suspended* co-presbyter, Mr. Stark, to take a seat with them as a corresponding member. It was known to many, if not all the members of that reverend body, that the Associate Synod had, for certain immoralities of conduct, suspended Mr. S. from the exercise of all the functions of the gospel ministry, and from the communion of the church. Even mere civil and literary institutions are accustomed to regard with some deference the acts of other kindred institutions in the *expulsion* of their members. We cannot therefore but regard this procedure of the Associate Reformed Synod as unparalleled in the history of the conduct of independent churches in relation to each other's disciplinary acts. We venture to say, that such sycophancy towards an individual under censure, and such discourtesy towards the judicatory inflicting that censure, could not have been committed by any other ecclesiastical body in the universe. Indeed, we know nothing that can match such conduct, unless it be that of a certain Dr. in New-York, who is represented (we hope *misrepresented*, for his own sake,) as swearing on a late occasion, that *Mr. Stark is a minister in good standing in the Associate Church.* An explanation is much needed.

---

**NOTICE.**—We have with the present number finished the early history of the Secession from the Established Church of Scotland. The acceptableness of this article will, we hope, be an inducement to the author to have it published in book form. There are very many in our church, who do not take the Monitor, who would doubtless be glad to put themselves in possession of this history. And besides it ought, if possible, to be disseminated among those who may have formed very unfavorable opinions respecting Seceders, from the unjust and perverted account given of them through the pages of the Biblical Repertory. The editors of which periodical have been placed by Mr. Beveridge in no enviable light, viewed as *historians.* We hope Mr. B. will go on with the history of the Secession Church, and bring it down to the present time.

We may notice in this connection that we have cause to complain of the negligence of correspondents. Out of some eighty settled ministers in our church, only five or six pretend to write for the pages of the Monitor at all; and even these, with one or two exceptions, have not of late manifested the same promptitude as formerly in digesting matter for our pages. Without the help of our brethren it will be impossible for us to sustain the character of the Monitor. *A word to the wise is sufficient.*

THE  
**RELIGIOUS MONITOR,**

AND  
EVANGELICAL REPOSITORY.

---

DECEMBER, 1836.

---

**ART. I.** *A Letter from the Rev. Ralph Erskine to the Rev. George Whitefield, referred to in the "Review of an account of the Secession from the Established Church of Scotland," &c.*

The following letter from Mr. Ralph Erskine, to Mr. George Whitefield, is somewhat long; and I had thoughts of only making a few extracts from it, for illustrating some points in the preceding review; but as it is probably rare, and may be more interesting without omissions or abridgment I have sent it entire. It shows what views the Seceders at first entertained of the Methodists, and their proceedings in England. It also furnishes a favorable specimen of their charitable spirit, in putting the best construction on the strange and erroneous expressions, which they had observed in Mr. Whitefield's publications. The copy, from which the following is transcribed, was obtained from my friend, Mr. S. M. of Washington County, Pa. Whether it may not be the first, and perhaps the only edition of it, I am not able to say. It appears to have been published, with a view to promote Mr. Whitefield's popularity in the United States. The following is the title prefixed to it:

"A letter from the Reverend Mr. Ralph Erskine, to the Reverend Mr. George Whitefield. Philadelphia. Printed and sold by B. Franklin, 1741."

The Letter itself, is as follows:

DUNFERMLINE, Aug. 21, 1739.

*Reverend and very dear Sir:—*

Yours dated July 23, was most acceptable; and I would have answered it by the first post, as you propose, but that, as it lay about eight days in my house before I was at home to receive it, so I delayed a few days thereafter, because I was to meet with the rest of my brethren of the Associate Presbytery, to whom I communicated your line and Mr. W. Seward's; and at the same time gave to each of them a

copy of your last Journal, as a present from you. I received nine of them at Burnt-Island, where we then were. I received, also, much about the same time, six of your last sermon on John vii. 37, &c., some of which, with some of the former sermons, I also gave to the brethren. And as I return you hearty thanks for these compliments, so my brethren received them as tokens of that love and kindness which you express in such affectionate terms, in the close of your letter to me, as gave them very much pleasure and satisfaction, and tended to increase and inflame their love more and more unto you.

Your being opposed for owning of us, and yet maintaining such a regard for us, gives ground to hope and expect, that you will receive no information about us to our disadvantage, unless, or until you have account thereof from ourselves, since you have laid such a foundation of kindly correspondence with us.

I have some acquaintance with Mr. Davidson in Edinburgh, whom you mention, and was glad to hear he had sent you Mr. Baxter's books. However, he has not had so much communication with us, as I hear he has with you, since he began to sway toward the Independent or Congregational way, which he has for some time been active to promote, though otherwise, I hope, a good and well disposed man. Meantime, by whatever hand you please to send any print, (expecting with the first occasion to see the Appendix, if published,) it can scarce fail to come to me, if but directed as your letters are. I have given orders to send you the prints relating to our public affairs in the Associate Presbytery, and in case of your absence, they are to come to Mr. W. Seward, or Mr. John Wesley.

I have now read your Journals and sermons, and I can assure you, with reference to the whole work in general, and the main scope of it, my soul has been made to magnify the Lord for the very great things he has done for you, and by you; and I rejoice to see you ascribe all to the free grace of God in Christ, and that he has so remarkably raised you up to testify against the errors and corruptions of the times, to rouse and waken a secure generation, and to bring such a number of sinners from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God.

If I shall speak of any particulars in which we differ, it shall only be to show the greatness of my love to you, by the greatness of the freedom I use with you; also to prevent after-mistakes, and to promote unfeigned love, which can both cover a multitude of infirmities, and overlook a multitude of differences; not by quite concealing of them, which might bring love under a suspicion, but by a friendly mentioning of them, which may prove it to be without dissimulation.

Though we desire to cover with that mantle of love all the differences betwixt you and us, that flow from your education in the Church of England, and adore the merciful Providence of God that has so far enlightened and qualified you and your brethren to be witnesses for him, and instruments of reformation; yet we hope, the more this work is of God, the more will it tend to bring about a happy union in the Lord between you and us, not only in a private and personal, but even in a more public and general way.

My brethren and I, that have had occasion here to confer about you, see a beauty in the Providence of your being in communion with the English Church; otherwise such great confluences from among them, had not attended your ministry, nor consequently received the benefit, or reaped the advantage by it, which so many of them have done. And

though infinite wisdom has made and may yet make this an alluring bait to draw them forth; yet as England's reformation at first, (from Popery and its superstitious and ceremonial services,) however great and glorious, was far from being so full as that of some other Protestant churches, particularly that of Scotland; so we would fain hope, that, when a new and general reformation shall be set on foot, some more at least of the rags of that Romish church will be dropped, such as (abstracting at present from the subject of church government) many useless rites and customs relating to worship, that have no scriptural foundation. This is what some of the most pious and eminent divines of your communion, have wished to see reformed, knowing that many of these were retained at first, only under a view of reforming gradually, and from some prudential considerations; and knowing also that the continued retaining of these things, which the reforming fathers designed gradually to cast off, has been more stumbling to the friends, than ever it was gaining to the enemies of the reformation. Therefore, though Providence at present be making a good use of your being, according to your light, of that way, yet when you are beginning, as it were, to lay a new foundation, may the Lord in due time enable you to guard against such things as may afterwards prove a hindrance to a multitude of tender christians their communion with you, as has been the case formerly. *Principiis obsta*, is a caution most necessary in many cases. What the great and famous reformer Luther retained from his original Romish education, proved a sad dividing snare among Protestant churches. And since (by the good hand of God upon you) you are so well occupied in dashing down bigotry and party zeal, I hope the hint I here give you on this head, will be the more agreeable.

No doubt the first and main business is to lay the foundation of saving faith, by preaching the pure truth and precious doctrine of the everlasting gospel, which (glory to God) you are so busy about, and we, I hope, are joining heart and hand with you.

Very dear sir, if you and your brethren, whom I honor and esteem in the Lord as his eminent witnesses, shall judge the freedom I have here used already, to be rank or unseasonable; the least challenge of this sort from you, shall be to me as excellent oil that shall not break my head; for I think I would choose to suffer many miseries rather than choose to offend you. But hoping my freedom shall rather be taken as a mark of that kindness of which my heart is full;

I proceed to tell you what may be reckoned exceptionable in the last Journal, though at the same time the wonders of divine grace therein recorded, were most savory to me, and all I have spoken with upon it; and will, I hope, stir up many to prayer and praise.

Your opinion about the business of the attorney has I hear, been written to you already; and therefore I shall say nothing of it. The correction you gave to your own opinion of its unlawfulness, by adding, *at least exceeding dangerous*, satisfied me.

Some have thought your love and charity extended a little too far beyond the scripture-rule in some instances, such as Journal last page 59, when you say, "The Quaker's notions about walking and being led by the spirit, you think are right and good;" unless they be Quaker of another stamp than the rest, whose dangerous tenets are inconsistent with the right notion of walking and being led by the Spirit, while, besides other things, they deny justification by the imputed righteousness of Christ,



or his active and passive obedience received by faith, to be the only ground of justification before God; and while thus they cannot receive Christ Jesus, they consequently cannot walk in him, nor be led by his Spirit, who is the spirit of truth, testifying of Christ, according to the revelation made of him in the word, which they contradict. Whatever duties of love you perform towards these men, yet I will never believe you mean or intend to justify their principles and delusive notions, nor think well of them, till once the Lord convince and convert them.

There is a passage in the same book, page 83, that has been improved against us, and our secession from the judicatories, which yet, when I read over again, seems to show to me how much you are of our mind, and would take the same course if you had been in the same situation. You very justly, I think, express your dissatisfaction with three of your brethren that were driven to deny Christ's visible church upon earth, and show that needless separation from the established church would no doubt be attended with ill consequences, and you judge of the state of a church, not from the practice of its members, but from its primitive and public constitution. Hence to me it would seem, that if even the plurality of its members, meeting judicially, should counteract its primitive and public constitution, you would see fit to leave them, and cleave to the said constitution, which is the case with us, in our secession from the present judicatories of the Established Church of Scotland.

It is true, such seem to be the defects of your ecclesiastic government in England, that, unless in the case of a convocation, you can neither boast of an ecclesiastical and judicial cleaving unto, nor complain of a judicial receding, from the primitive public constitution. But as I make no question, but in that case, you would find (as matters are at present stated in England,) there would be defections of the same sort with you, as there are with us; and consequently, that you would see need to take the same course that we of the Associate Presbytery do; so while you want the same advantages of seeing clearly when it is that defections are become national and judicial, and when there is a universal, practical departure from the scriptural principles of the church you profess yourself to be of, it is a question, how far it is consonant with the word of God, to maintain close [intimate] communion with these of that church, who either are subverting its primitive public constitution, or openly and avowedly denying the aforesaid principles, since right communion is founded on union, in the truth, at least by some open profession of it, which most of your clergy seem to have little of, while they excommunicate you and your brethren from the use of their churches. However well ordered, this also is in Providence for good; yet it discovers them to be what they are.

You likewise add, that "as long as the articles of the church of England are agreeable to scripture, you resolve to preach them up, without either bigotry or party zeal." This I heartily approve of, and this is the case with us also; we preach up and defend doctrinally, and judicially, these articles of the church of Scotland, agreeable to the scripture, which the judicatories are letting go. Hence I conclude, you seem to be just of our mind, as to separation from an established church. We never declared Secession from the church of Scotland; but on the contrary, only a Secession from the judicatories in their course of defections, from the primitive and covenanted principles of the church of Scotland, to which we stood also bound, by our ordination engage-

ments; and hence to this day, we never did quit our charges or congregations, to which we were ordained, by the imposition of the hands of our several respective Presbyteries, nor did we ever design it, unless we were obliged, by violence or compulsion, so to do.

As to your sermons, Dear Sir, I am ashamed you should mention my approbation of them, as if it were of any significance. The general strain of your doctrine, I love, admire and relish with my soul, and hope it will do much service through the blessing of God. And as to some particular expressions, which I myself could not have used, my love to you, and my view of the countenance of heaven with you, made me to put such a favorable gloss upon them, as to discern no odds betwixt you and us. But since I am upon that strain, of using all the kindly freedom I can, I shall give some instances; *Almost Christian*, penult page, "We shall then look back on our past, sincere and hearty services, which have procured us so valuable a reward." This I could by no means interpret, as if you meant it to the detriment of the doctrine of Heaven's being a reward of grace in Christ Jesus, and not of debt to our services, or of eternal life, its being the gift of God, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Sermon on *Justification by Christ*, at the close, "Do but labor to attain that holiness, without which no man shall see the Lord; and then, though your sins be as scarlet, &c." I could by no means think, that this was intended any way to thwart the doctrine of a free remission of sin, by the blood and righteousness of Christ only, which is the subject of the preceding sermon; or to make sanctification, or laboring after holiness, which is the first evidence, to be the root, ground, cause, or condition of forgiveness. No: I took your view to be, that in this way of laboring to attain holiness, people would evidence to themselves and others, that they were pardoned persons in Christ, or that they could not maintain the knowledge or assurance of it, but in this way of holiness. Sermon on (Phil. iii. 10, p. 14.) "He has past from death to life, and shall never, if he stir up the gift of God that is in him, fall into condemnation." This (if) here, I did not interpret, as favoring the Arminian error, against the certainty of the perseverance of saints, that are once savingly united to Christ by a faith of the operation of God, and passed from death to life; but rather viewed it as favoring the gospel doctrine, concerning the connexion betwixt the means and the end, and the necessity of the one in order to the other, though both are secured by promises, to believers in Christ, I was told by one, that in some part of your prints, you spoke of justification, by the act of believing; but as I noticed nothing of this in the prints, so I affirmed, that you had not so learned Christ, as to put the Arminian *To credere*, or any thing done by us, in the room of Christ and his righteousness, or of his obedience and satisfaction, which alone, received by faith, I was sure from your writings, you would own to be the only matter and ground of justification. Again, though I could not use the English of your *bone Deus*, because profane persons, here sometimes swear in these terms; yet, as I know it is common among your writers, so I judge nothing is intended by it, but a note of astonishment.

Now, some of these remarks are perhaps but trifling, and not so material as others of them; yet I have noted all down, that I may keep nothing back from you, that in the least occurred to my mind, of any seeming disonancy between us in words; yet I judged, that even under various ways of speaking, we mean the same thing, and pointed to the same end. And I can say before the Lord, I not only approve of your

Sermons and Journals, but see much matter of praise to God for them. I see much of the glory and majesty of God, and many of the stately steps, and doings of our mighty king Jesus in them: and have at times, with tears of joy adored his name, for what he is doing for you, and by you; and I pray for the continuance and advancement of that work of God. I rejoice that the Lord's work is going on with you, and that the day of power continues. Long may it do so, till all the powers of darkness give way to it, and till every Gogon fall before the ark of God.

Your way of arguing against the apostatizing clergy of your church, in your last sermon, even from the instance drawn out of your service-book, may be to them, I think, arguments *ad hominem*. May the Lord bless it for their conviction, and for awakening them out of their spiritual lethargy. When I consider how you and your brethren are stirred up of God, to such a remarkable way of witnessing for him in England, against the corruptions and defections of that church: And how we of the Associate Presbytery have been called forth, in a judicial way, to witness against the corruptions and defections of the church of Scotland; and both at a juncture, when Popish powers are combining together against us, and desolating judgments are justly threatened from heaven: There is perhaps, more in the womb of Providence, relating to our several situations and successes therein than we are aware of. What he does, we know not now, but we may know hereafter. If he be gathering his birds together before the storm, according to the call, (Zeph. ii. 1, 2, 3, and Isa. xxvi. 20, 21); glory to him that does all things well. We have lately been attending several sacramental solemnities in our brethren's congregations, where vast multitudes of people were present at the tents, without doors as well as in the churches, and I never found more of the presence of God than at some of these occasions. The spirit was sometimes remarkably poured out, and the power of the Lord was present to heal many souls. Enemies gnash with their teeth, as with you they do; but the Lord carries on his work. My brethren salute you most affectionately; they love and respect you in the Lord.

Now, very dear sir, I have in this long letter opened my very heart unto you, and told you the very worst thought that ever entered it, concerning you, which I could not have done, if it were not filled with love to you: and it loves you because you love Christ; and he loves and honors you, and I hope will spare and honor you more and more, to be a happy instrument in his hand, for advancing his kingdom and pulling down the throne of iniquity. May the weapons of your warfare be more and more mighty, through God, for that end. I am,

Reverend and dear sir,

Yours most affectionately in our blessed Immanuel,

RALPH ERSKINE.

I salute the worthy Swards and Wesleys in the Lord.

ART. II. *Queries to A. H. of Miami Presbytery.*

MR. EDITOR—

I observed a brief article in your October Number, containing some resolutions of the Presbytery of Miami, concerning which, I would take

the liberty to offer a few queries ; for the obtaining of more full information on some points.

The first resolution is, in effect, that the Presbytery approve, recommend, and as far as their influence may extend, become auxiliary to the American Bible Society. Now the brethren of Miami, cannot have forgotten, that the Associate Synod, to which they are professedly subordinate, had adopted regulations for uniting all their people, to act as a Bible Society ; in the way most agreeable to their own profession. They know, also, that the main objections of Synod to the American Bible Society, were, the opposition of that society to the printing, or circulating of the Psalms in metre, with the scriptures ; and the misapplication of funds. The Presbytery, (I mean the members of it, who were present at Synod,) concurred with their brethren, in their proposed plan ; and some of their congregations have contributed liberally to it. This, therefore, I would be glad to know by your correspondent from Miami, Whether that Presbytery have ascertained that the American Bible Society have changed their course, so as to remove the above grounds of objection ? And if so, Why it would not have been better, to have communicated the information to Synod, that their former acts on the subject might have been annulled ? and then reason and order would have appeared in the change of conduct, both by Synod and Presbytery. But for men to concur with the superior court in passing acts, and then in the inferior, to publish resolutions, which to every plain man appear directly contrary, and that without one word of a reason assigned, is rather mysterious.

If no such fact as I have supposed, has been ascertained, I would ask, Whether Presbytery have changed their views on the points objected to, that is, more particularly, whether they now see that the circulation of the scripture psalms in metre, is a point of no consequence ? The Synod seeing, that the influence of so mighty an institution as the American Bible Society, was operating against the scripture psalms in metre, and rapidly causing their disappearance, and considering this an important point of present truth for which they were contending, adopted the plan, which they judged best suited to the case. Perhaps the Presbytery have discovered some other and better method of attaining the same ends, and if so we should be happy to know it.

Presbytery resolve to recommend (this new course,) to the members of their several congregations, and of course, to those who have heretofore been acting on the plan adopted by Synod, as well as to others. We know not the manner or words in which the recommendation will be given, but from the nature of the case it must amount to this, and in plain terms might be so expressed. Brethren, we assure you that the plan adopted by our Synod, for distributing the scriptures, with the Psalms in metre, is not adapted to answer any good purpose ; it is not worthy of your consideration or support, it is a misapplication of your money ; the arguments used by Synod in its behalf, are of no weight ; and we advise you henceforth to discontinue your contributions to that plan, and give them to the funds of the American Bible Society, though these funds may sometimes be applied to the payment of rather large salaries, or lent to aid in printing the Apocrypha, and certainly will never be applied to print the scripture Psalms in metre."

Here I would ask, How any such a measure consists with the respect due from inferiors to Synod and their deeds, or consists with a due regard to our own witnessing profession.

The other resolution, which particularly drew my attention, is, in effect, to procure, send, and as far as practicable support, a missionary to the heathen, most probably to China, or where the Chinese language is spoken. The subject of missions and the state of the heathen, is one of the most spirit stirring nature, to every lover of Zion's cause; and every minister of the gospel, who rightly understands his commission from the Head of the Church, is in spirit and fact a missionary.

But still in this resolution, are several things not easily understood. The Presbytery represent to Synod, the great field for missionary labor in the far west, (of which they have the charge,) and therefore the necessity of Synod's sending them as large a portion of supply as they can. The field allotted to that Presbytery is large indeed, from about the middle of Ohio, on the east, without limit to the north, west, or southwest. In this vast region, there are many tribes of heathen equally destitute, and equally accessible as the Chinese, besides many handfulls of professing christians, earnestly praying us to come and help them; more than would occupy the whole missionary resources of Synod.

Has the Presbytery found means to supply these since last meeting of Synod? It is well known that small as the Secession Church is, they have not enough of preachers to supply their vacancies. Have the Presbytery so full a supply that they can spare one for China? It is well known that though Synod's missionary operations are comparatively small, yet they are fully equal to their means.

Have the Presbytery such a superabundance that they are able, alone, to bear the expense of sending and supporting a missionary to China? I hope this will not be thought too intrusive; the design of the question is, that if the brethren of Miami have discovered some new, and more successful plan of raising funds, it might be of excellent use, for other Presbyteries and Synod also to know and adopt it. The Presbytery seem to have a special respect to the Chinese language. Are there any of their members, or of our preachers, that are more familiar with that language than with other foreign languages? Or, is it more easily acquired than any of the Indian dialects within the Presbytery's own field of labor? Presbytery propose to send one missionary. To what Presbytery would the sphere of his labors belong? Or, is it consistent with Presbyterianism to send one alone to the heathen? Presbytery do not positively promise to support him, but only "as far as practicable." This supposes there will be a deficiency. How is that deficiency to be supplied? Perhaps the American Board of Foreign Missions would be liberal enough to aid in the case. Perhaps so indeed! and if this be the view of the Presbytery, it would at once answer several of my questions, for the Board could also furnish the missionary, and the missionary would find no such difficulty as I have supposed, in holding ministerial fellowship with any, of any denomination whom he might find there, and in short it would amount to this, that the Presbytery would become auxiliary to the American Board of Foreign Missions, as well as to the American Bible Society. One thing further; the brethren know that Synod have the subject of Foreign Missions lying on their table for consideration, and will probably adopt some plan upon it, as soon as practicable: and moreover they themselves (I mean those present at last meeting) acquiesced in what was done. Now I ask, as of the former resolution, What is the consistency of returning home, and in Presbytery thus hastily snatching Synod's business out of their hand, or at least anticipating them in it? In con-

clusion. There is something strange in the publication of these resolutions; it is not common for Presbyteries to publish their resolutions and proceedings, unless in matters of general interest, as we saw sometime ago an address by Cambridge Presbytery, urging their people to a co-operation on Synod's plan of a Bible Society; but why any person or Presbytery should unnecessarily publish resolutions which seem so directly contrary, is strange indeed. I would not impute motives to others which they disavow; but supposing myself to have been a member of that Presbytery, and had I been desirous of showing contempt of Synod and their measures, I would have heartily agreed to these resolutions and the publication of them, as a happy expedient for that purpose. If the character of the resolutions be not totally different from the impression they must naturally make on the plain reader; they stand strangely associated in the same article, with an account of a goodly number proceeding in the solemn and heart-knitting work of public covenanting. It is, however, to be observed that no authority of Presbytery appears for the publication of the resolutions; I have therefore scarcely been able to persuade myself that they are the grave acts of a court, but rather the effusions of an individual. I have all along considered myself as addressing an individual, and have therefore used the more freedom, though I have not intended to be disrespectful. Of course I do not expect a court to descend to answer my queries, but if your correspondent A. H. can throw any light on the subject, others as well as myself will gladly receive the information. Q.

---

ART. III. *Exposition of the First Five Chapters of the Epistle to the Romans; with Remarks on the Commentaries of Dr. Macknight, Professor Tholuck, and Professor Moses Stuart.* By ROBERT HALDANE, Esq. London: Hamilton, Adams, and Co. Edinburgh: William Whyte and Co. 1835.

It has often been observed, If you wish to test the orthodoxy of a divine, set him to comment upon the Epistle to the Romans. In that remarkable portion of the sacred canon, the marrow of the Gospel may be said to be concentrated. Its distinguishing doctrines are there exhibited in such lucid order and mutual dependence, as parts of one grand remedial scheme, that he who fails to discover them betrays at once the obliquity of his mental vision, and his ignorance of the gospel system.

Judging by this test, we are compelled to conclude that the standard of sound theological knowledge is at present very low among our learned divines, and in the public seminaries of Christendom. Three commentaries on the epistle to the Romans have lately appeared in this country, by three several professors in protestant universities, viz.—Doctors Ritchie of Edinburgh, and Tholuck of Halle, and Mr. Stuart of Andover, Massachusetts; which, whatever other merits they may possess, are certainly not calculated to give us a very high idea of the soundness in the faith of their respective authors.

The first, indeed, will probably do little harm. The author's name did not before stand particularly high, at least in the department of the theology; and his present work has brought him into notice, chiefly as

a pannel at the bar of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, from which, upon a vague disclaimer of error, he was dismissed without censure, little to his credit or to theirs. The other two are more calculated to be hurtful, and particularly the last. Mr. Stuart has obtained considerable celebrity in the religious world for his letters in defence of the doctrine of the Trinity, a work which, though far from faultless, certainly displays not a little ability and research: and, having lately entered upon the fashionable field of Biblical criticism, he is at present looked up to as an authority by many on both sides of the Atlantic. His reputation as a critic, we do think, has been considerably overrated. He is, after all but a second hand one, borrowing very liberally from the German divines, particularly Dr. Tholuck, above mentioned. This, however, has only rendered his works the more dangerous. Considering the well known character of German theology for some time past, it was hardly to be expected but that the extract, even after being refined in an American crucible, would retain some of its original flavour. In the present case, indeed, we question whether the poison has not acquired rather increased virulence, for of the two last mentioned works, so closely resembling each other that the first may be considered as the model, we do consider the commentary of the German Professor as by far the least exceptionable. Neither of them can however be considered safe. Through the loop-holes of verbal criticism on the sacred text, they have contrived to bring forward, and insinuate in a specious manner, the greater part of those Arminian and Pelagian tenets, which had fled from the touch-stone of open theological discussion. The imputation of the sin of Adam, and of the righteousness of Christ, are by both denied or explained away; the nature of faith misrepresented, and the cardinal doctrine of justification by faith, *i. e.* by placing to the account of the believer the perfect righteousness of the Saviour, perverted into an unworthy compromise, on the part of the great ruler of all, whereby, upon the consideration of his having received from the surety a *general* satisfaction for sin, he "*counts,*" as Mr. Stuart expresses it, "*the faith of the believer as complete obedience,*" and acquits him *gratuitously* upon the ground of it.

The spread of these doctrines, in this new dress, has called forth the work, the title of which stands at the head of this article. It is the production of a layman: but, as a contribution to our exegetical theology, it is of more value than those of the three learned professors put together. The author is already well known, both as a Christian philanthropist, and an able writer. He is well acquainted with the nature and tendency of German Neology, having witnessed its progress on the Continent, and the havoc which it has already made in some of the most distinguished of the Protestants Churches; and he is most laudably jealous of its introduction into this country. It was this which led him to take such a prominent and efficient part in the Apocrypha Controversy; and drew from his pen his valuable work on the Evidence and Authority of Divine Revelation; and the present volume may be considered as following out the same object.

Mr. Haldane has only proceeded in his Exposition to the close of the fifth chapter. His reason for confining himself at present to these chapters, (we hope he does not propose to stop short at them,) appears to be, that he wished to present to his readers a unique, and scriptural view of the fundamental doctrine of justification by faith, through the *imputed* righteousness of Jesus Christ. This is the great truth, which

the apostle proposes to establish in these chapters, and upon which he brings the whole chain of his unrivalled argument to bear. In going over the ground, Mr. Haldane has made it his aim, by a doctrinal analysis of the text, to bring out the apostle's meaning, and place it luminously before his readers, so as to shew them, that that grand truth, the very key-stone of the gospel system, rests not upon the "wisdom of man," but upon the infallible testimony of God. In this he has been very successful. We have in his pages no parade of criticism, no attempts to attract by striking out new meanings to words and phrases long since understood, but what is of far more importance, the old catholic doctrine, the true doctrine of the apostle, is fully and fairly exhibited, and clearly and convincingly established.

In the progress of his analysis, Mr. H. has frequent occasion to introduce several short exegetical dissertations on the various controverted words and phrases, which occur in these chapters, and to refute the erroneous views of them propagated by various other commentators, particularly in the work of Mr. Stuart. Thus we have a pretty lengthened exposition of the phrases, "*righteousness of God*," "*justification*," "*imputation*," &c. These form, perhaps, the most valuable portion of the work, and prove that the worthy author is no novice in the science of theology. His views are uniformly sound, his expositions of them clear and consistent with his text, and his refutation of the errors of his opponents able and satisfactory. The religious world are much indebted to him for detecting and exposing the sophistry of this new school, and thus providing an antidote for a poison which is not the less dangerous, that it is administered under the specious form of improved criticism on the sacred text. The parade of superior learning assumed by some of our modern biblical critics, is very apt to impose upon many, especially of their younger readers. They would almost persuade us, that, if the doctrines of the gospel were formerly known, the words, at least, in which they are written, were never before understood; and while they are learnedly hunting through their various phases, for recondite and novel interpretations, the reader is in danger of being led away, before he is aware, from those grand established truths which lie upon the *surface* of the Bible, and involved in all the inextricable mazes and contradictions of heresy. Against this evil Mr. Haldane's work is an excellent caveat, not only by pointing out and confuting the errors themselves, but by the plain, unostentatious, and common sense way in which he deals with the sacred text, fixing his attention, not only on its minutiae, but chiefly on its scope, taking an enlarged view of its contents, and thus "comparing spiritual things with spiritual."

We could have wished to have given a fair specimen of his manner, by extracting some of his more lengthened expositions, such as that on chapter iii. 21, chapter iv. 6, or the important verses in the close of chapter v. Our limits, however, entirely preclude us. We must content ourselves with the following short quotation, taken at random from chapter iv.

"3. '*And it was counted to him for righteousness*;' rather, '*unto righteousness*.'" It is not instead of righteousness, as this translation *for righteousness*, has led many to suppose. By faith a man becomes truly righteous. Faith is the recipient of that righteousness by which we are justified. *Unto* righteousness is the literal rendering, as the same word in the original is so often translated in this discussion; as where it is said, chapter i. 17, the gospel is the power of God *unto* salva-



tion; and chapter iii. 22, even the righteousness of God which is *unto* all them that believe; and so in innumerable other places, but especially in a passage precisely parallel to the one before us, chapter x. 10. 'for with the heart man believeth *unto* righteousness.' This is the signification of the phrase in the verse before us, which ought to have been translated in the same way. The expression, '*unto* righteousness,' is elliptical, and signifies unto the receiving of righteousness. In the different French translations, the meaning of the original is properly expressed, '*a justice*,' that is, to, or *unto* righteousness, and in the same way in the vulgate, '*ad justitiam*,' to righteousness.

"That faith itself is not the justifying righteousness is demonstrably evident from the very phraseology of many passages that speak of faith and righteousness in the same place, "Even the *righteousness of God*, which is *by faith* of Jesus Christ unto all, and upon all that believe." Here righteousness is supposed to be one thing and faith another. Righteousness is what we want in order to justification; faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, as testified in the gospel, is the means through which we receive this righteousness. Believing, then, is not the righteousness, but it is the means through which we become righteous. Can language more expressly shew that righteousness and faith are two different things, for two different purposes, though always both enjoyed by the same persons, and both equally necessary? In like manner, in Rom. x. 10, the Apostle says, 'For with the heart man believeth unto righteousness.' Here it is necessarily implied that faith is not righteousness, but that it is the means through which we receive righteousness. Nothing then can be a greater corruption of the truth than to represent faith itself as accepted instead of righteousness, or to be the righteousness that saves the sinner. Faith is not righteousness; righteousness is the fulfilling of the law."

Mr. Haldane will not, of course, expect us, as sound Presbyterians, to subscribe to his opinion, that "the keys of the kingdom of heaven were committed *exclusively* to the *apostles*," if by this he means, as we presume he does, to the *exclusion* of the *ordinary* office-bearers of the house of God. Neither can we be understood as vouching for the accuracy of every sentiment and expression which occur in the volume: but the slips will be found to be few and slight, and we can easily excuse them, in consideration of the sterling worth of the volume as a whole. In his appendix, he refers to an observation of Mr. Stuart, that his readers were not to expect from him a "*sermonizing commentary*," and very justly observes, that the difference of form would have been less felt had Mr. Stuart presented us, in his own way with the *substantial doctrines* of many of these sermonizing commentators. We confess, however, that we also feel not a little the want of the *practical improvement*, which these sermonizers were wont to make of the doctrines of the text. Nor do we think that Mr. Haldane himself has entirely supplied this defect. In fact, if there be a blemish in his excellent work, we apprehend it is the want of this, which, in our opinion, greatly lessens its interest, and even excites in the common reader a feeling of heaviness. We do not find in his pages the rich and soul-nourishing remarks of Henry, nor even the judicious but drier observations of Scott. No doubt this may be considered as not falling exactly within his plan, which was to give a simple statement of the great doctrines of the text, and clear them from the errors imposed upon them; and it must also be allowed, that the whole bearing of the exposition is of a practical

tendency. Still we do think, that a more liberal interspersion of such observations would have considerably relieved the dryness of the doctrinal discussion and enhanced its value to the common reader.

The truth is, a good practical family exposition of the Epistle to the Romans is still a desideratum in our libraries. We have at present before us a manuscript volume of Lectures on this Epistle, by the late Rev. James Aitken, of Kirriemuir, which we think not unsuited to supply the blank. We hope this volume will yet see the light, for we have much misjudged the portion we have examined, if it be not calculated to do much credit to the memory of the venerated author, and afford to the friends of evangelical truth a high degree both of pleasure and profit.

---

ART. IV. *A Letter of Robert Haldane.*

[LETTER FROM ROBERT HALDANE, ESQ. to the Rev. Dr. Morrison, Editor of the *Evangelical Magazine* respecting the Commentary of Professor Stuart on the Epistle to the Romans.]

We find this letter bound up with the last number of the London *Evangelical Magazine* for September. Robert Haldane is well known for Christian activity, and devotedness, and also for his sound learning, and for several excellent works published by him. A year or two since he published a Commentary on the first five chapters of the Epistle to the Romans. In connection with this, he examines the views and critical exposition of Prof. Stuart, and exhibits, and severely condemns his unsoundness as to evangelical sentiment. In the same number of the *Evangelical Magazine* of this year there is a notice of the second British edition of Stuart's Commentary on the Romans, doubtless from the pen of its editor, Dr. Morrison. This notice (which we copied into our paper) decidedly condemns the important doctrinal errors of the Commentary, and views it as calculated to exert a dangerous influence, but regrets the severity with which Mr. Haldane handled it. This gave rise to the following letter from Mr. Haldane. It is worthy of attention.—*Ch. Int.*]

SIR,—In your Magazine of this month, you represent me as adopting, in my Exposition of the Epistle to the Romans, “a style of censure which can never be applicable to such a man as Moses Stuart.” This language is calculated to mislead your readers, and induce them to suppose that I have made a personal attack on Mr. Stuart, while you are well aware that my censures are exclusively levelled against his heretical doctrine, and the perverted statements by which he labors to support it. And in what style should perversions of the truth of God be censured? Are they to be treated as mere matters of opinion on which we may innocently and safely differ? Or ought they to be openly met in a tone of solemn, strong, and decided disapprobation? If an apostle was withstood to the face when he was to be blamed, are the writings of Moses Stuart, which subvert the Gospel, to be passed without rebuke?

The style I have adopted, in my remarks on Mr. Stuart's Commentary on the Romans, is the style which I believe the Lord enjoins, and which his servants throughout the Scriptures exemplify, in opposition

to the manner of those who prophesied smooth things, who called evil good, who put darkness for light, and bitter for sweet, of which you have furnished so melancholy an example. Others who have read my work, consider the style as suitable to the occasion, and that a smoother style, in so flagrant a case, in which, by good words and fair speeches, the hearts of many have been deceived, would have discovered rather the love of the praise of men than of the praise of God. Your animadversion on this style, considering that the most vital doctrines of the Gospel are concerned, bears the appearance of being intended for the double purpose of discrediting, on the one hand, the only work in which Mr. Stuart's heresies have been brought to light; and on the other, of withdrawing the public attention from the fearful responsibility which attaches to your own conduct.

In the examples of opposing error, left on record for our imitation, we perceive nothing of that frigid spirit of indifference which smiles on the corrupters of the Word of God, and shuns to call heresy by its proper name. With what holy indignation do the apostles denounce the subtle machinations of the enemies of the Gospel! In vain shall we look among these faithful servants of the Lord, for any thing to justify that trembling reserve, which fears to say decidedly that truth is truth, or that error is error.

But, Sir, while I have to desiderate in you that zeal and decision with which you ought to have set yourself against the heresies of Mr. Stuart, I can give the less credit to your disapprobation of the style I have employed, when I cast my eye on the article in your Magazine, on the same leaf in which I am censured. Speaking of the report of a late deputation to America, you thus express yourself,—“If they are convinced in their minds—and surely they must be—that the American Christians, and particularly their own denomination, are living in a frightful sin against God, it was their duty to enter into no compromise with that sin, and to make no conditions of abstinence from denouncing it in the same frank, open, and manly way in which they would have denounced it in their native country.” Observe, Sir, how this applies to your conduct to the American Christians of your own denomination, who are *living in a frightful sin against God*, in retaining as one of their chief instructors a man who teaches *another Gospel*. “It would have been,” you say, “a noble act of Christian heroism to have forfeited a confidence which could not be secured without merging the identity of their character upon a paramount question in Christian morals.” You have only to change the expression, “Christian morals,” for *Christian doctrines*, and this language comes home to yourself. Had the Deputation acted in the way you recommended, “the American Churches,” you subjoin “would have learnt a lesson never to be forgotten, that British Christians cannot consistently with their obligation to the Great Master, make common cause with American professors of the Gospel, in their slave-holding or slave-defending propensities.” The application is obvious. Can British Christians, consistently with their obligations to the Lord, make common cause with an American professor of the Gospel, in his endeavors to subvert its very foundations? “Here,” you observe, “the faithful ministers of the cross have ever denounced it,” (slavery.) And have you, as a faithful minister, *denounced* the heresies of the man who tramples on the doctrines of the cross? “Are they,” you say, “to purchase the applause of the timid, the irresolute, and the actually corrupt, by standing aloof from that persecuted but

noble band of men who call the sin of slavery by its proper name?" And are you, Sir, to purchase the applause of those who stand aloof from the men who call the sin of heresy by its proper name? You add, "We say unhesitatingly, that English pastors will unspeakably degrade themselves, and violate principles which ought to be dearer to them than existence itself, if they will allow themselves to be placed in such an ominous position." And is not this the very position in which you have placed yourself respecting Christian doctrine? "It will not do," you observe, "to talk to us of prudence when a great question in Christian morals is in jeopardy." And will it *do*, when not one, but many great questions in Christian doctrine are in jeopardy? It appears, then, that you can "rebuke sharply" when you deem the occasion to be suitable; but that, in defiance of Scriptural example, you are offended with those who do so, when "sound doctrine" is concerned.

Mr. Stuart asks, "Can I publish to the world what I do not seriously regard as true?" If Mr. Stuart seriously regards what he has written to be true, the Apostle Paul as seriously thought that he ought to do many things contrary to the name of Jesus of Nazareth. But when this author overthrows the doctrine of Scripture, asserts in plain language that obedience *leads* to, and *ends* in justification,—when he explodes the imputation of sin and righteousness, and advances statements that impugn the justice of the Divine administration,—when, according to his American Reviewer, he has *denounced* doctrines which have "always been regarded as part of the common faith of Protestant Christendom,"—when, by glaring mistranslations, and perverted reasonings, he removes the foundation of a sinners's hope before God, all of which I have fully established in my Exposition,—when I observe this, I consider it to be my duty, however, seriously Mr. Stuart may regard such statements to be true, to show that they are utterly false, derogatory in the highest degree to the character of God, and if received, irretrievably ruinous to the souls of men. Sir, it is not in your power to rebut even one of these heavy charges.

You ventured, you say, when a former edition of Mr. Stuart's Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans made its appearance, to "commend it very earnestly to the attention of Theological students." Yes let me remind you of some of those "great swelling words," by which you introduced him to the public,—"His love of truth, his fearlessness of all consequences in the assertion of it, his freedom from all dogmatism and vanity, his patience in putting forth the amount of labor necessary towards reaching a difficult conclusion, his perfect simplicity of heart, are qualities which none can overlook in perusing his admirable writings." Assuredly you, Sir, cannot say with Paul, "neither at any time used we flattering words." *His love of truth.* Did you not shudder when you wrote this? *His freedom from all vanity—his perfect simplicity of heart.* If this be so, no marvel, if conscious of those qualities which you so unreservedly ascribe to him, Mr. Stuart cannot for a moment conceive that the personal experience of the Apostle Paul is described in the seventh chapter of the Epistle to the Romans; nor is it in the least surprising that he should explain the expression in the sixth chapter, "dead to sin," to mean "to renounce sin; to become as it were insensible to its exciting power or influence (as a dead person is incapable of sensibility.\*)" And as it is impossible to overlook "the characteristic features of Mr. Stuart's mind" in his *admirable writings*, it is not to be wondered at that you ventured to commend them

*very earnestly*; although now, indeed, you say you see "much in them, in the form of implication and inference, calculated to unsettle all the ancient landmarks on the subject of the innate depravity of human nature." You also say, "After all that Mr. Stuart has advanced in the present edition to support his theory," you "are not a whit more reconciled to its truth." But why? Because, according to you, it is now "stripped of all disguise." When you ventured so earnestly to recommend his admirable writings, were you not aware of the evil they contained, although possibly not so fully as now when you have got them *stripped of all disguise*? Sir, I maintain that such a paragraph as I have quoted above from your review, it will not be easy to match. Moreover, it has seldom been exemplified, that any one acting as you have done in this matter, has, without the smallest confession of his guilt, voluntarily, come forward as the accuser of another, who probably helped him to see through the "disguise" under which a fundamental doctrine of Christianity is undermined and overthrown. Can you be ignorant that a very ample acknowledgment to the Christian public is due by you, of your sin in contributing to disseminate the poison contained in Mr. Stuart's writings?

The Apostle Paul warned Christians against men who from among themselves arose speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples after them, and instead of complimenting false teachers in his day, as you do Mr. Stuart, denounced an angel from heaven on the supposition of his preaching another Gospel. And even now, when your eyes are opened to the deleterious character of Mr. Stuart's writings, and when compelled to admit that, "stripped of all disguise," his theory is, "that there is no sin in "the world but actual sin," how inadequate is the testimony you have borne against them? Yet can anything be more dangerous than heresy under disguise? And can that system be called Christianity which denies original sin? Was it not your duty, then, to lift up your voice like a trumpet, to cry aloud and spare not; and to do all in your power to testify repentance for your most unmerited panegyrics on this opposer of the truth, and on his "admirable writings," which, when stripped of all disguise, exhibit his frightful heresies and artful contradictions of the truth of God? Is that truth to be trifled with, and suffered to be trampled on in this manner? For the part, Sir, you have acted, you ought to humble yourself in the dust. If my style be not applicable to Mr. Stuart, is yours applicable? You had better have looked to your own style before you came forward to censure mine. You should have remembered the beam in your own eye.

Sir, it is uncandid and unfair to attempt, as you have done by an indirect, unsubstantiated, and undefined charge to impress the Christian public with the opinion that in condemning the errors of Mr. Stuart, I have employed a style of censure that is not applicable to him. My style of censure would be applicable to all the angels of heaven were they to teach the heresies of Moses Stuart. And with all your complimentary phraseology what do you virtually say to him? Do you not charge his doctrine, when stripped of all disguise, as heretical; and virtually deny him a sound understanding when you admit that he teaches fundamental errors, through a mass of misdirected learning?

You reverence Mr. Stuart's learning, criticism, and mental power; but is it possible that sound criticism can lead to false theology? I venture to predict, that after Mr. Carson's work shall be completed, the first part of which has been just published, entitled, "Examination of the

Principles of Biblical Interpretation of Ernesti, Ammon, Stuart, "and other Philologists," the claims of Moses Stuart will in those respects be much lowered. Nothing more clearly shows the necessity of such a work than the fact, that by the aid of false criticism, many modern interpreters have contrived to corrupt the Gospel, and darken the Word of God with a plausibility that deceives the generality of readers, and with a show of learning that overawes them. It is thus that Mr. Stuart's work on the Epistle to the Romans has commanded the admiration of those who would be thought learned, or averted the opposition of others who may have suspected its orthodoxy.

It is certainly no evidence of Mr. Stuart's uncommon candor when, in a passage quoted by you, he endeavors to impress his readers with a conviction that his opponents will be *sectarian and party men*. What he says on this subject you characterise as "admirable remarks;" you ought rather to have designated them as abominable artifice and dishonest dealing. Sectarianism is utterly out of the question. It is the doctrines of the Gospel, the most fundamental doctrines of the Gospel which are concerned, and not the distinctions of sects and parties. And now it turns out that you yourself are one of the party men or sectarians referred to by Mr. Stuart, though you are both of the same sect. Sectarian distinctions have nothing to do with this controversy. Mr. Stuart's works overturn the Gospel, and you know it.

Mr. Stuart lays it down as an axiom that the imputation of sin and righteousness is impossible. Where is the Christian who, after this will have the boldness to defend Mr. Stuart's work, or to affirm that to him the strongest style of censure is not applicable? Where is the Christian who will attempt even to palliate such heresies? Can any man be called a Christian who will not acknowledge that he was shapen in iniquity and conceived in sin; or who will hold up his face to affirm that in the day when the heavens and the earth shall flee away from the presence of Him that sitteth on the throne, he shall be able so to stand, exempt by the imputation of the righteousness of Christ? All refuges of lies, such as those which Mr. Stuart has substituted in its place, will then be swept away. It is worthy of particular remark, that in order to explode the doctrine of justification by the imputation of that righteousness, and to support his destructive errors, Mr. Stuart has selected the very portion of Scripture in which it is most expressly taught, and has perverted its meaning in a manner the most awful.

There has of late been much discussion in this country respecting the state of religion in America. Some maintain that it is in a flourishing condition, while others affirm that a great declension in sound doctrine has taken place. Nothing on the subject has been produced that more strongly confirms this last opinion than the astounding fact that one of the largest denominations of professed Christians there, continue to recognise Mr. Stuart as a leading instructor of their future pastors. Their lukewarm state, and little regard for the purity of the truth as it is in Jesus, is thus manifest to all. How different must their character be from the character of those Churches whom the Lord commended because they could not bear them which are evil, and hated the doctrine which he hates? This fact, connected with the little general disapprobation and abhorrence of Mr. Stuart's system which has been exhibited in that country, speaks volumes, and both invincibly prove that a Laodicean spirit of indifference to sound doctrine very extensively prevails.

On the whole, Sir, observing the style of high approbation with which Mr. Stuart's Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans has been ushered into this country, in the guilt of which you so largely participate; and when no warning voice was heard to admonish Christians of their danger, I considered it to be my duty openly and loudly to denounce his heresies, and to prove his system to be in direct opposition to the Scriptures. I held it to be proper, at the same time, to point out the heretical character of Dr. Macknight's Commentary, which unaccountably stands so high in the estimation of many. Several years ago, after publishing strictures on that work, I received a letter from Mr. Burder, the late excellent Secretary of the London Missionary Society, requesting me to send him some copies of my remarks, saying how reasonable they were, and stating that his reasons for wishing to distribute them was, that none of the missionaries went out from the Society without being furnished with that Commentary.—This he deeply regretted; and assuredly a worse book,—one more calculated to mislead and pervert them,—could not have been put into their hands. Mr. Burder found no fault with the style of my censures, although precisely of the same character with that which you condemn. It is the style which I believe to be sanctioned by the Scriptures, while I am convinced that, if, in reference to Mr. Stuart's work, I had employed a different style, it would have been contrary to what duty demanded. It is the same style that I had adopted on the Continent in opposition to the enemies of the cross of Christ in that quarter, which was highly approved of by the Christians there, and which I would humbly and thankfully remember, the Lord was graciously pleased to accompany with so many and such signal tokens of his approbation. And the good effects of this same style are apparent in the very different manner in which Mr. Stuart's works are now regarded by many. This encourages me to hope, that to whatever censures I may be exposed on the part of man, the testimony which I have borne against them has been accompanied with the blessings of my Divine Master.

I am, Sir, your obedient Servant,

ROBERT HALDANE.

*Edinburgh, June, 1830.*

---

**ART. V.** *Personal Religion an indispensable qualification for the Ministerial office, or the Minister should be a Christian.*

The comfort of the individual, the safety and advantage of the community, depend to a great extent on the qualifications of men for the offices they fill, and the callings they exercise. In no case to which it is applied, is this principle so important as in its relation to that profession which is intrusted with the cure of souls. It is perhaps equally true, that no station of responsibility is more marked by unsuitableness and insufficiency in the persons who aspire to it. The general respectability of the office, the prospect it gives of literary indulgence, or of careless indolence, in some cases the emoluments, and in others the gratification of all the dispositions which sectarianism has a tendency to produce and foster, are temptations to covet the honor of the Gospel minister, without a due respect to the gifts, which only can effectively discharge his duties. Nor is it to be forgotten, that both the objects of the

spiritual oversight, and they whose part it is to watch the overseers, and excite them to their duty, are often more negligent than they would be, if the interest were of an inferior and worldly kind.

These and similar considerations urge the necessity of cultivating correct sentiment respecting the sacred office, and commend to our judgment the regulations and provisions which almost all the churches sanction and profess to apply for the public good.

Our present aim is to illustrate a proposition which, it is believed, all admit, according to their own definition of the terms in which it is expressed. No man within the pale of nominal Christian will refuse his assent to the maxim, that a minister should be a Christian, but we are not on that account to suppose that our present task is useless or unimportant.

For our purpose, it is necessary that we affix a precise meaning to the term Christian. Whether it was originally a name assumed in honor of their master by the disciples themselves, or was a nickname imposed in reproach by their enemies, it is not very easy to determine. It is of more importance for us to know, that the word to this day bears very different significations among those who all employ it as a good name. By not a few it is bestowed on all who have been baptized, and according to them a man may believe hardly any Christian doctrine, and may practice scarcely any Christian duty, and yet be a Christian. To say in the dialect of such, that a minister ought to be a Christian, is saying nothing; and our difficulty would be, to find a minister who is not a Christian. We are not called to give any large account of the proper import of the designation. Suffice it for our purpose to say, that the man who is in truth a Christian, grounds his title to the name on his belief, and on his practice, and on the peculiar manner in which he has been brought to adopt the one, and to cultivate the other. He believes the truths peculiarly Christian, and his conduct is directed by their practical influence, and all is the effect of those internal supernatural operations which the Christian record both describes and promises.

All who allow this account of vital experimental Christianity, maintain that the possession of it is a chief requisite in the qualifications of the profitable minister of the Gospel. They admit its necessity to all men, and its special necessity to those whose work it is to inculcate and exemplify Christian faith and practice. We have not, therefore, to support or defend an affirmative in the face of direct denial. One of the chief obstacles to effective and profitable discussion on our topic, is the unquestioning, matter of course *conceditur* to our thesis. We seek not to pull down an avowed error, but to quicken an admitted speculation into a practical feeling, and our conclusion would urge, not a change in the rules of administration, but a more faithful and feeling observance of them.

In illustration of the necessity of personal piety to public office in the church, we might appeal to the divine administration in cases in which special influence was common and direct. The inspired penmen were without exception holy men of God, not only moved by the Spirit of God to present infallible communications to others, but themselves the subjects of that knowledge which is practical and saving. Thus were Moses and Samuel among them that called upon God; Paul, in whom the divine election and agency are so conspicuous, was made a Christian before he was invested with the ministry and apostleship. The



wonderful page of Christian history which records the conversion of that distinguished man, may not only be improved for the confirmation and establishment of the great cause for which he was a witness, but may be appealed to as an attestation from heaven of the truth, that the man who preaches the Gospel should himself be the subject of its power. It does not invalidate our argument, that we are not now to expect the same immediate interposition in the bestowal of office in the church. The union of gifts and grace, of authority and experience, is as desirable as ever, and is to be sought in the use of all the means which may be permanently employed in the church.

There are some facts in Scripture which may appear at first sight inconsistent with those to which we have referred, but more carefully examined, they will be found to confirm our rule in respect of its obligation and importance. The cases of Balaam and Judas, and other ungodly men, who have sustained office and performed public duty in the church while they may still excite alarm, and inculcate watchfulness, do set in the strongest light the guilt and misery of the godless, graceless minister, warning against the way of Cain, the error of Balaam, the gainsaying of Core, and the treachery of the son of perdition. We war not against any thing which is Scriptural in relation to the distinction of office in the church, the necessity of external qualifications for it, or the duty and propriety of observing instituted rules in the conveyance of it, and investiture with it. We would hail the appearance of a day which would exhibit a more careful examination, and a more strict application of all the appointments which can plead this high authority. Amid all controversies, however, this is surely an established point in divinely appointed church order, that the minister of Christ should be a man of God, and the preacher a believer, that he may declare what he has seen and heard and known.

In descending to a more minute detail of arguments, it may be mentioned as another proof of our position, that personal religion is necessary to the acquisitions which prepare for the ministry. These last, we admit in all their importance, and in nothing which we advance in behalf of the qualification, which is our special subject, do we sympathize with those who undervalue any one endowment, natural or acquired, of the Gospel minister. The history of the world and the church is confirming more and more, the usefulness of extended tuition, and preparation for the work of spiritual instruction, and ecclesiastical administration. Of such importance at the same time is the experimental knowledge of religion, that all other attainments, without it, fall short of any proper preparation for the Christian ministry. The man who pursues sacred studies without spiritual understanding, is like a blind man prosecuting the knowledge of optics or astronomy, or the man who has neither eye, nor ear, nor taste, investigating the principles of music, painting or poetry. In whatever manner we dispose of the questions respecting the original equality of mind, and the distinctions of native genius, it is undoubted that there are minds, whether it be from constitution or early acquired habit, vastly superior to others in the power of mastering particular branches of science,—they seem to possess a sense of which others are destitute. There is something analogous to this in the influence of personal experience on the studies of the candidate for the ministry. There is no doubt in his case, that the principle of the distinction is implanted, and without it the subjects about which he is versant, are not only unfelt in their proper character,

they are not known in the truth of their existence. Add to all this, that in the present instance the scholar proposes to become a teacher, and the learner an instructor.

There is the dedication of the minister to his calling which forms another step in his course, and in this too, we may discover the necessity of his being in heart a Christian. The manner of investiture with the sacred office is very solemnly conducted, and the candidate for the ministry publicly pronounces his vows and promises. It is the fashion of the time to plead for narrowing the import of these services. Our question ought to be, have they a foundation in duty and divine institution, and surely if promises are properly interposed in any case, if their tendency and influence are ever salutary, it must be here. And one of the uses made of the devotement, and the engagements which accompany it, should be to excite the care that there be a heart suitably moving to all that is said and done. Perhaps there is not an act more daring or more hardening than the empty unprincipled profession in these circumstances. "O that there were such an heart in them."

The exercise of the ministry would afford a large field for the confirmation of our principle, that the minister should be a Christian. With regard to one of the most important duties of the calling, the preaching of the gospel, the experience of the truth is essentially necessary. No gifts of knowledge or utterance can compensate for the want of it. Without it, the minister must be unacquainted with the condition of his hearers, and can know neither the state of the sinner nor the wants of the saint; and his ministrations will be unseasoned by that feeling and sympathy which give a spiritual unction to the words of him who comforts with the consolation wherewith he has been comforted of God. We find the impression of divine truth greatly increased by its being presented in connexion with the experience of the preachers. Inspiration might have communicated abstract truth in its purity, through the instrumentality of men of speculative intelligence, and the assent of our understandings would have been due to the communication; the charms which the spiritual sensations of holy men imparts to their language would have been wanting, and its fitness and moral influence considered as a mean of persuasion, must have been much impaired. One reason why men have been preferred to angels for the office of preaching, may have been the advantage which they possess as knowing all the sympathies of the men it is their work to address. Were mere intelligence and power requisite for the sacred office, Satan as an angel of light, would be immensely superior to the most knowing and gifted of mankind, and indeed the declarations and professions which a minister must make, if they are all falsehood and deceiving pretext as they must be from the mouth of an unbeliever, are truly diabolical, and liker a messenger from the father of lies, than a servant of the God of truth.

It is the minister's work also to be the mouth of the holy convocation in addressing the object of their worship. And this service might of itself be made the subject of a dissertation. There are questions connected with it of no easy solution, and in particular that which regards the manner of address and profession which should be employed, and how it should be regulated by a respect to the actual state of the Christian assembly. It is, however, palpably evident that it is a matter of great importance, that the public intercessor should himself be a real suppliant.

The error is common, either to think lightly of the importance of other ministerial duties, or to indulge low thoughts of the qualifications needful for the proper discharge of them. It were easy to shew that all the efficiency of the ministry depends much on these subsidiary exercises, and as easy to shew that the integrity and firmness necessary to one class of them, and the kindness and condescension necessary for another, require true Christian principle as their proper and permanent ground.

The principle of all goodness is essentially requisite to direct the outward conduct of a minister, and thus promote the effect of his professional labors. Disposition and conduct are of special importance in this calling, and the only security for them must be found in the fear of God.

The different measures of success which the minister may obtain, also shew the value of inward principle. If his success and reputation are great, he needs the grace of God to keep him humble; if his success is small, he requires to be furnished for the difficult duty of being contented and meeting his duties in the circumstances which are allotted to him.

There is a consideration, perhaps the most exciting of any we have yet alluded to, that the ministerial office and its duties have a peculiarly hardening influence on the natural heart of man. In every instance, privileges and professions, if not met by principles and feelings corresponding to them, are depraving and stupifying to the mind. The minister is more than any exposed to this influence, and more than any man in danger of resisting the truth and quenching the Spirit. Some have said that while the sin against the Holy Ghost is far more common than is generally believed, that of all the orders of men, the ministers of the word are in the greatest danger of falling into it. The fearful descriptions in Jude and 2 Peter refer to those in office in the church.

There is another general view of our subject which shews its relation to the best interests of men. We cannot say that the Christian minister will be always successful, nor that the graceless servant shall be always unsuccessful, but the ground of probable success is more connected with the piety of the preacher than with any thing else in qualifications which belong to the office. He that saves himself is the most likely to save them that hear him.

We might in conclusion refer to the happy influence of a genuine change on the minister. His gospel—all his labors, and all the fruits of them exhibit a most salutary improvement. The wilderness and the desert bud and blossom as the rose.

We cannot take leave of our subject without adverting to the lesson it inculcates respecting induction to the sacred office; it has a voice to those who may have to advise the student, to those who may have to invest him with the ministry, and to those whose votes select him for a pastoral care over themselves. It calls those in the office to frequent self examination. It invites the Christian minister to covet earnestly the best gifts, and to study advancement in all the spiritual attainments by which the energy of his office is promoted.—*Presbyterian Magazine.*

ART. VI. *Act of the Associate Synod in Scotland concerning the Associate Presbytery of Pennsylvania.*

MR. EDITOR—

In your 6th No. of the present Volume of the Religious Monitor, you have stated that the Associate Reformed Synod of New-York, at the late meeting of that Judicatory in the city of New-York, tendered an invitation to the Rev. Andrew Stark of that city, to take a seat with them as a corresponding member—Mr. Stark being under an act of suspension by the Associate Synod from the communion of the church, and from the exercise of all the functions of the ministerial office, for certain immoralities of conduct, which, even the most lax society professing christianity, would consider unusually gross in a professed minister of the gospel. You have expressed great surprize at the conduct of that reverend body in this particular. And I presume that a parallel to it could be found in no other religious society; nor even in civil or literary institutions. You ask for an explanation. I do not pretend to furnish one. But I have in my possession an authentic and regularly attested copy of an act of the General Associate Synod of Scotland, which may throw some light on the subject—by showing that the present step is in accordance with the early practice of that body. And that indeed some of the original component members of that body were not in circumstances very dissimilar to those of Mr. Stark. This document contains the record of important historical facts, and is worthy of being preserved in a more permanent and accessible form than that in which it at present exists in this country. It may be of use in throwing light upon the ecclesiastical history of the country, long after all the present generation have been numbered with the dead. I send you a faithful copy hoping you will give it a place in the Monitor. It is presumed that our brethren of the Associate Reformed, neither wish nor intend that their acts or their history should be kept secret. They cannot, therefore, reasonably think, and it is hoped they will not consider the publication of this document invidious.

J. P. M.

The above-mentioned act is as follows:

At Edinburgh; the thirty-first day of August, one thousand seven hundred and eighty-five years.

The Associate Synod took into consideration, an *Address* to them by the Associate Presbytery of Pennsylvania,—dated at Philadelphia on the 30th of October, 1784; which was laid before this Synod in April last, but upon which they could not then overtake any procedure;—as also an *Address* to them by the same Presbytery, dated at Pequen, on the 14th of April last, now laid before this Synod:—in both which *Addresses* they represent the great difficulties and discouragements through which they had been essaying to maintain the testimony among their hands in connection with and subordination to this Synod; particularly from the vehement opposition managed against them by their separating brethren, and the activity with which some of these were endeavoring to get them crushed altogether, and their people ensnared;—representing also, that they had published a *Narrative, Declaration and Testimony*,—for adapting the Reformation Testimony among the hands of this Synod, to the present state of matters in North America; and craving to have the judgment of this Synod concerning the same, —for strengthening their hands in so far as they may be found to have

done well, and for correcting them in so far as they may be found in any mistake: And in the list of which Addresses they crave to have a minister or ministers sent over for their assistance; as the applications to them for sermon, are more than they can well answer.

The Synod after serious deliberation upon this subject, with prayer for the Lord's countenance and direction,—did and hereby do most unanimously agree in expressing great satisfaction, and in holding it for matter of great thankfulness to the Lord; that their brethren of the said Presbytery have been enabled to proceed with much honesty, faithfulness and zeal according to their ordination vows and solemn covenant-engagements,—in maintaining the Lord's cause among their hands, against the cause of their separating brethren.

More particularly,—whereas the generality of the ministers who originally belonged to the Associate Presbytery of Pennsylvania, having been sent over to North America at different times by this Synod, viz: Messrs. James Proudfoot, Matthew Henderson, John Mason, Robert Annan, John Smith, and William Logan,—have thrown off their former connection with and subordination to this Synod, so as to be no longer a part of the same witnessing body with them; as they have formed themselves into a new state of union and church-communication with several ministers of a pretended Reformed Presbytery in Pennsylvania, belonging to the anti-government party in Scotland; also with Mr. John Roger, who had been sent over by this Synod, but had been afterwards deposed and laid under the sentence of the lesser excommunication by the Associate Presbytery of Pennsylvania for errors taught and maintained by him; and likewise with two ministers belonging to the Synod of the separating brethren in Scotland, one of whom is lying under the sentence of the higher excommunication by this Synod;—and have embodied themselves with all these ministers, in a new constitution of three Presbyteries, under what they call the Associate Reformed Synod; upon terms so loose and general as to consist with the former different principles and professions of these ministers,—while subversive of the Reformation Testimony among the hands of this Synod, and casting the door open for the grossest latitudinarianism; Therefore this Synod did and hereby do declare, that they disclaim all connection with and acknowledgment of the new constitution, and the party so constituted; and that they hold all the ministers above particularly named, in respect of their said new union and constitution, to be in a state of apostacy from the said Reformation Testimony, and their witnessing profession,—under a gross and manifest breach of their ordination vows, and solemn covenant engagements for maintaining the same.

And whereas, at a meeting of the Associate Presbytery of Pennsylvania, in June, 1782, when the aforesaid union was voted; Messrs. William Marshall, and James Clarkson, ministers and members of the said Presbytery; with James Thomson, from Pequea, Robert Hunter, from Philadelphia, and Alexander Muir, from Muddy-Creek, ruling elders and commissioners from their respective Sessions, to the said meeting of Presbytery; did protest against closing the said union, and appealed to this Synod;—and whereas, upon a refusal to let the said protest and appeal have a place in the minutes of that meeting, these ministers and elders did protest against said refusal; and that the constitution and powers of the Associate Presbytery of Pennsylvania were rightfully vested in them, as being now the only members adhering to the original constitution and covenanted principles thereof;—upon which they

immediately withdrew, and constituted themselves as the Associate Presbytery of Pennsylvania accordingly; Therefore this Synod did and hereby do acknowledge and assert;—that the said ministers and elders did well in taking the said step; as all the other members then had, by their voting the said union, cast themselves out of that Presbytery, or given up with any further existence in it, according to the original constitution and covenanted principles thereof, in connection with and subordination to this Synod. Wherefore this Synod did and hereby do assert, recognise and justify the constitution of the Associate Presbytery of Pennsylvania,—as claimed by the said protesting ministers and elders: And they acknowledge the said Mr. William Marshall and Mr. James Clarkson, with Mr. Thomas Beveridge, lately sent over by this Synod to take part with them in the Lord's work, together with the elders from their respective Sessions,—as making up the only lawful and rightly constituted Presbytery of Pennsylvania; in connection with and subordination to this Synod, and a part of the same witnessing body with them.

And though this Synod, at their meeting in Sept. 1783, did appoint a committee of their number to prepare a draft of an Address by this Synod, to all the ministers and people in North America, formerly and presently in connection with them, on both sides of the present breach, which draught has been prepared a good time ago, extending to a considerable length; yet the Synod find it impracticable for them, amidst the multiplicity of their other business, to gain time for a public reading and discussing and judging of the same; while also it might not be suitable to the confirmed state of the breach. Wherefore the Synod expect,—that their brethren of the Associate Presbytery of Pennsylvania will now satisfy themselves on that head, with the countenance and encouragement given to them by this present act.

And with regard to the Narrative, Declaration and Testimony, which has been published by that Presbytery; though some ministers of this Synod who have perused the same, do express great satisfaction with it, in the general state and tenor thereof; as what may be of singular use for supporting the truths of the gospel and reformation cause, against the errors and corruptions prevailing in that part of the world: yet as very few copies of that publication have come to this country, so that the generality of the members of this Synod have not had access to see it; the Synod can therefore form no judgment at present concerning it. But they expect,—that their brethren of said Presbytery will likewise satisfy themselves on that head, with the countenance and encouragement given to them by this present act; being all that the Synod find competent to them upon this subject.

Moreover, as the Synod reckon it their indispensable duty—and have it for matter of hearty concern,—to strengthen the hands and encourage the hearts of their brethren in the Associate Presbytery of Pennsylvania, concerning the management of the Lord's work among their hands; so they unanimously resolve to exert themselves, according to their capacity, in doing so: particularly, by such further mission for the assistance of these brethren as they can judge proper; and so soon as they can find it practicable.

And finally, the Synod do hereby express great satisfaction with the honesty and steadfastness of the people in that part of the world, who are continuing in adherence to our witnessing profession, under the inspection of the Associate Presbytery of Pennsylvania: And they ear-

nestly obtest all the ministers and people of their former concern in North Amerca, to return to their duty in connection with that Presbytery, for maintaining the Reformation cause in subordination to this Synod.

Extracted by

JAMES MORISON,  
Syn. Clk.

---

ART. VII. *Glasgow Emancipation Society.*

On Monday night, August 1st, a public meeting of the members and friends of the Glasgow Emancipation Society was held in the Rev. Dr. Heugh's Chapel, for the purpose of expressing the sentiments of the society in reference to the recent discussion on American Slavery, between the Rev. R. J. Breckinridge and Mr. George Thompson. Shortly after 7 o'clock, the place of meeting was filled with a numerous and highly respectable audience.

On the motion of the Rev. Mr. M'Tear, Robert Graham, Esq. of Whitehall, was called to the chair by acclamation. He briefly stated the object of the meeting.

The Rev. Dr. WARDLAW rose, and referring to the meeting being held on the 1st of August, as the anniversary of Slave Emancipation in the British Colonies, delivered a long and eloquent speech, from which, and other speeches, we can only extract as follows :

I bless God, Mr. Chairman, for the degree in which our cause has triumphed. But, while we do not forget our obligations to Divine Providence, neither must we overlook the human instruments employed by that providence in the attainment of the end. And this evening we have to express our obligations to one of these. It has been by the combined, earnest, persevering voice of public opinion reiterating in the ears of our government—not on the ground of mere political expediency, but on the higher and more sacred ground of moral and Christian principle—the demand for the breaking of the yoke of the oppressed, and the raising of the enslaved and degraded to the dignity of men, and to the rights and the privileges of freemen, that our cause has triumphed. We owe not a little, then to those friends of that cause, who have contributed to enlighten and enliven the public mind—to give it a just impression of wrong, and a clear perception of right—to rouse its indignation against the one—and to fix its benevolence in the resolute determination to effect the other. And amongst those to whom, on this ground, obligation ought to be felt and expressed by us, the subject of the resolution I am about to propose to you holds no inferior place. He exerted a power over the public mind at no ordinary amount. He brought up the cause in our own city, when it had long languished for want of adequate stimulation. He put new life into it; and he kept that life in vigor till the conquest was achieved. We shall not soon forget the triumphant result of his controversy, maintained in this city, hand to hand, foot to foot, with the Phalanx of the Colonial interest—headed at that time by their own chosen champion—but a champion whom, for their own sakes, I forbear to name—as I believe they are all as much ashamed of him as we could wish them to be. With the ability, the zeal, the eloquence, the energy, the steadfastness of principle,

the exhausting and indefatigable perseverance of our champion, we were more than satisfied. We expressed our satisfaction; and we expressed it not in words merely but practically. The most decided and flattering proof that can be given of satisfaction with an agent whom we have employed in one work, is to set him to another. We did so. He had done his duty so nobly in the home department of the great cause he had at heart, that, when he had achieved our object in the disenfranchisement of the slaves in our dependencies, and we looked abroad upon the world for other fields of philanthropic effort, we naturally and unanimously turned our eyes to him, believing that he who had done so well at home, would do equally well abroad.

Sir, when we began with our own colonies, we never meant to stop there. That was not the limit of our desires, or of our determinations. Our field was the world. Our object was universal freedom; the breaking of every yoke—the deliverance of the oppressed in “every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation.” And in contemplating this comprehensive object, whither was it to be expected we should first look? Whither but to America? There, there existed the greatest amount of the accursed evil whose extermination we desired; and in that country, both as Britons and as Christians, we could not but feel a special interest. This was not unwarrantable interference. It is always warrantable—it is more, it is morally incumbent—for fellow-men, if they have opportunity, to expostulate with fellow men—for fellow-Christians to expostulate with fellow-Christians—when they see evils existing, of which all the principles of justice, humanity, and religion, demand an extirpation. There are no considerations of international delicacy and etiquette that can justify connivance at sin on the part of those who have aught whatever in their power to accomplish its removal. If we fail to bring this power, whatever it may be, into operation, we become *socii criminis*, partners in the guilt. On this principle, if our American brethren saw any thing in us, which they thought, and justly thought, was an evil of sufficient magnitude to induce their kind offices for its suppression, we ought to feel obliged by their using their endeavors to stir us up to a due consideration of it, and to practical efforts for its removal. On the ground then, the broad ground of universal philanthropy, which allows no man to say, “Am I my brother’s keeper?” we look to America. On the ground of the Trans-Atlantic States owing their origin to Britain, and being kindred blood with ourselves, we looked to America. On the ground of their having derived their very slavery from us, and having had it fostered by our example, we looked to America. And when thus, in common with our brethren in the Northern and Southern Metropolis, we looked to America, and resolved on a mission of benevolence to that land, all eyes simultaneously looked to Geo. Thompson, as the man of all others most eminently fitted for the charge of the important and difficult trust. We sent him to America. We sent him, however, be it remembered, in accordance with invitations received by himself from associated friends in the same cause on that side of the Atlantic. Not that such invitation was necessary to justify his mission. It was not. He might have gone from us without any intimation of their wishes. We do not wait till the heathen send to us for missionaries. We send them uninvited. On the same principle might we have sent our Anti-Slavery missionary. But it was better, and it was providential, that, while we were resolving to send, they asked him to come. He went. He went with the



best wishes of the benevolent, and the fervent prayers of the pious. He remained in the faithful, laborious, and perilous execution of the commission entrusted to him, as long as it could be done without the actual sacrifice of life—till it would have been the insanity of hardihood to have persisted longer. He returned. We hailed his arrival. We privately and publicly testified our approbation of the course he had pursued. The present question is—are we now prepared to retract that approbation? Has the ordeal through which our friend and commissioned agent has recently passed, altered our minds, and disposed us to substitute for it a sentence of condemnation? Are we now ready to cashier him—to censure him—to send him to Coventry—to deprive him of his commission, and declare him disqualified for ever holding another, unworthy of all future service? I express my own judgment in the shortest of all monosyllables. I say, No; and the resolution which I hold in my hand, calls upon you to say No. I consider the recent controversy as having yielded only fresh ground for confidence; as having fully proved that the challenge he had issued was no empty bravado—but it was founded in conscious sincerity, in the fullest conviction of rectitude of principle—of truth, of facts, of force of argument, and of a fair prospect, not of mere victory, but of benefit to his cause. I shrink not from saying of him thus publicly, what I have said more privately in the committee, that I consider him, in this as in former controversies, as having borne himself, in every respect, creditably to his character and to his cause; to have established, to the full, his previous statements; to have successfully vindicated his Trans-Atlantic proceedings; to have justified the condemnation of the American Colonization schemes; and to have fairly fastened the guilt of slavery on the Government and people of the United States; that I consider him, in a word, as having come out of this seven-times-heated furnace unscathed—without a “hair of his head singed, or the smell of fire having passed upon him.” If this meeting are of one mind with me, they will accept the following resolution:

Resolved, That in the deliberate judgement of this meeting, the wish announced by Mr. George Thompson to meet publicly any antagonist, especially any minister of the Gospel from the United States, on the subject of American Slavery, or on any branches of that subject, was dictated by a well-founded conscientiousness of the integrity of his purpose, and assurance of the correctness of his facts; and that the recent discussion in this city, between him and the Rev. R. J. Breckinridge, of Baltimore, has left, not merely unshaken, but confirmed and augmented, their confidence in the rectitude of his principles, the purity of his motives, the propriety of his measures, the fidelity of his statements, and the straightforward honesty and undaunted intrepidity of his zeal.

It is far from being my intention, Mr. Chairman, to go through the controversy, and to comment on its various branches. Far less do I mean to give utterance to a single word disrespectful, unfriendly, or unkind, towards the reverend gentleman, who stood forward as his opponent. I give that gentleman all credit for sincerity, although I think him mistaken. I give him credit, for personal and ministerial character and respectability; and while I cannot but condemn the contumelious and sarcastic bitterness of some of his personalities, and whilst I conceive him to have failed in argument on every point that was worth contending for, yet I give him credit too for talent, and tact, and shrewdness, and great general information and ability. His failure was owing, not to any deficiency in these and other qualifications, but to the intrinsic badness of his cause. Let me add, that I give him credit too for his spirit of patriotism, by which he was induced to offer himself to the vin-

dication of his country. I can only say, and I say it, because I conceive him to possess mental qualities, and a weight of influence, such as, in a good cause, might fit him for eminent usefulness—O that that patriotism were guided by other principles! that, under the conviction that “righteousness exalteth a nation, and that sin is the reproach of any people,” and that every moment of the wilful continuance of sin is a moment of guilt and danger, he would throw the weight of his influence into the right scale, and make them tell on the true welfare of America, by making them tell on the immediate annihilation of the evil, or rather of the frightful combination of evils, in the oppression of enslaved millions—the instant removal of the accursed thing from the midst of the camp. This would be patriotism. I shall live in the hope that Mr. Breckinridge may yet see and feel it to be so; and that like another Dr. Cox, he may carry with him, from this country the full spirit of liberty, and set himself, on his return, to rescue his country from the reproach of all nations for her flagrant inconsistency, and from the gathering vengeance of offended heaven against practised and tolerated oppression.

The question before us now is whether he made out a good case against Mr. Thompson?—and to this question I again answer—for you, I hope, as well as for myself—No. I think he made out no case against him, either as to the great general principles of his cause, or as to any of the more important details or departments of the discussion. He attempted to show that the slavery of America was not chargeable on America as a nation. I, for one, was amazed at the attempt; triumphantly as I conceived Mr. Thompson to establish the charge he had brought, there did not seem to me any need for new grounds of proof. Why should Mr. B. tell us about the limited powers of Congress, and the restraints of delicacy and of honor under which even these limited powers are laid? Why tell us of the distinct legislatures, as to this and other matters, of the various States of the national confederacy; and of their incompetency to interfere with each other, or of the general Government to interfere with any of them? Why tell us of the peculiarities in the legislative enactments of the different States, and the difficulties thence arising? What is all this, and much more, to the purpose? What is all this but an admission, that on this particular point, whatever it may be in others, the federal constitution of the United States is radically and essentially bad? I must be allowed to apply this designation to any constitution that contains not within itself the power of grappling with and putting down great and flagrant iniquities. To vindicate the continuance, for one day, of the slavery and oppression of two millions and a half of immortal fellow creatures, in a country, too, boasting of its unrivalled freedom, on the ground that the constitution of the Government of that country is such as not to admit of its being interfered with, my wonder is, that any man could stand forward and tell us this, and not “blush and hang his head” to own himself an American. What are national sins, if those are not such which arise from the very constitution of a nation’s Government? For what is a nation answerable, if not for its constitution? And if that constitution is defective and wrong, where, if not with the nation, lies the sin of its not being mended—of the deficiency not being supplied—of the wrong not being rectified? If the constitution of America is confessedly such that it cannot authoritatively put forth its powers for the abolition of iniquities, and cruelties, and abominations, so flagrant and atrocious as are comprised in a system of slavery so woefully extensive

—let America—the country, the nation, the people of America—rulers and ruled, if republicans will admit the distinction—let America bear the disgrace and bear the guilt.

The proceedings of the Abolitionists in America were assailed in the course of the discussion, in no measured terms of severity. It is needless to say that, whether justly or unjustly assailed, it is not Mr. Thompson alone that is answerable for them. He followed out principles sanctioned at home. He followed out instructions received from home. I am not aware of any point in which he went beyond the terms of his commission. I speak, of course, of the great general features of his procedure. And in these, and in the minuter details, moreover, he acted in alliance with societies there, holding the same principles with ourselves. If there has been blame, then, we and they must share it with him. So far as I have yet seen, I have no objections. The question now is—have you?

To me it appears, that the question respecting the propriety or the impropriety of the measures of the Abolitionists will be found to resolve itself very much into another—into a question of principle. The principle to which I refer, is the principle of our association—the principle (to use a convenient term which has been coined for it) of immediatism. If the principle of gradual abolition be the right principle, then the measures were undoubtedly wrong—as far as possible wrong. But if we are right in our principle of immediate abolition, I see not how Mr. T. and his associates on the other side of the water could well have acted otherwise than they have done. This seems to me the turning point; and of this Mr. T.'s opponent appeared to be sensible, when he urged so repeatedly the unreasonableness—the infatuation, as he plainly thought it—of insisting upon the change being made instantly, independently of all regard to consequences. Now, Mr. Chairman, I was once a gradualist. It was in the earlier stages of our own controversy. I will not trouble you with the reasons which then satisfied my conscience. They do not satisfy it now. I now hold, and blush not to avow—notwithstanding Mr. B.'s evident astonishment that it should be held and avowed by any reasonable man—the principle of doing, and doing immediately, whatever the law of God, in spirit and in precept, demands, without regard to consequences. The most unreasonable of all principles, in my apprehension, is that which sanctions continuance in sin, and waits in anticipation of a distant day, and a position of circumstances, in which it will become right to relinquish it—right to cease from evil! My principle is simply this—abandon sin, do duty, and leave results with God. There are no imaginable circumstances in which it can be right or necessary to break the law of God, in order to avoid evil. Duty is ours; consequences his. It is a matter of principle; and when we have ascertained a principle to be right, it is not requisite that we should also ascertain before we venture to act upon it, whether it may be acted upon with safety. We, however, have found, in our experience, that it may. God has taught us this lesson; may our trans-Atlantic friends learn it, and act upon it! And if with them the evil has been sanctioned by the constitution of their country, and on this ground, compensation, to whatever amount, should be deemed equitable—Mr. B. boasted of their freedom from taxation (consistently or inconsistently with himself is not the present question,) and somewhat exultingly contrasted, in this respect, America with Britain—if heavily-taxed Britain, then, amidst all her burdens, could part with

her twenty millions for the attainment of her benevolent end, how much may not be spared for the same purpose by untaxed America!—here let them emulate us, if they will. I, for one, shall be well pleased if they follow us in everything but the ill-omened apprenticeship. I hope our experience will be a warning to them against this; and teach them to go right through with the business at once. I hold not only emancipation, but immediate emancipation, as a point of clear natural right; of right, I mean, to the slave. Experience in many instances—and even on the large scale of our own colonial transactions—has taught that the apprehensions entertained on this subject have had little or no solid foundation. Every one must have been struck with the identity of the whole strain or argument in the recent discussion, about the necessity of training and preparation; of endeavoring to satisfy owners and masters of their interest and their duty; of precautions to be taken; of instructions to be communicated; of habits to be formed; and of many other things to be done, before it could be safe, and consequently before it could be right, to emancipate. We were used to this. We had had it to satiety, to nausea; and we should have had it Mr. Chairman, to this hour, and for years and generations to come, had we not taken, firmly and determinedly, the ground of immediate, entire, and unconditional emancipation. We did this. We gained our point. And where are the anticipated horrors? And our ground has not changed. It is a matter of principle and of right still; and, therefore, we are immediatists in America, as we were in the West Indies. Mr. Thompson's mission has been called a failure. Those who think there is no success unless the end be fully attained at once, may call it so if they will; but the formation of 600 abolition societies, comprising, I believe, more than 30,000 members; the extensive infusion of the spirit of abolition into the bosoms of so many influential ministers and laymen, and of the rising youth of the colleges and seminaries of instruction, as well as into so considerable a number of the public journals—these, and other things speak a different language—tell a different tale. But I cannot enlarge here, without taking up ground that belongs to another, by whom it will be occupied with more efficiency.

There is but one other point, Mr. Chairman, to which I wish to advert. Mr. Thompson had given us, before the late discussion, very affecting, humbling, shocking details, in proof that in America, slavery was, to a sad extent, the sin of the church. Now, sir, if there was any one point on which, more than on the rest, Mr. T. was successful in establishing his statements, and clearing himself from every imputation of injustice, unfairness, and exaggeration, this was that point. The documentary evidence adduced on the last night of the controversy, contained disclosures which gave an appalling triumph. I could not but be pleased to see our friend so successfully vindicate his integrity; but oh, the satisfaction was fearfully darkened by the nature of the facts! To vindicate the ministers and churches of America, was avowed as one of Mr. B.'s principal objects. In no point did he more signally fail. The defence was feeble, inefficient and fruitless. The facts against him were overwhelming.

And here, sir, let me say, there rests an obligation, most imperative and solemn, upon the christians and christian churches of our own country. The duty is, to hasten their remonstrances to their erring brethren on the other side of the Atlantic; to rouse them to a proper sense of their sin, and of what the law of God and the Gospel of Christ

alike demand of them. Mr. B. has said, that if this subject is much meddled with, and especially, if such measures are persisted in, as those hitherto pursued, there must be a breaking of the fellowship of American and British Christians. Sir, I prize that fellowship highly; I prize it individually; I prize it collectively. But if it is a fellowship which requires to be maintained by connivance at iniquity and oppression—if it is not to be enjoyed without our entering into a compact to be silent or to be inactive on topics respecting which we feel it our incumbent and indispensable duty to “lift up our voice like a trumpet,” and show our brethren their sin—then I say, with whatever reluctance and whatever pain, let the fellowship cease! I have no conception of that sweet and delightful communion, of which the terms are, silence, and compromise, and gentle dealing with crying abominations. I have no relish for a harmony which a word uttered in behalf of oppressed and degraded suffering millions, would convert into discord, alienation, and anarchy. I desire to have no ear for that music, which would be turned to jarring and harshness, if a single chord were touched of sympathy with the unpitied bondman! By maintaining fellowship in such circumstances, and on such terms, we do double wrong. We not only “suffer sin” in our brethren; we directly encourage it. Let us rather, by faithful remonstrance, “deliver our own souls,”—wash our hands clean. If we retain fellowship without such remonstrance, we contribute in the very strongest way in our power to confirm every light impression of the evil; by renouncing it, we give declaration—strong, I admit; but not too strong—of our own impression of that evil: and such renunciation, directed by such a principle, may be the very means of rousing from the lethargy we are solicitous to disturb, and of giving the impulse we are desirous to impart.

I must have done. The resolution I have submitted to you expresses the decided conviction of my own mind. As to the sneers at our agent's not going immediately to the Southern States, it would be foolish to reply to them; as foolish as it would have been for him to have gone. I shall say no more than that such an act of insanity would have shown that we had been mistaken in our man; for, by proving him destitute of common sense, it would have proved him undeserving of our confidence and commission. We no more thought of charging him to go on his arrival in America directly to the Southern States, the seats of Trans-Atlantic slavery, than, in the case of our own colonial slavery, we thought of sending him with a commission to the planters and assembly of Jamaica, or to make an emancipation tour through the West India Islands. The one would not have been less absurd and hopeless than the other.

I conclude by saying that, in consequence of the recent discussion, George Thompson, instead of having sunk, has risen in my estimation, both as to personal character and as to official ability and trust-worthiness; and never stood higher in my regard than he does at the present moment. The resolution will be seconded, and you will then have it in your power to express your concurrence with this estimate, or your dissent from it.

The Rev. Dr. was frequently and enthusiastically cheered during the delivery of his address, and sat down amid repeated rounds of applause.

The Rev. Dr. KIDSTON seconded the resolution. He was not fond of addressing such meetings as the present, for various reasons; but on

this occasion he no sooner knew by whom he was to be preceded than he felt quite relieved. He had anticipated exactly what had occurred—namely, that the subject of the resolution would be so amply discussed as to leave nothing for him to add. He would therefore not occupy their time by entering at all upon the subject, lest the impression which had been already made, should be enfeebled by what he might advance. He would only give expression to one idea. The effect which had been produced by Mr. Thompson's lectures on slavery in this country, afforded a practical illustration of the wisdom of the Head of the Church, in appointing preaching as the great means of propagating the gospel. More had been done by Mr. Thompson's lectures than could have been effected by all the pamphlets it was possible to circulate. He would only add, that Mr. Thompson had risen greatly in his estimation in consequence of the discussion which had taken place a few weeks ago. He was particularly delighted with the last night's proceedings. It had been held out that, as a witness, Mr. Thompson was unworthy of credit relative to the working of the slave system in America, but on that night he completely proved all that he had formerly advanced, and that too on documentary evidence, furnished by Americans themselves. (Cheers.)

The resolution having been carried by acclamation, Dr. K. again came forward. He said that in a case such as the present, he thought the better way was for the audience to express their opinion by holding up their hands. The vote was then taken in this way, and the meeting, without a single dissent, acted on the suggestion.

The Rev. Dr. HUGH proposed the following resolutions, and on the conclusion of his speech was greatly cheered.

Resolved, That the Glasgow Emancipation Society, considers itself called upon to repeat its unmitigated reprobation of Slavery, as existing in the United States of America, and of that prejudice against color, which is at once a result and support of the slave system; a system which glaringly violates a great principle in the American Constitution, declaring liberty to be the inalienable right of all men; which opposes the spirit and letter of the religion of holy benevolence so extensively possessed by the American people; which is productive of an incalculable amount of crime and misery, both among the two millions of slaves and those by whom they are held in bondage; and which must constantly offend Almighty God, and expose that land to the visitations of his displeasure;—that it also repeats the expression of its cordial joy in the rapidity with which the cause of Immediate Abolition has spread, and is now spreading in America; in the peaceful, intrepid, and religious spirit which, amidst good and bad report, the American Abolitionists have been enabled to display; and in the near prospect of bloodless triumph with which Divine Providence already animates their efforts—and finally, that it resolves anew, along with its many British allies, to remonstrate with the American people in the spirit of fidelity and love, on the claims of the Negro population; to cheer the Abolitionists of America onward in their path of benevolence, until Slavery shall disappear from the American continent, and America and Britain, already united by many powerful ties, shall consistently and indissolubly unite, for the Abolition of Slavery from the face of the earth, and the promotion of the happiness of the whole human family.

The Rev. JOHN EADIE, of Cambridge-street Secession Chapel, seconded the resolution.

Dr. HUGH read several interesting extracts from letters lately received from Messrs. Lewis Tappan, and Wm. Lloyd Garrison. The announcement of the names of these philanthropists was received with enthusiastic cheering.

The Rev. D. KING moved the third resolution, which was seconded by Mr. DAVID M'LAREN.

Mr. ROBERT KETTLE proposed the fourth resolution.

Dr. HUGH again rose. At the risk of its being thought that he spoke too often, he must lay something before them, to which he did not know well how to allude. It relates to our friend Mr. Thompson. He had never been adequately remunerated for his services. He had only got what barely sustained him and his family. A few friends to the emancipation cause having taken this into consideration, they resolved to present him, not with a piece of plate, but with a pecuniary testimonial. Though only a few had yet subscribed, the sum already amounted to between £200 and £300. Their townsman, Dr. Cleland, had been presented with a testimonial of a substantial description, and though he did not wish to depreciate the Doctor's services, he must say he considered that Mr. Thompson had wrought at least as well for such a mark of esteem. He would say no more; but if they would be so good as to turn it over in their kind hearts, and communicate the result to his friend Mr. Lethem, the Treasurer to the testimonial Fund, he trusted something would be done to honour Mr. Thompson, which would, in fact, be also honoring themselves.

At the conclusion of the speeches, the venerable Chairman was thanked, and rapturously applauded by the audience, and the meeting broke up.—*London Patriot.*

---

#### ART. VIII. *Religious and Missionary Intelligence.*

ATTEMPTS AT EVANGELIZATION IN SPAIN AND IN PORTUGAL.— These two countries are now in a deplorable situation. Some troops seduced by intriguers, have proclaimed at Madrid and at Lisbon, constitutions, not accordant to the opinions, manners or wants of the south of Europe. Civil war desolates the Spanish peninsula, and Don Carlos, opposing the excess of liberty by an excess of despotism, has proclaimed, if we may believe the journals, the re-establishment of the Inquisition:— that bloody and infamous tribunal which was abolished by king Ferdinand VII. In this struggle of conflicting passions, amidst the shouts of executioners and the groans of victims, it is difficult for the Gospel to make its voice heard. Can the calls of the God of peace awaken the conscience and convert the soul, amidst war, carnage, mourning, desolation and ruins? However there is a little good along with the mass of evil, and some rays of an approaching dawn begin to enlighten the darkness which covers the Peninsula.

It is a fact generally admitted, even by the partizans of Rome, that the Spanish and Portuguese clergy have lost a great portion of their influence, especially with the middle classes of the nation. The time is gone by when the word of a priest can be enforced as the word of God; and when ignorant and tyrannical monks can rule the Peninsula with an iron rod. The eyes of the nation begin to be opened. The people have torn off the mask of these modern Pharisees, and have discovered their shameful hypocrisy; they have uncovered these whited sepulchres, and have found within a mass of dead men's bones and all uncleanness. Never, it may be safely said, will Popery recover the ground it has lost; never will Rome exert there the absolute dominion she once possessed. Possibly Don Carlos may enter Madrid, and may gradually subjugate all Spain; but even should this supposition be realized, the Spanish clergy

will never recover its ancient power; for it would be surrounded by modern opinions and modern manners. What is, is. Nothing on earth can make Spain and Portugal go back to the stupid prejudices of the sixteenth century. Thus Rome has irrevocably lost her two strongest fortresses, the two retreats in which she pretended to bid defiance to all the forces of the human mind.

Unhappily the inhabitants of the Peninsula, in leaving one extreme, have run into another; if they are no longer superstitious, they have become infidel, and while refusing to believe everything, imagine they ought not to believe anything. This result was almost inevitable; for having been instructed in a merely human religion, the religion of the priests, when they rejected this false religion, they knew of no other, and embraced scepticism. The number of infidels is immense in the Peninsula, and the responsibility of this sad state of things rests upon the Romish clergy, who have shut the door of the kingdom of Heaven against a nation that had foolishly confided to them its religious destinies.

The friends of the gospel, in France, feel that they have important duties to perform in these circumstances, and that God calls them to enter into this field of tares. They have had the New-Testament printed in the Spanish language, as well as many tracts. The distributors of these religious tracts, it is true, meet with many difficulties, and the inhabitants are not favorably situated for receiving the gospel of peace. Yet the Lord condescends to encourage christians in their arduous work, and we can already remark some fruit of their labors in this new field. An English traveller who has resided for some time at Barcelona, writes thus from that city to the Bible Society of Paris :

“ I find things here in a state which makes me think that I run no risk in providing myself with copies of the Word of God, and offering them to those who will purchase or take them. The same day that I received your letter, I sold three dozen copies of the Bible for £8 10s. sterling, and I distributed six gratuitously. In the ten days following, I found purchasers for 120 copies, and gave away 40. I cannot tell you, however, the difficulties which prevent in Spain the introduction of a single copy of the Holy Scriptures; but the goodness of God is greater than the opposition of men. Indeed I was about to send back to Marseilles 820 copies of the Bible which I had on board a vessel, owing to the impossibility of entering them, when I succeeded, in a lawful way, but secretly, in introducing them at small expense. I have on hand six hundred copies, but as I dispose of a number every day, I hope that they will soon all be in the hands of inhabitants of this city, where there is great spiritual darkness, however distinguished the inhabitants are for intelligence and natural talents.”

The journals of Spain begin to notice the labors of Bible Societies. A journal published at Madrid, called *L'Espagnol*, has lately published a long article on this subject, which has been copied into a paper in Barcelona. The writer explains the origin, aim, and efforts of Bible Societies, and closes thus :

“ Why should Spain, the discoverer and explorer of the new world, the discoverer of inoculation for the ravages of a dreadful disease, a nation which has always been distinguished for her zeal in the cause of humanity, continue to be deprived of *Bible societies*? Why should a nation eminently catholic continue to be isolated from the rest of Europe, and take no part in the magnificent enterprises of the present day? We have avowed on several occasions that liberty will never be firmly established in our country so long as its advocates regard christian faith



as incompatible with it, and do not unite religious with political influence. We will now say that the most powerful cause of the culpable enmity between the disciples of Christ and the advocates of liberal opinions, is that the youth receive, in our primary schools, too little instruction in the principles of christianity. But if Bible societies were established and multiplied, the gospel would be better understood, and that political system would be abandoned which regards the destruction of the christian faith as an advance in the progress of society. All would then be surprised to see how nearly parties are agreed, and from this harmony the constant progress of improvement might be expected."

A Spanish gentleman communicating the journal from which the above article is taken, to the Evangelical Society, adds what follows:

"The publication of this article in the Spanish journals is a remarkable fact. If the bitter contest which devours unhappy Spain shall terminate, I have no doubt that the rapid propagation of the Holy Scriptures will be the consequence, and the blessed influence of evangelical truth will take the place of that fanatical delusion which, under the name of religion, has caused the most deplorable excesses."

A French christian distributed many tracts in 1834 and 1835, on the frontiers of Spain. He writes recently:

"All the people press around me to receive tracts, which gives me opportunity to preach the gospel on horseback. This is my pulpit. I always carry tracts, and yet I regret to be obliged to say continually, 'I have no more.' I gave a New Testament to an officer of the customs whom I met, and who was well acquainted with the tracts. I asked him if his comrades would let me pass the frontier, or if I must get permission. 'Sir,' he replied, 'the books you gave me, last year, are carefully cherished in this country; you have only to say that you are the person who distributed them and you may pass anywhere.'"

The intercourse between France and Portugal is not so easy, and the duty of evangelizing this portion of the world belongs to English christians rather than to us. However, some of our friends of French Switzerland are settled in that country and labor there according to their means for the advancement of the kingdom of Christ. I have before me a letter containing the following information respecting Portugal:

"The chains which bind this enslaved nation to popish despotism are broken. The abolition of convents has been not only decreed, but put in execution; a good part of these institutions are transformed into charitable establishments, or schools designed to afford instruction to the people. The revenues of Portugal have at last ceased to go to the Vatican. The harvest is great; it is probably not yet ripe; yet the Lord begins to prepare the way. We can hardly form an idea of the profound ignorance and superstition in which the priests have hitherto held the lower classes, and yet it is to the poor that the gospel is to be preached. The schools which have been established similar to those in France are flourishing. Our friends \*\*\* and \*\*\* take a lively interest in them, worthy of the imitation even of christians. They do not complain of fatigue or weariness, but are pleased with their work. How much more, if they were influenced by love to God and his gospel? This is what is wanting in all their philanthropic enterprises. The other day on entering one of the Sunday schools, we met there the empress, (widow of Don Pedro) who often visits them. It was apparent, by the attention she paid, how much value she attached to this work. Some popular works, and small tracts for children are now in a course of translation in Portugal. Application has been already made abroad to obtain

Testaments in the Portuguese language. But whether their introduction into the country will be allowed, experience has not yet shown. Another melioration which has been effected in Lisbon, and is owing to the new government, is the abolition of street-begging. Foreign beggars have been sent home. It is computed that 6000 came, from Galicia alone. A convent has been fitted up to receive those who from age and infirmity, are incapable of earning a subsistence, and some occupation has been sought for them."

These are small beginnings, it is true; but far from despising them, we should pray the Lord that he would deign to prepare the minds of the people by his Holy Spirit, and we shall soon see the good seed of the gospel take root in Portugal. The schools which have been established will diffuse some light, and dissipate more and more the darkness of superstition, and if copies of the Holy Bible are then distributed freely in this country we may hope that christian truth will make rapid progress. Oh! what a happy day for the church will that be when the south of Europe shall open her eyes to the light of the Sun of righteousness who brings healing in his rays! I am, &c. G. DE F.

—*N. Y. Observer.*

**PERSIA.**—It gives us pleasure to publish the following letter, which we have recently received from the Rev. Dr. Robertson:—

NEW-YORK, Oct. 29, 1836.

My dear Brother,—I send you some extracts from a letter received by me, a few weeks since, from the Rev. Mr. Perkins, Missionary of the American Board at Oormiah, in Persia. They are of a very encouraging nature, and lead to the belief that Providence is indeed opening the door widely to this very interesting portion of the great missionary field. The letter is dated 8th of February, 1836. Mr. Perkins begins with the following remarks in relation to my own mission:

"We greatly rejoice in the smiles of God upon your interesting mission. With your press you hold the main-spring of influence in Greece. May you long have the strength to wield and guide so powerful an engine." He then continues—

"A kind Providence has, at length, brought us to the place of our destination, for which, as well as for the very cheering auspices under which we commence our labors, we feel under unspeakable obligations of gratitude to God. The missionary field here is fully ripe for the harvest, among the Mahomedans, as well as among the Nestorians.

"But you may like to have me enter somewhat into particulars respecting our situation at Oormiah. We arrived here on the 20th of last November. The country is decidedly the finest I ever saw. A grand lake lies within a few miles of us, and the ancient city is surrounded by a plain, the largest and most fertile and highly cultivated that my eye has yet surveyed. We have secured a very comfortable residence in the most elevated and healthy part of the city. Our houses (my own and that of Dr. Grant) are both in one court, large and extremely pleasant and convenient. Connected with them are spacious gardens, studded with lofty shade trees, and irrigated by a beautiful stream of water. This whole situation, which is most ample, both for Dr. Grant and myself,—a large school room and rooms for a number of Nestorians, who reside in our families—we procure for the small sum of \$75 per year. By a little alteration and repair, we have made our houses about as comfortable as the best houses in America.

"But it is in the readiness of the people to receive our labor that we find the choicest sources of contentment and encouragement. We have a fine school in operation in a large basement room in my house. It already numbers about thirty young men and boys; and we have the prospect of it being soon filled to overflowing. Residing in our families we have two bishops, three priests, (the most learned in the province) and two very promising boys. One of these priests teaches our school. One of the bishops, the same who spent the last year with me at Tarecz, acts as Dr. Grant's interpreter. The other bishop and the other priests are engaged in translations, the preparation of school cards, &c. We are obliged to begin with the very elements. Not a blow had been struck when we came here. But we feel greatly encouraged by the evident desire for schools and the Scriptures. We meet with no opposition, but are fully sustained, in all our measures, by those high ecclesiastics who reside with us.

"Dr. Grant has a great deal of medical practice. He however shuts his door an hour or two per day, to teach a Mahomedan school. As we commenced our labors among the Nestorians, the Mahomedans also flocked around us clamorous for a school, and we could do no less than begin with them too, on a small scale.

"The political state of Persia is still a little unsettled. I consider, however, the circumstances quite as favorable for the introduction of Christianity into the country, as would be the case were the government firmly settled."—*Episcopal Recorder*.

**FRANCE.**—An agent of the British and Foreign Bible Society, thus writes:

"It is truly wonderful to see the great attempts which are making, from all sides, to promote the kingdom of God in France.

France is, at present, in a state of struggle and inquiry, which must, we hope, end in an acknowledgment of the Bible, as the only authority to which we can submit. I do not mean to say, by this, that all are filled with hunger and thirst after the righteousness of God, and that we have nothing to do but to satisfy the wants which are heard on every side: alas! we are not yet come so far! There are lying before us in France, immense fields, where the ground has not yet been tilled, and where the seed has consequently not yet been sown. There are thousands and hundreds of thousands, who have accidentally heard speak of a book called the Bible, but this is all they know of it.

The hour of rest and repose has not yet struck for the servants of the Lord: on the contrary, now is the time when they are required to display increased energy and perseverance."

**SPAIN AND PORTUGAL.**—"Spain and Portugal," says the annual report of the British and Foreign Bible Society, "have occupied, during the past year, much of the anxious attention of your Committee. They have met with two excellent and devoted friends, who, for some time past, have been exerting themselves most assiduously to promote the objects of the Society in Spain. They have visited the metropolis of the country—sought and obtained interviews with several persons of influence—and, in the face of the most formidable discouragements, have persevered in endeavors to rouse attention to the subject of distributing the Holy Scriptures, and though hitherto their zeal has met with little else but disappointment, owing to the present unhappy state

of the country, your Committee indulge the hope that their self-denying labors will prove not to have been in vain.

To the troops which went from this country to Spain, grants of the Scriptures, in English, Spanish, Dutch, German, and Catalan, were made, as far as opportunity offered.

There is now no legal impediment to the introduction of the sacred volume into Portugal. The difficulties which present themselves there, arise chiefly from other causes. Consignments, to the extent of 652 Bibles, 250 Select Books, and 460 Testaments, have been made to Oporto and Lisbon: at each of which places a correspondence has been opened, with gentlemen who appear to have the interests of the Society much at heart.

**GREECE.**—Unfriendly persons among the Greeks, are taking great pains to awaken jealousy of the Protestant missions and opposition to them, and not without some present success. In several of the Islands, there is a no small degree of fanatical superstition, which is condemned by the more intelligent and enlightened of the people.

**BROOSA.**—The state of feeling and the conduct of the Armenians at Broosa, towards the mission at that place is strongly in contrast with what is experienced at Constantinople. The opposition is owing to the influence of the acting bishop of the place. The Greeks partake of the unfriendly feeling, the slanderous tracts against American missionaries, which have been circulated in Greece, having been extensively circulated also in Asia Minor.—*Miss. Herald.*

**DEPARTURE OF MISSIONARIES.**—The following reinforcement of Missionaries are expected to set forth for their respective fields of labor before the close of the present year.

1. A company for South India, to embark for Madras in the ship *Saracen* on Monday, Nov. 21st. The company consists of six clergymen, one physician, and their wives. They are all to be in Boston, by the 15th.

2. A company for the Sandwich Islands, to embark at Boston on Monday, December 5th. The contracts for the passage are made, but the ship is not yet engaged. This company consists of four ordained missionaries, (one of them a physician) one physician not ordained, ten lay teachers, and their wives, and two unmarried female teachers. All to be in Boston by Wednesday, Nov. 20th.

3. A missionary and lay teacher, with their wives, destined to the Nestorians, and a missionary and wife destined to the Greek Island of Scio. Passage not yet engaged, but they are expected to embark about the middle of December.

4. A missionary and wife, destined to South Africa, and expected to embark about the same time.

5. Two male and two female teachers, destined to the Choctaws west of the Mississippi, are expected to take their departure from the 1st to the 15th of December; probably from New-York by water, for New-Orleans.

The Rev. David White and wife, and Mr. Benjamin Van Rensselaer James, a colored missionary printer, sailed from Baltimore for Cape Palmas, in brig, *Niobe*, on Monday Oct. 30th. An Episcopal missionary sailed in same vessel.—*Bos. Rec.*

**METHODIST STATISTICS.**—The entire amount of members in the Wesleyan Methodist societies throughout the world, and of travelling preachers employed in their service, is as follows :

In Great Britain,.....	293,132
Ireland,.....	26,434
Foreign stations,.....	61,803
Canada,.....	16,092
United States of America,.....	652,538

Total number throughout the world,.....	1,049,989
---	-----------

*Number of Travelling Preachers.*

In Great Britain,.....	998
Ireland,.....	158
Foreign stations,.....	285
United States of America,.....	2,758
Canada,.....	74

Total number throughout the world,.....	4,273
---	-------

Besides these there is in England and the United States a large body of local preachers, men of capacity, piety, and zeal, who perform eminent service to the church. Their number has not yet been precisely ascertained.—*N. Y. Observer.*

**ART. IX.** *Proceedings of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, May, 1836.*

From a Scotch paper containing a report of the Proceedings of the above judicatory, we learn that much of their time was occupied in deciding causes connected with the subject of *Patronage*. That evil which was one of the chief causes of the Secession, it seems, still exists to the great grief of many godly people in the Church of Scotland. The act of Assembly of 1834, called the *veto* act, has not answered the purpose for which it was intended. That act gave to the congregation desiring a pastor a *veto* on the presentation made by the patron. That *veto*, however, was not absolute ; it only amounted to this, that the congregation might bring their objections against the presentee, if they had any, before the Presbytery ; which court was to decide on their validity. And the presentee being a licentiate of the Church of Scotland and in good standing, it is easy to see that there must be a difficulty in the way of sustaining the objections which a congregation would be likely to bring forward. Hence the *veto* has been of little service to reclaiming congregations—it can afford such but little relief. From the complexion of the debates on this subject, it appears evident that it will be some time yet before that body will establish the right of “popular election,” or allow the people to elect their own pastors. On a point which embraced the principle of popular election the vote stood 90 to 190. The subject, however, of popular election is exciting considerable interest at present, is gaining ground, and must ultimately triumph. Had we room we should be pleased to lay before our readers some of the debates which related to this matter ; but we must content ourselves at present with publishing the Assembly’s proceedings in relation to the

Old Light Burghers, the Synod of Ulster, and Presbyterian churches in England.—ED. REL. MON.

“UNION WITH SECEDERS, [OLD LIGHT BURGHERS.]

“Dr. P. MACFARLAN reported from the committee on this subject, that they had met with a committee of the Seceders, and after conferring on a variety of topics, they were happy to find that for the most part the two bodies were agreed on all points of doctrine and discipline. There were two points, however, on which farther information was considered by the committee—the one was, the obligation of covenants, and the other, the law of patronage. The report, therefore, recommended that the committee should be re-appointed to obtain farther and more definite information on these points, and report to the next Assembly, with a view to enter into a union on terms equally honorable to both parties.

Dr. P. MACFARLAN stated in explanation, that on many points, and those of essential importance, the committee of the Seceders, and themselves, were unanimous in opinion. The course of education required by the Synod, and the trials prescribed for students and ministers, were of the most satisfactory description. With regard to the points on which farther information was desired, he might state that the first, respecting the obligation of covenants, was fully stated in their letter to the Assembly last year, and with regard to the second, from personal conversation with several individuals of that body, he could say that in uniting with the Church, they would never think of refusing to submit to the laws of the Church and State on that matter, as long as they existed, reserving to themselves the right of expressing their opinion fully and freely upon the subject.

Dr. COOK begged to state, that by consenting to this report he was not to be held as pledged to any of the measures which had been detailed.

Dr. THOMSON then moved that the committee be appointed, with some additions, which was agreed to, after some remarks from Mr. Mackenzie of Comrie, to the effect that the Church ought not to wait till other bodies proposed to unite with her; but that as she was the author of the schism, she ought to be the first to seek a reconciliation.

SYNOD OF ULSTER.

Principal DEWAR then brought up the report on the Synod of Ulster, which stated that, after enquiry, they found that the Synod required an unreserved subscription to the Westminster Confession of Faith from all its members. The committee recommended that the Church of Scotland should hold ministerial communion with any member of the Synod of Ulster who produced a certificate stating that he had signed the Confession of Faith. Principal Dewar concluded by moving that the report be approved of, which motion was seconded by Dr. Cook, and unanimously agreed to.

The MODERATOR then addressed the deputation from the Synod of Ulster, which was in the House, expressive of the pleasure of the Assembly at receiving the Synod of Ulster into the communion.

Dr. COOKE of Belfast then addressed the Assembly in name of the deputation, and gave a very cheering account of the progress of Presbyterianism in Ireland. Every year they were adding on an average ten congregations to their number; and in this increase of the Church, it was satisfactory for him to say, that the Government of the country had gone hand in hand with them, and so soon as they made out a case

of the necessities of the people, the various Governments had always come forward and bestowed at once a permanent endowment. It was a remarkable fact, that in the extensive district to which their operations were directed, only three regiments of soldiers were necessary; for, as a Bible-reading province, they carried with them not only the Bible and Catechisms, but a large portion of Scottish industry and perseverance; and the consequence had been, that their rocks and bogs were now waving with the promise of an abundant harvest. The number of Irish Presbyterian schools was about forty, and they wanted nothing but money to increase these schools indefinitely. The Rev. Doctor concluded a speech of great eloquence, by returning thanks to the General Assembly for the recognition they had made of his brethren and himself as a branch of the Church.

**PRESBYTERIAN CHURCHES IN ENGLAND.**

Dr. DUNCAN, of Ruthwell, gave in the report of the committee on this subject, which recommended that the Presbyteries in England, having formed a Synod, in accordance with the recommendation of the Assembly of last year, the Assembly should recognise the said Synod as a branch of the Church; and farther, that in some way the Synod should be represented in the Assembly, so that their representatives should form a constituent part of that House.

The PROCURATOR moved that the Assembly should, in terms of the motion of last year, in respect of the resolutions adopted by the Synod, recognise the Synod as a branch of the Church, in so far as to receive their ministers into communion with the Church; which motion was seconded by Principal Dewar.

Captain GORDON moved that the recommendations contained in the report, including that as to the Synod being represented in the Assembly, be approved of, and a committee appointed to report thereon on Monday.

Considerable discussion took place on this last motion, and it appearing to be nearly the unanimous opinion of the Assembly that the Procurator's motion should be adopted, Mr. Colquhoun advised Captain Gordon to withdraw his motion, to which, after some conversation, he consented, when the motion of the Procurator was unanimously agreed to, with the following addition by Mr. Dunlop, "That the Assembly farther declare, that they will gladly receive from the said Synod, and make to them, as occasion may require, communications regarding the well-being of their churches, and the progress of the Gospel amongst them; and will further aid them with their counsel in matters wherein their advice may be required."

---

**ART. X. *Miscellany.***

**DANCING.**—The following plea for dancing is plausibly and ingeniously written, and as it expresses the opinions of many, especially in our large cities, who profess religion, we insert it for the purpose of expressing our own views on the subject.

"A subscriber will feel thankful to the Editor of the Presbyterian, if he will publish the inclosed—and will be also thankful, if there be heresy contained therein, to see it exposed by the Editor or any other person.

“There is much value in the science or art of dancing, if it could be separated from the evils which attend it; it seems necessary to a perfect system of education, which should neglect neither the body nor mind. It is so intimately connected with music, that although now, chiefly because of the disapprobation of Christians, we have music without dancing, there never was dancing without music. This connexion is often illustrated, by the circumstance of persons finding themselves almost irresistibly inclined to accompany with dancing certain strains of music. If poetry and music are “sister arts,” it must not be forgotten that the muse of dancing was sister to both. The beautiful conception of the ‘music of the spheres’ was formed by one who felt this connexion. The science of motion has been reduced to as complete a system as that of sound.

“It has been objected to dancing, that it is a desecration of that which was formerly a religious exercise. It was just as much a religious exercise as music—just as much as music *now* is—and no more. There were dances expressive of all the different sentiments which are capable of being expressed by music, even those of lofty adoration, as that of David before the ark. There is no doubt that there was once a dance to the tune of Old Hundred, which we may conceive to have been as solemn and majestic as that noble tune, and equally worthy of being employed in the worship of Almighty God. And we have many anthems, and ascriptions of praise from King David’s Psalms, which we may imagine the Jewish women to have embodied in their dances with sublime effect.

“But because dancing has been used, and may be used again, in religious worship, is that a reason why we may not express by it any innocent or amiable emotion? Then, as music has been, and will be, used in the same manner, it is equally a desecration to express a love of our country in a patriotic song, or rejoicing at a happy marriage, in a nuptial song—or our grief at the burial of our friends in a dirge.

“In all countries there have been patriotical dances, and war dances, and dances commemorative of great events,—as victories, in numerous cases mentioned in the Old Testament—and in the dance which Theseus taught to the young men of Athens, and which we are told, represented in its mazes, the labyrinth of Crete.

“There are almost no emotions which we have not heard expressed in the most forcible and often affecting manner, by music, and which may not be expressed with additional force and effect by dancing added to music. It is a beautiful and graceful art, calculated to adorn the body—and if rightly used, to ennoble and refine the mind.

“The more domestic emotions are equally capable of being thus embodied. How beautiful would be a dance at the fireside, which might express the sentiment of “Home—sweet Home.” Such “music and dancing” was, or might have been that which welcomed home the Prodigal Son, mingled with such as gave the praise to God.

“Amorous dances, as well as amorous songs are offensive to good taste, but are no necessary part of the art, and such should be excluded; as well as those used in corrupt or idolatrous worship.

“If it be asked, to what purpose is all this? what good will it do? we may humbly answer; besides the benefit, in various ways, which the rising generation will derive from the revival of the essential part of this art,—if it be *the truth*, however impertinent it may appear to some, the world will be the better for knowing it.



"If every thing be cast aside, which the hands of sin and folly have stained, even the holiest things, the very ark of God, (with reverence be it spoken,) would not escape." T. E.

We presume from the strain of the foregoing remarks, that the writer may be classed with those professing Christians, who endeavor to justify their early prepossessions in favor of an amusement, which was once a source of enjoyment to them, but in which they feel they cannot now participate without creating suspicions of their religious sincerity, in the minds of more grave and sober Christians. The question, therefore, is seriously argued, whether dancing may not be made consistent with the gravity of a Christian profession. Our correspondent has probably indicated the train of thought which has led many, who are externally connected with the household of faith, to countenance in their families this worldly amusement. To the religious aspect of the subject therefore, we are invited to direct our remarks.

The action of the human system in dancing, simply considered, is as innocent as any other voluntary motion. To bring the muscles into healthful exercise, running, leaping, or dancing, are alike harmless in a moral point of view. In admitting this we are aware, some will say we have given up the argument; for if dancing is not in itself criminal, its abuse should not be pleaded for its entire disuse among Christians. This, however, is a mistake. We speak merely of dancing as a bodily motion, and entirely disconnected from all its associations. It can easily be conceived, that a simple, harmless action may, from the uniformity of its appendages, become unadvised, inexpedient, and even criminal. In the case of dancing, we conceive this to be true. Bodily motion, healthful in itself, has been reduced to a science, and is regulated by rules which render it necessary that a plurality of persons should engage. Societies are thus collected for the simple object of amusement, and with these societies many objectionable things become inseparably associated. The advocates of dancing will perhaps interpose and say, we are not defending the abuse of the art but its innocent use. True: but where have we an example of its innocent use? where do we find it practised without abuse? In like manner it has been contended that theatrical exhibitions might be enlisted in the cause of morals, but where have we ever seen it done in fact? The theatre has always, from its earliest history, been prostituted to the cause of vice, and every attempt to reform it has been unavailing; hence it is justly condemned as an institution, which, whatever it might be under proper regulations, never has been, and as far as experience teaches, never can be brought under these regulations. This is precisely the case with dancing. It has always been productive of frivolity, thoughtlessness, and even crime. Give a religious or moral cast either to it or to theatrical exhibitions, and the fascination of both is destroyed, to those who now indulge in them. Our correspondent argues on a plausible, but not a probable hypothesis. He supposes that dancing may be so far reclaimed from abuse, as to be made the appropriate mode of expressing the innocent and amiable emotions of the heart; we on the contrary believe, that regarding human nature as it is, and that in connexion with dancing as now generally practised, there is no hope of such a reform. The abuse of the thing is inseparable from its use. But to be more specific. If professing Christians are to encourage dancing they must begin by instructing their children in the art, and then what is to be apprehended? These children in the immaturity of their youth, can and will regard it

in no other light than as an amusement, a pastime, a means of introducing them into company. Evil consequences immediately begin to unfold themselves.

1st. This easy mode of obtaining gratification without any exertion of intellect, renders them restive when called to employ and improve their minds, and causes them to regard application to study as a drudgery imposed by hard task masters. We believe this to be an invariable result, that the light amusement of the dance excites in children a distaste for mental application.

2d. It creates a taste which is not easily satisfied, and which when indulged, inevitably leads to a criminal expenditure of time, exposure of health, and dangerous associations. If children are taught to dance, opportunities must be given them for the exercise of their new faculty. They must attend the practisings, they must attend private dancing parties, they must frequent the public balls. In carrying their love for amusement to excess it is not easy to restrain them, and they might justly say to their parents, why did you suffer us to learn to dance, if you did not intend that we should indulge the appetite which you have created? In the great majority of cases but little restraint is attempted, and hence children are thrown much from under the eyes of their parents, enter into promiscuous society, form attachments which their parents would not sanction, expose their health by unseasonable dress and hours, become vain and frivolous, mispend much precious time, by converting a recreation into a very laborious business.

3d. Dancing as it now is, and as it ever must be, is extremely unfriendly to the implantation and nourishment of religious principles and feelings in the minds of the young. A stronger contrast could not be furnished than between the dancing room and the family altar, than between the frivolities necessarily connected with this amusement, and the serious inculcation of pious feeling. How impracticable would it be to gain the attention of a young person to religion either before or after a dancing party? and why this peculiar reluctance unless there be in the thing itself something unfriendly to piety? All who have experience in this matter, must admit the justness of our remark; and many parents have lamented the graceless habits of their children, when they themselves have laid the foundation of them, by making dancing a part of their education.

Thus to encourage children in dancing, operates disadvantageously on their intellectual, moral, and religious character. We speak, of course, of dancing as it is, and we cannot well speak of it in any other point of view. We can appreciate it only from its known and uniform tendencies. Our correspondent may be able in his mind, to disconnect its "essential part" from what is merely incidental, but he cannot accomplish it in practice. The world has already settled what are the uses of dancing, and it would require many Luthers to induce them to regard it in any other light. It cannot become the means of moral or religious instruction, and therefore it should be avoided by the Christian. If it were a religious ceremony under the Jewish dispensation, under the Christian, we hear of the one dance only, which cost John the Baptist his head. And now, however professing Christians may plead, that instruction in this art may be necessary to a polished education, and to obviate awkwardness and rusticity in the manners of their children, they would not justify the practice in themselves. They at once see how incongruous it would be for men and women professing godliness, to engage in an

exercise, which to say the least, was so opposed to the gravity and sobriety becoming the Christian character. With one word to Christian parents we dismiss the subject. While you make your children proficient in the art of dancing how can you complain, if to the neglect of important duties, they take every opportunity of indulging their taste and displaying their talent? While you throw them into the embrace of the world, how can you be surprized that they cast off all care for their souls? When you permit them to mingle with promiscuous society in the dance, how can you pray that they may not be led into temptation? In the training of your children you rest under fearful responsibilities, and if through your indiscretion, their souls should be lost, unmitigable will be your grief. "Conform not to the world" in its questionable practices, and "avoid even the appearance of evil," are maxims which, if deeply imprinted on every Christian's mind, would deter him from endangering himself and offspring, by countenancing the practices of a world lying in sin.—*Presbyterian*.

SLAVERY.—We give below the Resolutions of the Presbytery of Harmony, S. C., on the subject of Slavery. This is one of the *Orthodox*, or *Old Light* Presbyteries, subordinate to the General Assembly. The present Moderator of the General Assembly, Dr. John Witherpoon, is a member of it. At the same meeting at which the following resolutions were passed, others were passed in condemnation of the errors of Albert Barnes. Thus while they condemn *doctrinal heresy* they boldly advocate *practical heresy*. We do not recollect to have read any thing more strongly justifying slavery except a Message of Gov. McDuffie. We are sure that the readers of the Monitor will regard these Resolutions as impious. They fully advocate the *principle* of slavery. They teach that the relation of *master* and *slave* is a scriptural relation; whereas it is an *abuse* of a scriptural relation. *Slavery* is to the scriptural relation of master and servant, what *concubinage* is to the scriptural relation of husband and wife. Both these things are *abuses* of lawful relations and therefore sinful: and it is impossible to render them any thing else than sinful: and hence we are in favor of the immediate abolition of *slavery*, which is only a name for a particular *sin*. Mr. Madison and others have declared that the movements of the "Northern Abolitionists" would cause the people at the south to justify the *principle* of slavery, who had only before justified its *practice*. This is true. But the cause of truth and righteousness does not suffer thereby. It is only the throwing off of a *mask* and bringing men to express honestly their sentiments. Had it not been for northern abolitionism it is probable the Presbytery of Harmony would still have worn the mask. Now they have cast it aside. We rejoice that abolitionism has done so much good.—ED. REL. MONITOR.

"Whereas, sundry persons in Scotland and England, and others in the North, East and West of our country, have denounced slavery as obnoxious to the laws of God: some of whom have presented before the General Assembly of our Church, and the Congress of this nation, memorials and petitions, with the avowed object of bringing into disgrace slaveholders, and abolishing the relation of master and slave.

And whereas, from the said proceedings, and the statements, reasonings, and circumstances connected therewith, it is most manifest that those persons 'know not what they say nor whereof they affirm;' and with this ignorance discover a spirit of self-righteousness and exclusive

sanctity, while they indulge in the most reckless denunciations of their neighbor, as false in fact as they are opposed to the spirit and dictates of our holy religion.

Therefore, *Resolved*,

1. That as the Kingdom of our Lord is not of this world, his Church as such has no right to abolish, alter or affect any institution or ordinance of men political and civil merely: nor has the Church even in our midst the right to prescribe rules and dictate principles which can bind or affect the conscience with reference to slavery, and any such attempt would constitute ecclesiastical tyranny. Much less has any other church or churches or bodies of men ecclesiastical, civil, or political under Heaven, any the slightest right to interfere in the premises.

2. That slavery has existed from the days of those good old slaveholders and patriarchs, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, (who are now in the Kingdom of Heaven,) to the time when the apostle Paul sent a runaway slave home to his master Philemon and wrote a christian and fraternal epistle to this slaveholder, which we find still stands in the canons of the Scriptures; and that slavery has existed ever since the days of the apostle and does now exist.

3. That as the relative duties and obligations of master and slave are taught in the Scriptures, in the same manner as those of parent and child, and husband and wife, the existence of slavery itself is not opposed to the will of God; and whosoever has a conscience too tender to recognize this relation as lawful is 'righteous over much,' is 'wise above what is written,' and has submitted his neck to the yoke of man, sacrificed his christian liberty of conscience and leaves the infallible word of God for the fancies and doctrines of men.

4. *Resolved*, That the relation of master and slave is purely a civil relation, and in this State no person or persons can impair, abridge or alter that institution, save the Legislature or the people of South Carolina only."

---

**ANTI-SLAVERY MOVEMENTS.**—The plans and operations of the American Anti-Slavery Society have never been more extensive than at the present moment. Lewis Tappan and R. G. Williams, have met the friends of the cause in the city, and made highly interesting and important statements.

1. They have now in the field or prepared to enter, **FIFTY** agents. These are soon all to meet in New York city, to receive suggestions from Mr. Weld who has the general control of the agencies, to devise plans for occupying the country, and to receive instructions as to their fields and plans of labor.

2. Two missionaries are to be sent out to the West Indies, to ascertain facts respecting the results of British emancipation, &c.

3. Rev. Dr. Beman is to go on a mission to Europe.

4. The publications of the Society *shall* be sustained.—Now, about 12,000 of each of the monthlies are circulated.—*N. Y. Spec.*

---

**A NEW BOOK.**—*Six years in Monasteries of Italy, and two years in the Islands of the Mediteranean, and in Asia Minor*; containing a view of the manners and customs of the Popish clergy in Ireland, France, Italy, Malta, Corfu, Zante, Smyrna, &c., with anecdotes and remarks illustrating some of the peculiarities of the Roman Catholic Church, by S. J. MAHONEY, late a Capuchin Friar: New York, Hall & Voorhies,

1836. The subject of the Monasteries and Nunneries in the Papal Church has been attracting much attention in the community. Information from different sources is accumulating, throwing increasing light upon the character of these institutions. Mr. Mahoney's testimony is valuable on account of the ample opportunities for full and correct information which he possessed, being himself a devotee of the Papal Church at the time. It furnishes full corroboration of the sad state of profligacy, and corruption of the Romish clergy, and the pervading pollution of the institutions referred to.—*Ch. Intelligencer.*

---

ART. XI. Notice.

As we have been earnestly requested by some of our readers to publish intelligence respecting the progress of Abolitionism, we have, in the present No. published the proceedings of an Emancipation Society in Glasgow. These proceedings relate chiefly to the conduct of Mr. George Thompson while in this country, and also to his late debate, in Glasgow, with Rev. R. J. Breckenridge, of Baltimore. Mr. Thompson, it seems, had given a challenge to any American who might be in Europe, to discuss publicly the subject of American Slavery. Mr. Breckenridge being then in England accepted the challenge. The discussion hinged chiefly on the *character* of American slavery, not whether it be an *evil*, this both parties admitted, but whether it be a *national evil*, or *sin*; this Mr. Breckenridge denied. However flattering Mr. B's. position may be to us at the north, we cannot but think that he utterly failed in maintaining it. Slavery in this country, is most unquestionably a national sin; and on account of it the whole nation stands exposed to the just judgments of heaven.

Dr. Wardlaw's speech, delivered before the abovementioned Emancipation Society, gave Mr. Breckenridge great offence and prompted him to write a long letter to the Dr. We intend to publish this letter in our next No. that our readers may have both sides of the question before them. We shall probably make some comments on it. In the mean time we must be allowed to say, that, although we are abolitionists, in our judgment Mr. George Thompson's mission to this country has been prejudicial to our cause. There is a national feeling among us which is opposed to any interference on the part of strangers with our concerns. We do not pretend to justify this feeling altogether, but since it exists, we believe that American Abolitionists will succeed better in attaining their object, if they do their own business, without seeking or using foreign aid. We hope, therefore, that Mr. Thompson will not return to this country in the same capacity, in which he came before, although we have a high respect for his character, talents and zeal. We think the cause of abolition will succeed as well without him. We cannot but rejoice, however, to learn, that notwithstanding all the hard things that have been said of him by his enemies in this country, at home where he is well known, his character stands above suspicion.

N. B. The Review of Haldane on the Romans, which appears in the present No., is taken from the Edinburgh Presbyterian Magazine.

THE  
RELIGIOUS MONITOR,

AND

EVANGELICAL REPOSITORY.

---

JANUARY, 1837.

---

ART. I. *Brief Exposition of Important Texts.*

"This sickness is not unto death, but for the glory of God, that the Son of God might be glorified thereby. John xi. 4.  
Then said Jesus unto them plainly, Lazarus is dead." John xi. 14.

We are here told in the fourth verse, that the sickness of Lazarus was not unto death; and again, in the fourteenth verse, that he was actually dead. Commentators imagine, that the difficulty may be obviated, by supposing the meaning to be, that the sickness of Lazarus, though it would terminate in death, yet not in a death that would continue to triumph over his body, and separate between him and his friends, till time ended, and the morning of the resurrection dawned. Even this supposition does not, however, remove the apparent contradiction between the 4th and the 14th verses. The great source of difficulty appears to have been, in commentators, and readers generally, understanding the conjunction "*but*," as an adversative; that is, as expressing some opposition between what precedes, and what follows, and implying that Lazarus would not really die; that the sickness was not unto death, but for the promotion of some other purpose. "*Αλλα but*," is here, however, evidently a conditional conjunction, expressing a limitation and an inference from what precedes; and is of the same import with *except*. "This sickness is not unto death, except for, (or on account of,) the glory of God." Glassius, in his *Philologia Sacra* says, this word is used to signify *except*, and quotes in proof, Mark ix. 8, "And suddenly, when they had looked round about, they saw no man any more, save (*αλλα*, except) Jesus only." A similar use of the word, we find in the parallel passage in Mat. xvii. 8. This use of the conjunction *but*, is also common in our own language; and one of the first meanings given to it in our best dictionaries, is *except*. The motto of the christian has been said to be "none *but* Christ." "None *but* the holy shall enter heaven." Let the reader then remember the primary meaning of *but*, and all the difficulty, and apparent contradiction in these passages is done away. Jesus does not say that Lazarus would not die. On the contrary, He expressly intimates, that he would die; while, &

the same time, He declares that the sickness would not thus terminate in death, but for the promotion of the glory of God. Jesus did not permit this sickness to bring on death, in order to wound the hearts of those He loved,—to fill them with anguish, as they witnessed his dying agonies and wept over his grave. No; by this sickness and death, the glory of God was to be promoted. “This sickness is not unto death, but (except) for the glory of God, that the Son of God might be glorified thereby.”

Every passage should be read and studied, as if directed to us individually, and applied for our own direction and comfort: I may then call the reader to *Observe* 1. That the glory of God the Son, and the glory of God the Father, cannot be separated. This sickness was not unto death, but for the sake of the glory of God; in order, that the *Son of God* might, by this death be glorified. While the glory and the goodness of Jehovah were proclaimed by the resurrection of Lazarus from the dead; it is here plainly intimated, that God was thus to be glorified, through the glory that would redound to his Eternal Son, by the manifestation of his almighty power. The glory of the Son of God is as dear to the heart of the Father, as his own. And what will be the doom of those who neglect, or despise Him; or prefer any thing before Him! While those who deny the Saviour's Deity, and thus seek to rob Him of his glory, arm against themselves all the attributes of the Eternal; yet, are they less guilty, or in less deadly peril, who, professing to believe in the Saviour, yet give the throne of the heart to some detestable idol, or contemplate the dying Redeemer with indifference? Is he more excusable than the open Socinian, who, professing to seek redemption through the blood of the Lamb, yet lives on, unaffected by a sense of his mercy, and drunk with the love of the world—as careless of Christ, as indifferent to his glory, as if He possessed no excellencies to adore, no comeliness to desire, and no mercy to fire the soul with love? Such a man is not a christian. He professes to believe, but he has really no faith. It is true, the natural feelings may be excited where there is no faith; but, it is equally true, that there is no faith, where there is no feeling:—that there is no genuine godliness, where a love, an active, burning love, does not fill the heart with zeal for the Saviour's glory. The man who can preach, or read, or hear of a crucified Redeemer with indifference, has no idea of what is meant by his love, no faith in his name. He uses the words, and professes to believe the words; but he attaches no meaning to, and does not *really believe* the momentous truth, that the Lord of glory suffered for the guilty; that He, before whom the ten thousand times ten thousand, and thousands of thousands of heaven's hosts are adoring, came down from his throne to die. If he did really believe that the Son of God was smitten by the sword of justice for *his soul*, that the life of Jesus was taken on the cross for *his sins*, that the vials of wrath were poured into the Saviour's soul for his offences; it is impossible that he could remain cold, and worldly-minded, and indifferent to the divine glory, or the divine commands. The form of godliness may outwardly adorn the soul, but that soul is dead, and every moment in danger of eternal damnation. O let us examine then, whether we love, and love supremely, precious Christ. He is infinitely worthy, he deserves all our love. Can we then call heaven and earth to witness, that our great aim is to exalt our adored Redeemer? We may suffer in his cause,—we may be reproached and persecuted,—we may be

branded as bigots, as fanatics, or enthusiasts:—Can we say, no matter—only let “the Son of God be glorified thereby;” and all shall be welcome? Can we say, come joy, or sorrow; come praise, or reproach; come life, or death; only, let the glory of my Lord be great? then be “strong, and of a good courage, for the Lord thy God is with thee,” and thou “shalt in no wise lose thy reward.”

2. Let bereaved mourners think of the language of Jesus here, and bow in humble submission. The sickness which carried your beloved brother, or husband, or wife, or child, to the grave, was “not unto death” by a blind chance, or a fatal necessity; “but for the glory of God.” Let this thought calm your sorrow. God saw it to be for the best. Infinite love guided by infinite wisdom, has given you this cup to drink. Let us not, by mourning, challenge Jehovah’s dispensations, nor deny the right of government to the Most High. Yes; remember that the same gracious God, who gave his Son to die for you on the Cross, gave death a commission to strike down your friend. And remember too, that he who wept at the grave of Lazarus, still lives; still lives to sympathize with you in the hour of your sorrow; and, as you stand by the corpse, and the grave of your beloved, still says to *you* from the throne of his glory; “the sickness was not unto death, but for the glory of God.” “Thy brother shall rise again.” O look through and beyond the grave then, to the land of glory. Look up to the throne, and say, “It is the Lord; let Him do what seemeth Him good.” He is wise in his love, and the arrow of death came from the hand of mercy. It is for His glory, and that glory shall be dearer to me, than friends, and life. “Though He slay me, yet will I trust in Him”—“not my will, but thine be done.” “O thou my God, save thy servant that trusteth in thee.”

---

“Ye have heard that it hath been said, an eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth. But I say unto you, that ye resist not evil: but whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also.” (Matth. v. 38—39.)

Our Lord here reminds the Jews of the laws given by God to their fathers, and points out the false interpretation put upon them, by the Scribes, and Pharisees. There is a particular reference here to Exodus xxi. 22—25. The punishment which the law of Moses enjoined to be inflicted upon offenders, whether literally or by paying money for the maiming or damage done, was always to be decided on and inflicted by the magistrate. The Scribes and Pharisees, in opposition to this, taught the Jews, that this law authorised private revenge, and permitted private persons to take private retaliation on enemies for injuries received. This false interpretation, our Lord condemns; not the law itself, as given to the Jewish Judges for the relief of the injured.

“But I say unto you that ye resist not evil.” By evil is not here intended moral evil or sin; this, we are expressly commanded to hate, and resist. Neither is the evil of error, either in principle or practice intended here; for this too, our Lord commands us to beware of, and contend against: but by evil is intended the *evil man*; the angry and wicked opponent who has injured us, in our person, or property, or good name. The commencement of the next clause of the verse proves this:—“I say unto you that ye resist not evil; but *whosoever* shall smite thee on the right cheek, turn to *him* the other also.” In the command to turn the other cheek to the smiter,—to give the cloak to him who has taken away your coat; we are to regard the spirit, rather



than the letter of the precept; the temper of mind thus inculcated, rather than this mode of expressing it; the disposition that would make us willing rather to bear an insult, and suffer a trifling loss, than seek redress, by contending with the quarrelsome man, or embroiling ourselves in the troubles and temptations inseparable from a lawsuit. We are not, when smitten on one cheek, literally to turn the other. Our Lord himself, when struck before the High Priest, though He bore without punishing the insult, yet did not do this. The evident design of the precept is to teach us, rather to suffer an insult, than revenge it; rather submit to wrong, than seek vengeance on the injurer. This is not intended to forbid, in every instance, self-defence, when life, or property is illegally, and wickedly assailed; nor, to prevent a man from appealing, in extreme cases, to the tribunals of justice for help and redress. Still, even when this is done, we must beware of making the appeal, through a principle of revenge, or a wish thus to retaliate, and avenge ourselves on the aggressor. Sometimes I say, in the case of great danger, or great injury and loss, such a course may be lawful. But, in general, and especially in reference to personal insults, and petty injuries, let them strike; turn the other cheek; that is, seek not revenge, but patiently put up with the insult, and pass by the injury. Have you, like your Master, been unjustly smitten on the cheek; have you, like Him, been spit upon and reviled? Forgive, and try to forget it. God will wipe off that reproach, and these revilings are heard in heaven. Your enemies may ridicule you, as mean-spirited, and cowardly; your own carnal heart may tempt you to return blow for blow: but beware, let them curse, but bless thou. The Lord will requite you good for their cursing on the great day. He knows your reproach, and your shame, and your dishonor: your adversaries are all before Him. Perhaps even in this world he will plead your cause, and avenge your wrongs. Perhaps he may show you, in judgments poured out upon your injurers, that while He permitted you to be afflicted by them, He reserved wrath against their souls. Perhaps He may resent your injuries, by causing their own actions to cover them with contempt and confusion, or, by the hands and tongues of other wicked men, He may punish them for the wrongs they have inflicted on you. Perhaps He may leave *you* to suffer, and *them* to prosper, through life; and only on a judgment-day, scatter the dark cloud that hangs over you, and hush forever the reproaches with which your enemies have assailed you. No matter. Whatever the dispensations of God may be toward you, or your injurers; *your duty* is to forgive. Forgive your enemies, your God has forgiven you. Bear with their insults,—how long has the Saviour borne with you. “Father forgive them.” “Lord lay not these sins to their charge.”

---

“There is no speech nor language where their voice is not heard.” (Ps. xix. 3.)

The words “there is,” and “where,” are supplied, and the original is literally, “no speech nor language, their voice is not heard:” and yet these heavens proclaim to all nations, in a language that all can understand, the glory of God. There is a striking beauty in the brevity of the original. They have no speech nor words, yet without these, their voice is heard; “their line is gone out through all the earth, and their words to the end of the world.” They preach to all people, in their “own tongues, the wonderful works of God.” This voice of His works alone, without His voice speaking in the scriptures, can never indeed make wise unto salvation, nor teach us how we can

come with acceptance, before the Most High God: still they leave atheism and infidelity without excuse, and unite with the voice of inspiration in pronouncing their abettors "fools," whose condemnation is just. Who, but those whose "foolish heart is darkened," can contemplate these displays of almighty power unmoved? And who, without sin, can refuse to listen to the language in which they proclaim the unspeakable greatness of Him who spake, and "the heavens were made; and all the host of them by the breath of His mouth?" O with what earnestness and delight, should christians listen to this voice of Jehovah's works! works which declare the glory of Him who died to save us! "For by *Him* were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities or powers:"—"all things were made by Him; and without Him was not any thing made that was made." "He that made all things is *God*."

W. E.

---

**ART. II. *Mr. Breckenridge's Letter to Dr. Wardlaw.****To the Rev. Ralph Wardlaw, D. D., of Glasgow.*

SIR,—I observe in the *London Patriot*, of last week, an abstract of the proceedings of the Glasgow Emancipation Society, on the 1st of this month, at a public meeting held "for the purpose of expressing the sentiments of the society in reference to the recent discussion on American Slavery, between the Rev. R. J. Breckenridge and Mr. George Thompson." The greater portion of the report before me, is occupied with a speech made by you on that occasion, in proposing to the meeting the following resolution, viz., "That in the deliberate judgment of this meeting the wish announced by Mr. George Thompson, to meet publicly any antagonist, especially any minister of the gospel from the United States, on the subject of American Slavery, or on any one of the branches of that subject, was dictated by a well-founded consciousness of the integrity of his purpose, and assurance of the correctness of his facts; and that the recent discussion in this city between him and the Rev. R. J. Breckenridge, of Baltimore, has left, not merely unshaken, but confirmed and augmented their confidence in the rectitude of his principles, the purity of his motives, the propriety of his measures, the fidelity of his statements, and the straightforward honesty and undaunted intrepidity of his zeal." This motion was seconded by the venerable and respected Dr. Kidstone; whose speech on the occasion is but briefly reported. Other resolutions—some of similar import, some of a general character—were offered and seconded by Dr. Heugh, and Messrs. Eadie, King, M'Laren, and Kettle. But above all, the proceedings bear the signature of Robert Graham, of Whitehill—whose venerable name is dear to every good man.

These proceedings, Sir, have relieved me from a state of great and painful anxiety, as to the view my countrymen might take of the propriety of my taking any notice, more or less, of Mr. George Thompson. For while nothing is further from my purpose than to wound the feelings of any friend of that individual, it is necessary to say, that in America, every one who is not an abolitionist, or, in other words, ninety nine hundredths of the people, consider him, not only unworthy of credit, but unworthy of notice. At length, I have a tangible proof, by

which to make my countrymen feel, that persons of the utmost respectability, excellence, and piety, in Britain, not only concur in all the principles and proceedings, but partake of all the prejudices and ignorance of that individual, and openly defend his flagitious conduct. From this day forth, I deem myself fully acquitted on the only part of the subject which filled me with personal anxiety. For although you have not hesitated to speak in terms sufficiently disparaging of my humble efforts to defend this truth; yet as you have given no reasons for the judgment you have delivered, those who read for themselves may escape the influence even of your authority. And as you have been pleased to decide on the whole merits of the case, as well as on the merits of the parties involved in it,—I escape, of course, from the whole blame of having damaged the truth by feeble advocacy.

In this state of the case, it cannot surprise you, that I turn with delight from those who have hitherto assailed me, and address myself to you: that I avail myself of the right arising from your free and repeated use of my name, and your judgment both upon my character and acts to speak freely in return. Let us forget the miserable trifling of Mr. Robert Barnard Hall. Let us pass over poor Moses Roper, who, it is but just to say, has written the most modest and sensible attack yet made on me. Let us even be moderate, in having absolutely silenced the garrulity of Mr. Thompson, who begs off in his last note, which has just reached me, in the *Patriot* of the 17th instant. I have that to say which you have not only invited, but challenged me to utter, and to which I ask your serious regard.

I have manifested my deference to the judgment of a Christian people, by discussing at its bar, questions purely national and personal, into which, under erroneous pretexts, they had interfered in a manner the most vexatious. I believed they were in great error,—I presumed they were sincerely disposed to do good,—I knew they were really doing us, and themselves, and the world, harm;—and challenged and forced into the matter, I have discussed it on its mere merits—admitting you and your people to be all you professed to be—and only endeavoring to prove that we were not as evil as you made us out. So far as you and those whom you can influence are concerned, you have declared that you remain more firmly than ever settled in your harsh judgments of us, and your fixed purpose to follow out all your offensive courses. Nay, you plainly declare, that rather than alter a tittle of your conduct, principles, opinions, or demands on this subject, you prefer that all fellowship between us and you should terminate. That argument and conclusion, then, being complete and final, we need say no more. I am content to wait and see, whether the American people will, at your suggestion, change their national constitution: or whether, in the event of the adequate majority for that purpose not being attainable, they will, as the inference of your argument, break up the confederacy—to regain your good opinion.

There is, as I have said, quite another view of the whole case. You say in the course of your speech, "If our American brethren saw any thing in us, which they thought, and justly thought, was an evil of sufficient magnitude to induce their kind offices for its suppression, we ought to feel obliged by their using their endeavors to stir us up to a due consideration of it, and to practical efforts for its removal." And in the context you are somewhat pointed in enforcing this idea, as containing in it a great rule of duty. In general we have considered the ill-doings

of this delicate office more hurtful than its omission. In particular, it has appeared to us as a pretext liable to infinite abuse, and practically resorted to most by those who had least ground and least right to display it. But, sir, I can hardly either in faithfulness or honor, abstain any longer from its use. And the main object of this communication is, to point out, in the actual condition of considerable portions of the British empire, evils, which really are, or which your party has declared to be, of so palpable and so monstrous a description, that decency would seem to require you to repress them, or be very modest in rebuking others while they exist.

1. To come at once to the grand cause of outcry against us—the unhappy and indefensible existence of slavery, in many of the States. Will you be so good as to turn your eyes to the map of Africa, and fix them on a spot longer than half of Western Europe? At its southern extremity, find Cape Town. Then find the speech of Dr. Philip, delivered in Exeter Hall ten days after you delivered yours. In that town and neighborhood are 9,000 British slaves!! Scattered over that vast peninsula are many thousand more of British slaves!! And yet the ear of day is dull with being told that in the British empire there were no slaves; and the very speech that has elicited these remarks was made at a meeting on the anniversary devoted to a glorious fact that never occurred, namely, “Slave emancipation in the British colonies.”

2. Turn, now, I pray you, to the map of Asia, and find the vast dominions which God has lent to you there, embracing a population of one hundred and thirty millions of souls. Then look over a file of papers, and read a conversation that occurred in the Commons House of Parliament, but a short time back, between the honorable Mr. Buxton and Sir J. Hobhouse, on the subject of British slavery in India!! There you will find it admitted that “domestic slavery prevails to a great extent” in India, “especially in Bengal.” There you will find proof that no direct effort was ever made to abolish it,—and reasons urged by the government why it cannot now be abolished,—and why treaties now existing seem to render its future abolition impossible!

3. Turn your attention, next, to the Western side of the Atlantic Ocean, and see nearly a million of apprentices in the West India Islands; and then remember what you have yourself said and written on the subject of this system: and call to mind the innumerable declarations made weekly, up and down the country, by those who belong to your party, and who (at the Houdsworth Anti-Slavery Society, on the 3d of this month) denounced it “as aggravated slavery, under the delusive name of apprenticeship,” and denounce every “proposal of government” as only calculated to excite suspicion.

Do I draw an inference at all strained, when I say, that the subjects of a Monarch, whose dominions in three quarters of the globe are, by their own showing and by irrefragable proofs, covered with slaves, should deal somewhat gently with other nations, who may chance to be in the same unhappy condition? Do I say too much when I caution such people to be more guarded in boastful assertions, which are contradicted by the fact and the record of the case. Do I give needless offence, when I beg you to remember, that your Parliament is omnipotent over this subject, and is therefore responsible for all the evils which exist, either through their negligence or by their consent? Alas! sir, it is an ancient habit, to be bitter against our brother for a mote when a beam is in our own eye.

But I have more to add. We have been spoken against with great

severity for neglect of the spiritual welfare of the colored population of the United States: and you have, in an unhappy hour, said, you believed and approved these hard sayings. I have, in vain, denied; in vain, disproved them. My object, now is, to show the condition of the country, whose people bring and credit them; still keeping the line of duty indicated by your suggestion.

4. Let me beg you then to look at the condition of Lower Canada, where the Roman Catholic religion is established by treaty and by law, where annual grants of public money are made to support it, and where it has had free course, until the people are so ignorant that by statute law the grand jurors and school commissioners are allowed the privilege of making their marks instead of signing their names, and where, according to the belief of the whole universe, except papists, a system of idolatrous worship is guaranteed by the power of the British realm.

5. Then look over the votes in the Committee of Supply in the present Parliament, and you will see £8,928 "for the Roman Catholic College at Maynooth," (which is just about the sum the vilified Americans pay annually to promote the religion of Jesus Christ in Western Africa, through the Colonization Society,) and I ask you, as a Christian, to resolve the questions, which of these enterprises you deem most injurious to true religion? which you and your party have most actively opposed? and which is most under your eye and control? Heaven and earth are moved to prevent the spread of the gospel in Africa, through the Colonization Society; and not a whisper is heard to prevent the increase of idolatry in your own land, through governmental patronage.

6. But a more frightful case remains. Remember that you have above one hundred millions of heathen in your Indian possessions;—then read the noble speech of the Rev. W. Campbell, a missionary from Bengalore, delivered at Exeter Hall, at the last annual meeting of the London Missionary Society. There, Sir, you will find positive proof that the horrid system of Hindoo idolatry, in all its cruelty and corruption, is upheld, partaken of, and made a source of gain by the British authorities in India! Temples are supported by the government; priests and dancing women are paid a monthly allowance out of the public revenue; magistrates are present and aiding officially at their brutal ceremonies; military officers do their peculiar honors to the abominable thing; and British functionaries collect the wages of iniquity. And now, sir, what can the eagerness of party zeal find, in all its false allegations against us, equal to the naked deformity of these facts.

7. But pass again to another portion of your wide empire. In multitudes of publications I have seen our alleged neglect of the religious instruction of the colored population of America, made the basis of insinuations against the sincerity of our religious profession. If you will read the speech of Dr. Phillip, already alluded to, you will find the following sentence: "Boteman, a Caffre chief, and others, have been petitioning me for missionaries, by every messenger through whom they could convey to me a verbal communication, for the last twelve years, and I have not yet been able to send them one." Gracious heaven! what an account will the twenty thousand protestant ministers of Great Britain have to render for the souls of these poor Caffres, whom so many of them have forgotten, to abuse their brethren in America for neglecting a population amongst whom a larger proportion hear the gospel, than of the inhabitants of the capital of the British Empire?

Let us look at London, the seat of your wealth, power, and civilization; the abode of your Sovereign; the seat of your Parliament; the seat of a bishop, whose income would support a hundred missionaries. Listen to what the bishop says of so much of his diocese, as is contained in the metropolis. "There are," says he, "thirty-four parishes, containing above 10,000 souls each, (omitting all notice of those which contain less) and in the aggregate 1,137,000 souls: but there is church room for only 101,682—less than one-tenth of the whole! Allow one church for every 3,000 souls, and 379 churches would be required; while in fact there are but 69: or if consecrated chapels be added, only 100." That is, above 1,000,000 souls, in a single city, and that city the seat of your glory, utterly unprovided for by the nation, and the Established Church. Now if we should add what is done by dissenters of all classes, and add also the destitute of the small parishes, the result might be varied a little; but still, make the best of it you can, and you are left with more people destitute of the means of grace in London alone, than in all the United States! If you doubt these statements of the Lord Bishop of London, consult the proceedings of the last annual meeting of the City Mission; and then ponder, whether the hundreds of pounds squandered on Mr. Thompson's trip to the United States—and in printing his slanders of that country—and the additional hundreds, which I see Dr. Heugh urged the people of Glasgow to give him by way of "Testimonial Fund"—might not have been fully as well laid out in sending the gospel to the British capital?

Besides, the accusations now made your own, on the general subjects of slavery in itself considered, and neglect of the religious instruction of the natives—the remaining charges which we have been arraigned upon—may, to a certain extent, fall under the general head of severity, injustice, and deep rooted prejudice against the blacks. These things may be true, or they may be false. The statements and evidence on both sides are in reach of the public. You have vouched for their truth, and it is not now my design to show the contrary; but to show who they are that are so ready to magnify real errors, and to allege false crimes upon their neighbors.

9. Pray, sir, were you ever in Ireland? If you were, you saw a land fertile and beautiful; a people, handsome, intelligent, and active; a climate more genial than any other in so high a northern latitude; in short, every thing that should make its teeming population rich, happy, and powerful. I was there. I saw hundreds of people who had no fixed abodes, I saw the majority of the houses of the lower classes to be worse than the stables and cowhouses in England; I saw thousands in rags; hundreds naked; and hundreds more naked, except a piece of a single old garment. I looked at the third report on the expediency of a poor law for Ireland, made by order of Parliament, and I found that 2,385,000 souls are out of work, have nothing to depend on and are in distress for thirty weeks every year. It is a settled, indisputable truth, that one-third of the Irish people beg their bread two thirds of every year. And yet enormous quantities of grain and live stock, and all sorts of provision, are exported from Ireland. And yet, in defiance of all this tremendous, long-continued, and periodical suffering, there is no poor law, nor any sort of general provision by law, for the poor of that island. But there are forty-nine regiments of horse and foot, and a constabulary force of about equal magnitude—ready to stay the people's stomachs with lead at night, and steel in the morning.

This is the happy consummation of six hundred years of British authority! And how can you, Sir, look any human being in the face, and charge his country with wrong, till you have strained every effort to redress this vast hereditary guilt? Or if you fail, how can you speak, *nationally*, in the hearing of earth, or heaven, about human wrongs?

10. Look, for the last time, to the vast plains of South Africa, wet with the blood of murdered nations. Read the clear and masterly speech of Dr. Phillip, already twice referred to. "If a traveller who had visited that country twenty-five years ago, were to take his stand on the banks of the Keiskamma river, and ask what had become of the natives whom he saw there on his former visit; if he took his stand on the rocks of the Sondags river, and looked towards a country seventy miles in breadth before him, he might ask the same question; if he were to take his stand again on the Fish river, and then extend his views to Caffraria, he might ask the same question; and were he to take his stand on the Snow mountain, called Graaf Reinot, (he would have before him a country containing 40,000 square miles,) and ask where was the immense concourse he saw there twenty-five years ago; no man could tell him where they were!" Ask Lord Glenelg, his Majesty's principal Secretary for the colonies, and he will admit that the system of treachery, plunder, and butchery, by which these brave and upright savages have been wasted in exterminating oppression, constitutes perhaps the most degrading of all the chapters of the history of mankind! It is a chapter written in the tears and blood of slaughtered tribes—and is hardly yet dry upon the paper that records it for the execration of posterity! It is a chapter that had not been fully enacted when you were concocting plans and arranging agencies, by which to make illustrious the benign sway of universal freedom, justice and benevolence in your *Monarchy*—and to brand upon our *Republic* reproaches which all coming generations could not efface.

But why need I multiply particulars? When these things are set right, and you seek from us another list, we will say to you concerning your polity, in nearly all its parts, things which you will then be better able to bear. We will point out how you may establish real freedom amongst yourselves, and thereby show your acquaintance with its sacred principles; how you can make your laws just, equal, and humane, and thereby manifest in practice your devotion to principles commended for others. At present such a proceeding could only irritate; and is the more readily forborne, because it is not as an American or a Republican, but as a christian, my mission brought me to you. The assurance, too, that the party with which you act, is, in point of numbers, a very small minority of the British nation, makes me the more willing to adhere to this view of my duty. Indeed it is chiefly because your party has much of its strength in that sect to which I was more particularly sent, that it seemed clearly necessary for me to take part at all in these discussions.

I readily admit that time, patience, sacrifices, and much labor, are needful for the redress of the evils I have pointed out. I know that the present generation is not responsible in such a sense, for most of them, as past generations have been. I am convinced that multitudes of Englishmen deplore, and would gladly remove them. I am satisfied that it is by the silent influence of example, and the kind and clear exposition of general principles, rather than rude and harsh personal or national assaults, that we can do you good, in these or similar cases. And I

gladly declare my belief, that the christians of America, as such, can and ought to hold christian intercourse and sympathy with the christians of Britain—notwithstanding the British nation may be responsible in the matters alleged; and that we can and ought to do it—without perpetual vituperation and insult, even for what is true—not to say without gross perversions of the facts and merits of the case. Such, sir, are my views of the subject. I deeply regret that yours are so widely different. And I humbly beseech you to imagine the whole course of your proceedings and arguments—embracing of course the mission of Mr. Thompson, and his conduct since his return—made ours, and our case made yours; and then decide what would by this time have been the feelings of your people towards us, if we had treated you as you have treated us? I declare, in the presence of God, my firm belief, that if things go on much longer as they have progressed for the last two years, there will not be found on earth men more estranged from each other than the professors of religion in the two countries. I have already witnessed the spectacle of a part of the religious press in England, urging forward the government of the country to an intervention, if necessary, with arms, against the progress of liberty in Texas, upon the false and ignorant pretext that the government of the United States unless prevented by force, would possess itself of that country, and introduce slavery there! The people generally of America are long ago aroused to the highest pitch of indignation against your proceedings in this whole business. You have now reduced the christians of that country to a position, where, if they act with you or admit your previous statements or principles—they become, on your own showing, infamous! You may now behold in the preceding statement the posture in which all the world but yourselves have viewed you during all this terrible affair!

Was it ignorance of your real condition, or was it ignorance still more gross of ours, or was it national vanity and prejudice, or was it all these unitedly, that impelled the abolition party in Britain to pursue the course they have adopted? It is not my desire to give offence, and I will not therefore attempt to decide. Your party profess to have full and accurate information about us; though it is very odd that at your meeting, Dr. Heugh moved, and Mr. Eadie seconded, and your “very numerous and highly respectable meeting” unanimously voted, that our national constitution contained a very important principle, which is not only not in it at all, but which the very discussion you were pronouncing on *ex cathedra*, proved not to be in it! Well informed gentlemen, not to say just judges, should be more cautious. It does not become me to say that your party are ignorant of the condition of their own country; but if they knew the facts now commended to their notice, it is not easy to reconcile their singular disregard of them, with their rampant benevolence on the other side of the water; and if they were unacquainted with them, they had better stay at Jericho till their beards be grown. Upon the delicate and painful subject of national prejudice, it is difficult to speak properly at all; but especially so to gentlemen whose passion lies in surmounting all prejudice whatever. The *John Bull* newspaper is said to represent the views and feelings of the extreme High Church and Tory party; the *Record* is the reputed vehicle for Low Church sentiments; the *Patriot*, I am told, stands in the same relations to the Congregational Dissenters, embracing both Baptists and Independents, who are generally Whigs and Radicals. The *Times*,



which from its great ability, must always wield a vast influence, is considered the organ of the Independent Conservative interest. I am very likely to be mistaken; but I have tried to inform myself of your condition—and this is what I learn. Be so good Sir, as to read any editorial article in either of these papers, for the last four months, in which it was necessary to express opinions or feelings in regard to the United States, and you will at once catch my present drift. But to aid such as have neither time nor opportunity for such a review, excuse the following sample from a late number of the last-named paper:—"In short, this is just the wretched 'Colonization scheme,' to which those pious slave-owners, the Baptists, Independents, and Presbyterians of the United States have betaken themselves, as a plaster to their consciences, rank and rotten with hypocrisy; and though that holy American humbug may command a congenial support from the canting zealots of liberty and lashes, hallelujahs and horse-whippings, Bibles and brutality, missions and murders, religious revivals merging in slave auctions, and love-feasts terminating in Lynch Law," &c. &c. It is but justice to say, that I have seen equal grossness only in the *John Bull*, and in Mr. Thompson's speeches, to some of which latter, this has a most suspicious resemblance. It is my duty also to declare, which I do with sincere pleasure, that the present Foreign Secretary of the King (Lord Palmerston,) and the journals which speak the sentiments of the Government, are by far better informed, and more candid in regard to American affairs in general, than any others whose published views have come to my knowledge.

I may, in the end, be permitted to suggest, that perhaps too much has been said in relation to the existing and prospective intercourse between the churches of the two countries; and possibly too much consequence attached to it by myself, as well as others. I have uttered the sentiments of those who sent me, in their name; and endeavored to enforce them by such considerations as appeared to me just and appropriate. But I am not aware of any thing having transpired which would justify the supposition that America, or her churches, looked for any advantage which was not likely to be reciprocal, in being permitted to hold this intercourse. Still less can I conceive than any one could be justified in demanding of our churches, as conditions of it, not only adhesion to moral principles which we reject, but the procurement of political changes which are impossible. Yet, if I comprehend the drift of all British abolitionism, it stops not a whit short of this.

It was the world more than America, we sought to benefit. We had no purpose of attempting a revolution in Britain; nor did it enter into our conceptions that a revolution in America, of the most terrible extent, would be dictated to us, in terms hardly supportable. It was the benighted heathen for whose good we were laying plans; and the thought of personal advantage or honor, or enjoyment, to any portion of ourselves had never place for a moment, nor even ground for exercise; and, therefore, we must needs be proof against all discriminating threats. It is quite gratuitous for the sects in England to decline receiving our delegates, except they be Abolitionists—which many individuals and some public meetings have recommended—which the Baptists, if I am rightly informed, have virtually done—and which seems nothing beyond the compass of your argument.

Indeed, this aspect of the case is so very far from the one which the facts exhibit, that I am greatly surprised that wisdom, if not kindness,

did not prevent its presentation. For I believe no delegate who has gone from Britain to America, has been assailed, in public and in private, on any of the great evils which I have hinted in this communication, as every delegate who has come from America to Britain has been assailed on the subject of slavery. I believe, too, you would search in vain in America, for any man who had received from any sect or institution in Britain, any token of respect or esteem; while it will be equally hard to find in Britain any man amongst any sect to which any delegate from America has ever come, who is not indebted to us for all the consequence he has derived from literary and theological distinctions denied to him at home, but bestowed by the kinder or more discerning spirit of strangers!

For my own part, without intending to commit the folly of depreciating a great nation, I am obliged to say, that the thing which surprised me most in England, was the universal ignorance which prevails in regard to America; while the thing which grieved me most, was the almost equally universal prejudice against us.

You do not know us. You have little sympathy with us. You do us wrong in all your thoughts. In regard to all these points, I believe there is but one mind amongst all Americans, not being Abolitionists, who have been in England. And if you have been pleased to express the hope that I would return to America materially changed in many of my views and principles, I have only to say in reply, that so profound is my sense of the false estimate you put on every thing *national*, as between us and you, that my visit to England has opened a new source of devotion, in gratitude to God that he permitted your ancestors to persecute ours out of it. So little impression of the kind you expect, has all that I have been forced to hear in England against my country and my brethren produced, that when I return to embrace again those beloved men, I shall revere them more, as I measure them by all I have known elsewhere; and when my weary feet touch that sacred land, I shall rejoice in the very "dust and stones thereof"—as more precious than the pearls of all lands beside!

If I may not call myself your fellow-christian without offence, I can at least sign myself your fellow-sinner.

R. J. BRECKENRIDGE.

Paris, Aug. 20, 1836.

ART III. *A Protestant's Resolution, showing his reasons why he will not be a Papist.*

MR. EDITOR—

I send you from a volume of pamphlets, what is called "The Protestant's Resolution." I find no name to it, nor to a short preface to it, in the beginning of the volume: with the exception of a phrase or two, it appears to me seasonable at the present time. G.

*A Protestant's Resolution, showing his reasons why he will not be a Papist. "Be ready to give a reason of the hope that is in you." 1 Pet. iii. 15. Digested in a plain method of question and answer, that an or-*

*dinary capacity may be able to defend the Protestant Religion, against the most cunning Jesuit, or Catholic Priest.*

*Question.* How many Religions are there in the world? *Answer.* Principally four: Pagan, Jewish, Mohometan and Christian. *Q.* Of which of these religions are you? *A.* Of the Christian religion. *Q.* How many parties lay claim to the Christian religion? *A.* Two principally, the Papist and the Protestant. *Q.* Of which are you? *A.* The Protestant. *Q.* What do you understand by a Protestant? *A.* One who takes part with those who formerly protested against the errors and corruptions of the Church of Rome. *Q.* What are those errors? *A.* They are very many, I am ready to give an account of some of the principle ones. *Q.* What is the first error? *A.* In that they forbid the Bible to be read in the vulgar tongue. *Q.* What is your opinion in this thing concerning the scriptures? *A.* The scriptures were written for the use of the common people, and therefore should be translated into known tongues—that they may be read, heard, and understood by all. *Q.* How do you prove that? *A.* Because the Lord frequently commands the reading of the scriptures by the people, and solemnly charges the reading of them to the people. *Q.* Where is the command? *A.* Deut. xxxi. 11. "Thou shalt read this law before all Israel in their hearing." "Search the scriptures, for in them ye think ye have eternal life." John v. 39. Moses hath in every city them that preach him, being read in the Synagogues every Sabbath day. Act. xv. 21. "Whereby when ye read, ye may understand my knowledge in the mystery of Christ." Eph. iii. 4. "When this epistle is read among you, cause that it be read also in the church of the Leodiceans, and that ye also read the epistle from Leodicea." Col. iv. 16. "I charge you by the Lord that this epistle be read unto all the holy brethren." 1 Thess. v. 27. "Blessed is he that readeth and they that hear the words of this prophesy." Rev. i. 3. *Q.* What is the second error of the Papists? *A.* Their receiving unwritten traditions with equal respect and reverence, as we receive the holy scriptures. *Q.* Wherein lieth the evil of this opinion? *A.* In this namely, in making the traditions of men equal in dignity and authority, with the express revelation of God. *Q.* What is your opinion in this matter? *A.* That the scriptures in themselves are a full, sufficient and perfect rule. *Q.* How do you prove that? *A.* Because it contains all things that are necessary for men to believe and do, in order to eternal life. "To the law and to the testimony, if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them." Isa. viii. 20. "These are written, that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that believing, ye might have life through his name." John xx. 31. "Though we or an angel from Heaven, preach any other gospel unto you, than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed." Gal. i. 8. "And are built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself, being the chief Corner stone." Eph. ii. 20. "From a child thou has known the holy scriptures, which are able to make thee wise unto salvation through faith, that is in Christ Jesus, that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished (Margin perfected) unto all good works." 2. Tim. iii. 15. 17. *Q.* What is the third error of the Papists? *A.* That we are to believe the scriptures upon the sole authority of the church. *Q.* Wherein lieth the evil of this opinion? *A.* It lieth in this, namely, that men being liable to mistake, may lead me into errors, so that I can never be sure that what I take as my rule is indeed that right

one of God's prescribing, therefore the testimony of the church cannot be the only or the chief reason of our believing the scriptures to be the word of God. Eph. ii. 20. "Built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone." "For this cause 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 men* but as it is in truth the word of God, which effectually worketh also in you that believe." 1. Thess. ii. 13. **Q.** What then is the chief reason of our belief of the scriptures? **A.** The testimony of the spirit of God in the word itself, witnessing it to be of God. "Thy word is a lamp unto my feet, and a light unto my path." Ps. cxix. 105. "The commandment is a lamp, and the law is light." Prov. vi. 23. "The word of God is quick and powerful, and sharper than a two-edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow, and is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart." Heb. iv. 12. "We have also a more sure word of prophesy, whereunto ye do well that ye take heed, as unto a light that shineth in a dark place until the day dawn, and the day-star arise in your hearts." 11. Pet. i. 19. **Q.** What is the fourth error of the Papists? **A.** In asserting the infallibility of their Pope and Church, and that every man must submit his faith and conscience to them. **Q.** Do the Papists any where assert this? **A.** Yes: and Bellarmine in particular layeth down this position, that if the Pope commands the practice of vice and forbids virtuous actions, the church is bound to believe vice to be good, and virtues to be bad. Bel. de Pont, Rom. lib. 4. cap. 5. **Q.** What is the Protestant's belief in this matter? **A.** That there is no human supreme infallible judge in the church of God, to whom all christians are obliged to submit their faith and conscience, in all matters of religion. **Q.** How do you prove that? **A.** From three reasons? 1st. Because it is a greater authority than even the Apostles did claim. "Not for that we have dominion over your faith, but are helpers of your joy, for by faith ye stand." 2d. Because it is contrary to Christ's command, concerning trial of Doctrine. "Be ye ready always to give an answer to every man that asketh you a reason of the hope that is in you." 1 Pet. iii. 15. "Believe not every spirit, but try the spirit whether they are of God." 1 John iv. 1. 3d. Because as to matter of fact, judges and teachers have caused the people to sin in following them. "When Aaron saw it, he built an altar before it, and Aaron made proclamation, and said, to-morrow is a feast unto the Lord." Exod xxxii. 5. "And Moses returned unto the Lord and said, oh this people have sinned a great sin, and have made them gods of gold." ver. 31. "Oh my people they which lead thee, cause thee to err, and destroy the way of thy paths." Isa. iii. 12. "Do not ye after their works, for they say and do not". Math. xxii. 3. **Q.** What is the fifth error of the Papists? **A.** That the Pope is universal head of the church. **Q.** What is the Protestants belief in this matter? **A.** We deny that there is any such visible head, therefore the Pope cannot be so. **Q.** How do you prove that? **A.** Because neither our creed nor the sacred scriptures hath revealed any such thing to us. **Q.** Whom then do the Protestants affirm to be the universal head of the church? **A.** Jesus Christ, and Him only. **Q.** How do you prove that? **A.** Because the scriptures reveal it. Ps. ii. 6. "I have set my King upon my holy hill of Zion." Eph. i. 22. "And hath put all things under his feet, and gave him to be head over all things to the church." **Q.** What is the

sixth error of the Papists? *A.* That kings and emperors, and their subjects are at the Pope's disposal in general, and particularly that the persons and estates of the clergy, are not under the power of the civil magistrate. *Q.* What is the Protestants belief? *A.* 1st. That kings and emperors are not properly subjects to the Pope, nor hath the Pope any power to absolve any of their subjects from their allegiance. 2d. That even the clergy are subject to secular princes, and their bodies and estates under their government. *Q.* How do you prove that? *A.* Because they are in the number of those on whom the scriptures charge subjection. Rom. xiii. 1. "Let every soul be subject to the higher powers." Tit. iii. 1. "Put them in mind to be subject to principalities and powers, to obey magistrates." 1 Pet. ii. 13, 14, 15. "Submit yourselves to every ordinance of man, for the Lord's sake, whether it be to the king as supreme, or unto governors, as unto them that are sent by him for the punishment of evil doers, and for the praise of them that do well; for so is the will of God, that with well doing, ye might put to silence the ignorance of foolish men." *Q.* What is the seventh error of the Papists. *A.* That the Pope of Rome is next under Christ. *Q.* What say the Protestants? *A.* That he is Antichrist, because none have more marks of Antichrist than he. *Q.* How do you prove that? Because no Antichrist can do worse things than he. 2 Thess. ii. 3, 4, 9, 10. "That day shall not come, except there come a falling away first, and that man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition, who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped, so that he as God, sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God, ver. 9, even him whose coming is after the working of satan, with all power and signs, and lying wonders, ver. 10, and with all deceivableness in them that perish. Rev. xiii, throughout.

[To be continued.]

#### ART. IV. *The Christian World Unmasked.*

(Continued from page 278.)

And now, Sir, I trust, you will no more complain, that faith is destitute of proper guards: no earthly monarch need be better guarded—If any more foxes are left in your bag, pray lug them out; I must be going presently.

Doctor, you shall have another quickly; I am dragging out his heels; and here he is: but, see, how he grins at me! Sure, I do not half like his countenance. What is the matter, Reynard?

"Matter enough, master grazier! Why am I cooped in a bag, and bereft of liberty? I was born in a free country, and have a right to breathe free air. If I trick a lamb out of your fold sometimes; do not you trick a butcher too with rotten sheep? And does he not trick his customers with rotten mutton? And do not they trick the butcher often out of his money? So your tricking, like the year, goes round; and the best of you is but a fox to his neighbour. When we borrow lambs or geese, necessity compels us: we must live by our wits, or not at all. You are satisfied we have no convenience for breeding lambs or poultry; and if we had, there is reason to suspect, you would make as free with

our folds and henroosts, as we do with your's. If harmless hares cannot well escape you, neither would our lambs and poultry. Besides, an honest fox, when taken in a henroost, no more complains of dying, than your good Christian folks complain of hanging, when taken in a burglary. But this we do complain of, as a very partial thing, that some of us, a little remnant, are picked out from the rest, and have wholesome food and lodging in a stable yard, while the rest are doomed to destruction. I am bagged for a hunt, and every day must live in fear of hounds; while the smirking fox, inhabiting a kennel, lives every day in peace and plenty, like a gentleman. No reason can be given for this arbitrary choice, since all our natures are the same; and, if bad, are but as we received them nor can we make them better. We foxes often talk about morality, and like it full as well as you: but we cannot live by honesty, it proves our utter ruin, and so we practice it as little as yourselves. Oh, master grazier, if you can reconcile this partial conduct towards foxes with common equity, never quarrel with your Bible-election. We have not wronged you, as you have wronged him that made you: and we may claim far better usage from you, than you can claim from your Maker."

Why, Doctor, this fox preaches like a methodist: he must have been a curate at the Tabernacle, or some recruiting sergeant to the Countess: but he shall have a hunt to-morrow for his saucy sermon; I cannot bear the subject. Our vicar always shakes his head, when he hears of election; and the schoolmaster makes a woeful wry mouth at it. He will let his face down amazingly, and loll his tongue almost out to his navel, when the word is only casually mentioned. Indeed my stomach rises sadly at the doctrine; it is a frightful notion, exceedingly discouraging, and seemeth not consistent with common equity. What think you of it, Doctor?

Sir, I think the doctrine of election never can agree with human merit; one will be always barking at the other. Every man, who seeks to justify himself by works, will loathe the doctrine heartily, and load it lustily with most reproachful names. Yet men reject the doctrine, not for want of scripture-evidence, but for want of humbled hearts. We are not willing to be saved by *an election of grace*, till we know ourselves, and find our just desert.

A furnace is the proper school to learn this doctrine in, and there I learnt it. Nor men nor books could teach it me; for I would neither hear nor read about it. A long and rancorous war I waged with it; and when my sword was broke and both my arms were maimed, I yet maintained a sturdy fight, and was determined I would never yield; but a furnace quelled me. Large afflictions, largely wanted, gave me such experience of my evil heart, that I could peep upon *electing grace* without abhorrence; and as I learnt to *loathe* myself, I learnt to *prize* this grace. It seemeth clear, if God had mercy for me, it only could be for this gracious reason, because *he would have mercy*: Rom. ix. 18; for every day and every hour, my desert was death.

Sir, the colour rises in your face; and I shall take an hasty leave, unless your staff is laid upon the floor. The fox, I find, must have a hunt to-morrow, for the hint he dropt to-day; and the least I can expect is bastinading. I know the rancour of the human heart against this doctrine, for I have sorely felt it; and *charitably* thought that all its teachers were the devil's chaplains—Sir, I go directly, unless your staff is dropt.

Here take it, Doctor, in your own hand ; and then you may be easy but pray be very brief upon this matter, lest my choler should arise. I cannot stand a long fire upon election ground ; and if your words are very rough, you may bring on a furious handy-cuff. For your own shoulders' sake, do not lay me on too thick and hard.

Plain speech, Sir, is the best : such I give and give without bitterness. If gall should mingle with my words, it will not drop from my lips, but trickle from your heart.

I ask then, are you not a sinner ? And is not death the wages of sin ? And a very *just* wages, because appointed by a *just* God ? As a sinner then, you deserve death ; and every man that sins, deserves it also. And sinners, at the judgment day, will be condemned, not because they were decreed to be damned, but because they did revolt from God, and broke his righteous laws, and sought no hearty refuge in Christ Jesus. *The Son of man will gather out of his kingdom all them, who do iniquity, and will cast them into a furnace of fire.* Matt. xiii. 41, 42.

No sinner then can urge a claim on God ; for every one has forfeited his life. God, if he pleased, might reserve them all for destruction, as he did the fallen angels ; or he may reserve some for punishment, by leaving them to follow their own wickedness ; and be gracious unto others, by granting them repentance, faith and holiness. And in shewing mercy unto these, he does no injury to others.

If you think that God may not withhold his mercy from some, while he sheweth it to others ; or that he is *obliged* to shew it unto any, or to all, then he has no grace to give, but is a debtor unto man ; and the covenant of grace is an empty name.

When traitors are condemned to die, it often happens that the king will spare some one at least, and hang the rest. And this act of *grace* may be shewn to one or more, without a charge of *injustice* to them that are hanged. One has cause to bless his prince, while the others have no reason to complain.

And shall not the sovereign Lord of all, be allowed to act in the same manner towards his *rebellious* subjects ? Must his hands be tied up, that he cannot do what an earthly prince may justly do, shew mercy to some offenders without injuring the rest ? This is hard indeed ! But God will not be fettered by the cobweb cords, which human pride has weaved for him. He will have grace to give, and justice to inflict ; and will be glorified in both.

The provision of a Saviour makes a way for God to exercise his mercy, in consistency with justice ; but he may exercise it when and where he pleaseth.

The grace of God is called *free* ; because it is free for God to *give* to whom he pleaseth. His grace is free, just as my alms are free ; and grace is heavenly alms. Now my alms are free, because they are bestowed freely, where I like. If any could demand them justly, they would cease to be an alms, an act of grace, and prove a debt.

If men had due conceptions of the majesty and holiness of God ; and of the traitorous nature, deep malignity, and heinous guilt of sin, their mouths would soon be stopped. But men forget their *real state* of condemnation, and dreaming of a claim on God, through the fancied merit of obedience grievously worm-eaten, they quarrel with the doctrine of election. And indeed the doctrine cannot harmonize with any human claim, arising from a pure covenant of works, or from the mongrel co-

venant of faith and works, transported from Galatia into Britain, and carried by her convicts to the colonies. No; the doctrine of election is altogether built upon a *pure* covenant of grace, and shakes a friendly hand with this. - Here God may grant, or may withhold his mercy, as he pleaseth; since all are in a state of condemnation, and none can justly say unto him, *What dost thou?* This, Sir, may suffice to vindicate God's *justice* in electing grace; and his justice is well grounded upon equity: he needs no court of chancery.

Neither has this doctrine any *real* tendency to discourage sinners, when they truly seek salvation through Jesus Christ. It is not expected that any one should know himself a *chosen vessel*, before he seeks salvation; this must be known by seeking. He cannot peep into the rolls of heaven, to see if his own name be written there, nor needeth such a peep. His business layeth with the *written* word on earth, which tallies with the rolls in heaven. *Secret things belong to God; but what is revealed belongs to us, and to our children for ever.* (Deut. xxix. 29.)

Now in the written word, a *decree* of God is found, which shews, who are the chosen and the saved people; *He that believeth, and is baptised, shall be saved.* The chosen people therefore are a race of true believers, convinced by God's Spirit of their ruined state; endowed with divine faith, by which they seek to Christ for help; and seeking do obtain pardon, peace and holiness. And an experience of these blessings brings assurance of election. Thus the *written* word unfolds the secret rolls of heaven. By grace a sinner is enabled to believe; and through believing finds salvation, witnessed to his heart by the Holy Spirit.

Jesus Christ, the *bread of life*, is freely offered in the gospel to every hungry famished soul. Such are prepared for the bread, and the bread prepared for such. And these should never pore upon the doctrine of election, but muse upon the gospel promises, and call on Jesus confidently to fulfil them. He turns no real beggar from his gate, though full of sores and vermin. His heart is lined with sweet compassion, and his hands are stored with gifts. He has supplies for all wants; legs for a lame beggar, eyes for a blind one, cordials for a faint one, garments for a naked one, a fountain for a filthy one, and a rope for a sham-beggar, who asks for mercy, and yet talks of merit.

Every one, who feels the plague of his heart, may come to Jesus. He gives them all a gracious invitation, and will afford an hearty welcome. Hear his words, *Him, that cometh unto me, I will in no wise cast out;* (John vi. 37.) *in no wise!* though vile as Manasseh, filthy as Magdalen, guilty as the cross-thief, or ten times more so, Jesus will *in no wise* cast him out. Strange tidings to a pharisee!

But a weary soul, who is *sick and poor, and blind, and miserable, and naked*, should come just as he is, just as the patients in Judea did, and not stay to fit himself for a cure. This is a sorry trick of the legal heart, which wants to *purchase* favor, and take the work out of the Saviour's hands. The feeling our sickness makes us *fit* for the physician: and when we seek to him, every fancied recommendation of our own must be cast aside, like the robe of Bartimeus, else it twines about the feet, throws a sinner down, and prevents his walk to Jesus.

It is the Saviour's office, as it is his honor, and his heart's delight, to save a sinner freely; to call, and wash, and heal, and clothe, and feed a prodigal, at his own expense. He asks no recommendation, but our



misery and helplessness; and does relieve his patients now, as he relieved them in Judea, out of mere compassion. All that seek in his appointed way, will be saved graciously, and love the Saviour heartily. He makes them happy, wise and holy, and they give him all the praise. He puts the crown at last upon their head, and they return it to his feet, as a due acknowledgment, that the crown was purchased by his merit, and bestowed through his mercy. Thus Jesus will be ever glorious, ever lovely in a ransomed sinner's eyes; and eternity will seem too short, too utter half his praise.

Now, Sir, what discouragement can you find in this doctrine to make it frightful? The gospel bids *us give all diligence to make our calling and election sure.* (2 Peter i. 10.) Such, as feel their ruined state, are graciously invited to partake of mercy; and all, who seek with diligence, are assured they shall find; and when they find the peace and *love of God shed in their hearts by the Holy Ghost*, an inward evidence of their election is obtained, and by a growth in grace it is confirmed.

Thus an awakened sinner, who feels his misery, has no cause to be alarmed at the doctrine: and a sinner, fast asleep, will commonly despise it. He wants no drawings of God's Spirit; he is *wise* enough to draw himself: nor needs a shepherd's care to fetch him to the fold; he is *strong* enough to fetch himself: nor can bear the Lord should say, *I have chosen you*; he is *old* enough to choose for himself. He can *climb* into the fold by his own nimble legs, and keep himself there by his ready wit: no thanks to the shepherd. And he looks and talks so bravely, one is almost grieved to hear the shepherd say, *a climber is a thief*; (John x. 1,) and by that word condemn him to the gallows.

Sinners perish through security; and this doctrine of election brings a little friendly thunder to arouse them. They think salvation is the work of man; and presume they may repent and turn to God, just when they please, to-morrow or the next day, as well as in the present day; and so are unconcerned about it. But here they find an awful truth, *It is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that sheweth mercy*: (Rom. ix. 16.) It is therefore time to look about them, to *ask, and seek, and knock, lest the door should be shut.*

But what avails our seeking, you reply, unless we are elected? Sir, I say again, your business does not lie with the *secret rolls* of heaven, but with the *written word* on earth: and the written word declares, *Ye shall seek and find me, when ye shall search for me with all your heart.* (Jer. xxix. 13.) Whoever thinks himself an elected person, and does not seek, as God requires, with all his heart, will find himself most dreadfully confounded. And such, as seek with all their heart, yet doubt of their election, will find at length that God is their covenant God in Christ. And when by seeking, they have found him so, they will some time be made to see, that grace alone, electing grace, did give them both the *will* to seek, and the *power* to find.

None can come to Jesus, *except the Father draws them.* Yet sinners do not perish, because they *cannot* come, but because they *will not* come. Jesus says, *Ye will not come to me, that ye may have life.* (John v. 40.) Man's ruin layeth wholly in his own *perverse will.* He cannot come, because he will not: help enough is provided, were he willing: but he will not heartily accept of Jesus, as his only Prophet, Priest, and King; his heart will not submit to be *wholly* saved by grace through faith.

When the will is well subdued, and grace alone subdues it, Christ is

ready for a sinner, and the promises invite him sweetly unto Christ; *Whosoever will, let him come*; and again, *Ho, every one that thirsteth, come.* (Rev. xxii. 17. Isa. lv. 1.)

Thus salvation is of the Lord *alone*, and damnation *wholly* from ourselves. Men perish, because they *will not* come to Jesus: yet if they have a will to come, it is *God who works the will in them*: grace, electing grace, both draws the will, and keeps it steady; and to grace be all the praise—Well, Sir, any more chattering foxes in your bag?

Yes, Doctor, one more; but the last served me such a scurvy trick, I have no heart to drag this other out. It may answer full as well, to borrow Reynard's face, and play the fox myself.

Your doctrine of election, I confess, is bravely sweetened by another portion of your creed, called perseverance. If the former seems a sour pill, this is quite an honey-comb. I never heard till lately of this doctrine, and learnt it then by accident. Last midsummer I went to Gamble fair, and when the market was well over, a knot of graziers, old acquaintances, dined with me at a public house. Being seated round a table, a pert young fellow stepped into the room, who swung his hat into the window, and thrust a chair among us, to partake of the ordinary. His name, we learnt afterwards, was Mr. *Fulsome*; and his mother's maiden name was Miss *Wanton*. Mr. *Fulsome* was mighty still at dinner, and played his knife and fork exceedingly well; no man better. But when the cloth was removed, and some few tankards had gone round, Mr. *Fulsome's* face looked like the red lion, painted on my landlord's sign, and then his mouth began to open. He talked swimmingly about religion, and vapoured much in praise of perseverance. Each fresh tankard threw a fresh light on his subject, and drew out a fresh head of discourse. "No sin, he said, can hurt me. I have had a call, and my election is safe. Satan may *pound* me, if he please; but Jesus must *replevy* me. What care I for drunkenness or whoredom, for cheating or a little lying? These sins may hurt another, but they cannot hurt me. Let me wander where I will from God, Jesus Christ must fetch me back again. I may *fall* a thousand times, but I shall *rise* again; yes, I may fall exceeding *fouly*."——And so he did, Doctor; for instantly he pitched with his head upon the floor, and the tankard in his hand. The tankard was recovered; but no one thought it worth their while to lift up Mr. *Fulsome*; nor did he rise from his foul fall, according to his prophecy: we left him silent on the floor, when the shot was paid. Oh, Doctor, what must we say of such professors.

The very same, Sir, that Paul says, *Their damnation is just.* (Rom. iii. 8.) Such scandalous professors are found at all times, in our day, and Paul's day; yet he will not renounce the doctrine of perseverance, but having given these licentious men their dose, he declares a firm persuasion afterwards, that *nothing shall be able to separate true believers, from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus.* (Rom. viii. 38, 39.)

Jesus Christ, the shepherd of the flock, declares, *I give unto my sheep eternal life, and they shall never perish, neither shall any pluck them out of my hand.* (John x. 28.) Yes, he affirms, *The mountains shall depart, and the hills be removed, but my kindness shall not depart from thee, neither shall the covenant of my peace be removed, saith the Lord, who hath mercy upon thee.* (Isa. liv. 10.)

What right have you to pray for perseverance, unless it is a gift of the covenant? You may only pray for what is freely promised; and what is promised, has been purchased for believers; and being pur-

chased for them, will be surely given to them, else the purchase were in vain.

Pardon of sin is promised, *I will forgive their iniquities, and remember their sins* no more; (Jer. xxxi. 33, 34;) therefore I may ask for pardon.

Grace is promised to subdue our evil nature; *Sin shall not have dominion over you: he will subdue our iniquities*; (Rom. vi. 14.—Micah vii. 19.) therefore I may ask for sanctifying grace.

Perseverance too is promised, *I will make an everlasting covenant with them, that I will not turn away from them to do them good; but I will put my fear in their hearts, that they shall not depart from me*; (Jerem. xxxii. 40.) therefore I may ask for persevering grace, and should ask with confidence, as David did. *The Lord, he says, will perfect that which does concern me*; therefore he prays, *forsake not the works of thine own hands.* (Psalm. cxxxviii. 8.)

God's promises are the foundation for our prayers; and were designed not to make the means of grace needless, but to stir men up to a diligent use of them. A gracious heart maketh this use; but a corrupt heart turns the grace of God into wantonness, and no legal terrors would prevent it. The thunders, lightnings, and earthquakes, which shook mount Sinai, almost terrified the Israelites to death; yet a few days after, we find them brisk and jolly, setting up an idol, and dancing round it merrily. And such is human nature, almost killed with fear at an awful providence, yet laughing at that fear, when the shock is over. Nothing but the grace of God can set the heart right, and keep it steady.

(To be Continued.)

---

#### ART. V. *On Church History, and the Importance of studying it.*

While true religion is often stigmatized as something calculated to contract the human mind, and imbue it with sentiments of an illiberal kind in reference to sound principle and proper conduct, it will ever be found to exert effects of the very opposite description upon all who imbibe its spirit and act agreeably to its laws. It never fails to enlarge our conceptions of the character and works of God, our own personal interests as well as the interests of others: and it essentially includes the active employment of our lives for the glory of Him who made and redeemed us, and for the general and greatest good of men. Yet it cannot be denied that many who bear the badges of Christianity, and some whose manifest sincerity and habitual consistency of conduct, constrain us to believe that they are Christians in truth, are contracted in their views of particular subjects. But this no more proves that our holy religion does not enlarge the mind, than the other imperfections of the best, while in the present state, prove that the word of salvation is not admirably fitted "to make the man of God perfect and thoroughly furnished to every good work." They are not always the most liberal who put forth the greatest pretensions to liberality. The religion of the present day is remarkable for professions on this subject, and in many instances, it is ready to despise that of our fathers; while if subjected to a close

and candid inspection, there is reason to believe it will itself be found more contracted and selfish than what it so rashly and ignorantly pretends to censure. In the circle of your religious acquaintance, you will find persons of very marked sincerity who take much delight in speaking on spiritual subjects, and in engaging in devotional exercises; while, at the same time, they evince the greatest indifference, and even aversion to the history of the church of God,—so much so, that they seem to suspect the sincerity of the man who delights to spend a considerable portion of his time in reading, conversation, and inquiry upon the subject. The sincerity and devotion adverted to, cannot be too highly recommended and encouraged; would to God they were more general, for where these are wanting, all must be wrong; yet the religion of such is very incomplete. They evidently labour under such mistakes as prevent them from rising to that eminence and enlargement in religion which they are otherwise fitted to attain, and they shut themselves out from many sources of enjoyment to which they have access, and render their usefulness comparatively limited. For commending the knowledge of the history of the church to all, and removing mistakes which many good people labour under in reference to its importance, we request their consideration of the following statements.

There is a great deal of Church History contained in the Holy Scriptures. The main design of the Bible is to develop the plan of mercy drawn according to the manifold wisdom of God in his eternal counsels; to reveal the Saviour, and offer complete salvation to man. This is the living and life-giving doctrine of Scripture which all of us should be earnest to know; and it is presented in every aspect fitted to engage our attention, and make us improve it for our eternal peace. But in treating the subject, the Spirit of God presents us with a history of the church from the time it was erected upon earth, down to the period when the canon of Scripture was completed. Here, then, we have from God himself, a narrative of the most prominent ecclesiastical facts for a period of more than 4000 years. We find the church presented to our contemplation as she existed during the Patriarchal and Mosaic economies, and we have the history of the commencement of the Christian dispensation. It is admitted that the historical facts inserted in the holy Scriptures, derive peculiar importance from their connexion with the coming of Christ into the world, and his departure from it after he had finished the work given him to do, and on that account, as well as from the circumstance of their being the word of God, they have higher claims upon our attention than can be pleaded for uninspired history. But the fact that so much of the history of the church is found in Scripture, must be regarded as a commendation of the whole subject to our improvement. She is the same identical corporation in every age, is as much the object of Divine regard now as when the word of the Lord was primarily spoken to her by the ministry of prophets and apostles; and there can be no doubt that the successive passages of her history possess an importance worthy of particular interest and fitted to serve very important purposes to men. Had it been the pleasure of God to have inspired men for the adding of other epistles to the Scriptures, and to have addressed them to the church at a time posterior to that in which the last of the books composing the Bible were written, we have reason to believe that such an addition would have in some way embodied the most prominent facts of the history of the church at that time, or that the book of the Acts would have brought the history

of the circulation of the gospel and of its success farther down than it does.

In publishing the prosperous and the adverse events that befel the church for such a long period, God is to be regarded as giving an example to man, and shewing what should be done after the sacred canon is completed. Ecclesiastical historians, in so far as they have obtained mercy to be faithful, are followers and fellow-workers with God and his inspired penmen; and they who have a right relish of the writings of the latter, will not be indifferent about the former.

In the word of God we have many calls to the contemplation of the works of the Lord, and particularly the wonders he hath done in behalf of Israel. These cannot be limited to what are recorded in the Scriptures, and to what pass under our own observation, but comprehend all that are placed by the providence of God, within the reach of our diligent inquiry. Let it not be supposed that the duty of knowing what has befallen the church from the days of our fathers is one to be established merely from analogy. God has enjoined it upon us by both precept and example, and it is admirably calculated to afford real advantage and exquisite enjoyment to all who perform it.

Let the humble Christian who has been accustomed to make little account of ecclesiastical history, consider for a moment the manifestation there made of the God of Zion. You have acquired such knowledge of God as convinces you that there is none in heaven or on earth once to be compared with Him, and you have learned to count all things but loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Him. It is no doubt in the salvation exhibited in the gospel and in the person of the Saviour, that God is chiefly to be known and admired. You read in the promises and the precious declarations of doctrine, that God is merciful in his church, and long-suffering, that His care about her is unwearied, and that he is ever in the midst of her to help her right early. This is a glorious and a most engaging manifestation of Divine excellencies. But it is in the history of the church that we see the actual display of the mercy and long-suffering of God. We there see the unwearied exercise of a care extending to her minutest circumstances of necessity and danger, and it is shown that the grace promised by God has in adorable faithfulness been made to reign through righteousness unto eternal life from age to age.

It is of vast importance as it introduces us to an acquaintance with many of the most eminent saints and servants of God. The great things which relate to Zion's safety and prosperity have been accomplished by the instrumentality of eminent men. The part which they have acted is so conspicuous, and the place which they occupy in the history of the church is so prominent, that it has been found that the most successful manner of introducing to an acquaintance with any period is by writing the memoirs of the men who acted the most distinguished part in it. Surely there can be nothing more pleasing to the child of God than to be introduced to an acquaintance with these men that have been most highly honoured of God, and whose hearts burned so ardently with zeal for the honour of Christ and the best interest of immortal souls. Such were our ecclesiastical reformers, and that mind must be ignoble indeed that can derive no pleasure from the acquaintance with them which is acquired from the improvement of these memorials which God has preserved by his kind providence in the pages of uninspired history. To read of these is an exercise not merely pleasing, but calculated to be highly profit-

table. The bringing of our cold and contracted souls in contact with their historical remains, has a tendency to kindle in them the same ardent piety, to elevate and enlarge them with the same lofty Christian patriotism, to awaken and regulate our zeal for the safety and success of the same cause in which they embarked, and to train us for the society of the perfected saints in heaven. We acquire the knowledge of a man's character and endowments, of his mental and moral excellencies, not merely in looking at his plans and reading his promises, but in contemplating his actual performances, and we find every accession to the knowledge of what he hath done as an additional illustration of his character, and as fitted to render an acquaintance with him the more intimate. And, in like manner, do we grow in acquaintance with God by the reverential and ardent contemplation of him as presented to us in the declarations he has made about his own Being and perfections, in the display that he hath made of the plan of mercy and his promises of salvation to all such as apply to him. But he has actually manifested the glory of his perfections in his goings forth for the salvation of his church and his chosen people from time to time; he has made a most surprising display of himself in the purchase of redemption, and all that he does in paving the way for its application and in positively effecting it. The wonderful works God has done in the church are a correct counterpart of the promises of his word,—they are a commentary from himself, and when devoutly considered in connexion with the word, they shed a light upon it, and serve to shew more of the glory of God than can be seen through the word as unaccomplished. The Scriptures of the Old Testament presented, with great peculiarity, the appearance of Messiah, and the things relating to his sufferings and the glory that should follow, but they were never so fully understood till they took place. Our fathers who lived under the former dispensation, had not the means of beholding the glory of the Redeemer so clearly as we have under the present, and a reason is, that he had not actually displayed it in the execution of his work of redemption. The holy prophets searched and inquired diligently into these things, but as it was not given them to behold the glory of the Lord in the actual fulfilment of the work, so their knowledge of it was limited in comparison with that of the apostles, who were privileged to speak of it as actually accomplished. In his word, God presents us with the whole plan which he is to execute in his church even to the end of the world, and they who contemplate it by faith see much of his manifold wisdom and grace, but they will see far more when it is finished. It is in the history of the church that we behold the work, so far as already executed; and it surely becomes us to listen to its demonstrations of the character of the Saviour, that we may increase in acquaintance with him. The person who has read the history of the church,—traced the footsteps of him who hath led his Israel all the way they have already gone through the wilderness, and contemplated his many merciful interpositions and mighty deliverances, may be said to have lived in the church from age to age,—to have walked with God for many generations, and to have witnessed the glorious displays of his right hand and his holy arm, and having walked with him so long, and seen so much, his knowledge must be far more intimate and enlarged than that of those who look at but few of his works, and who limit their views to a few points of the stupendous plan. To be indifferent about the works which God has performed, in behalf of his church, is, though many sincere Christians are

not aware of it, to be indifferent about God himself; his chief design in all that he does is to manifest his glory, and it never shines more brilliantly than through the medium of his word as fulfilled in his works. His ancient people looked at him for many generations, in the light of the glorious things that he did in bringing them out of Egypt; and if we know him as the God of our fathers, we must come and behold the marvellous things that he hath performed in emancipating us from Popish superstition and idolatry, and in maintaining the pure Protestant religion to the present day. "According to the days when 'his church' came out of the land of Egypt has he shewn to us in our land marvellous things."

Let all who profess to prize the gospel and conscientiously perform their duty to God, remember, that without a knowledge of the history of the church, they cannot form a correct estimate of their privileges, or the extent of their obligations. To you who believe, he is precious, "and his word is more to be desired than gold;" but in estimating it, we have not merely to take into account its contents, but all the cost that has been expended in preserving it to our time and transmitting it to our place. It is a parcel of heavenly treasure above all earthly value in point of intrinsic excellence, and in the account of him who is the author of it, its value is greatly enhanced by the length of the way along which it has been communicated, and its miraculous preservation amidst all the danger to which it has been exposed. The most prominent facts of ecclesiastical record are the efforts which have been made for the manifestation of truth by its friends on the one hand, and the stratagems employed for its corruption and suppression by its enemies on the other. In raising up men for preserving and publishing the truth contained in Scripture, sustaining them in most arduous struggles, and in making them, in many instances, even prefer the loss of life to the abandonment of truth; the Lord has communicated the means of grace down to our day, and will continue to do so even to the end of the world. Now, we never value our Bible aright till we consider what it contains, and how it has been reserved for us. We never estimate as we ought the public ordinances of religion, without taking into account what God has done in defence of his house till now, and in setting before us an open door that no man can shut. We should therefore regard all that has been done for the church, particularly in our own land, as done for us; but how can we do so if we wilfully remain ignorant of the most remarkable passages of her history since her first erection among us. To think correctly, and to feel in unison with the true children of Zion, is to identify ourselves with the church of God, to regard her interests as our own; the dangers to which she has been exposed, and the sufferings she has undergone, as experienced by ourselves; and all that her God has done in preserving and delivering her, as testimonies of his kindness to us in particular. Hence, she is frequently personified and spoken of as a woman that has lived from the time of her first formation, and as remembering what God had done for her in the multitude of his mercies.\* "Many a time have they afflicted me from my youth; yet they have not prevailed against me. The plowers plowed upon my back, they made long their furrows. The Lord is righteous, he hath cut asunder the cords of the wicked." Every new deliverance entails upon her an additional obligation to

---

\* Psalm cxxix. 1.

God, and she feels and fulfils it when her members become acquainted with it, and give the glory to God which is due to his name.

And besides the obligations which result from the salvation the Lord has wrought for her, there are others which descend from her own voluntary engagement, and of which we cannot safely be ignorant. The engagements which Israel formed at Sinai, are often referred to by the prophets as binding in their day, and the breaking of them as one of the evils which procured the Babylonian captivity, and the awful judgments with which they were visited. To the question, "wherefore hath the Lord done this?" It is answered, "Because they have forsaken the covenant of the Lord their God."\* It is in the page of history that we learn that our fathers devoted themselves and their posterity to the Lord, and swore that they would walk in his ways. Never did a nation under heaven give more solemn pledges of fidelity to God than we then did. But how are we to know this, and how is it possible to be faithful to the Most High, if we do not seriously consider the original transaction as preserved in history. What would we think of the neighboring kingdoms that could entirely overlook alliances, and stipulations of treaties formed with Britain in the days of our fathers? And what shall the God of our ancestors think of us if we will not even look at the indisputable claim he has upon us from our explicit engagement and oath?

But the strongest reason with which we can urge the Christian to the serious perusal of the history of the church is, the connection which his acquaintance with it has with the advancement of the glory of God. This ought to be the chief end of man; and it certainly is so in reference to all who have obeyed the gospel. They regard it as their "reasonable service." And in giving him glory they do not contemplate his excellencies merely in the abstract, but as unfolded to them in the performance of his precious promises to the church. In heaven, we have reason to believe, that after the mystery of God is finished here below, the whole of the redeemed will, with all their heart, and soul, and strength, give glory to God in the highest, and they will admire the object of their praise as manifested in their salvation; and all that he did for his church will be presented to their view. The stupendous plan of redemption will be beheld in the full glory of its execution, the history of the whole divine procedure in executing it, will be present to their distinct contemplation, and all this will be seen as a reflection of the perfections of God, and serve to enlarge their comprehension of him, and animate their praises of his glory. In redemption,—and it includes all that he hath done for his church,—he has made to himself a glorious name; from the praises of the redeemed is the glory of that name declared.

Now, the saints on earth should aspire at the greatest possible conformity to what they shall be in heaven. They should join in the song of Moses, the servant of God and of the Lamb, "Great and marvellous are thy works, Lord God Almighty." But the man who is unacquainted with what the right hand and the holy arm of God hath achieved in behalf of his church is ignorant of many of the most signal of his works, and his communion with the saints in the celebration of them, and his tribute of praise to God must be limited, compared with what they would be but for his ignorance. They can never sing the song of

---

\* Compare Deut. xxix. 24 with Jer. xxii. 8, 9.



Moses who are ignorant of the history of the Old Testament deliverances; and surely they know little of the song of the Lamb who are ignorant of what that glorious conqueror and his company have done, and are yet to do in subduing antichrist, and in saving the redeemed church from the most dark and destructive domination. If then a knowledge of the history of the church be so necessary to an acquaintance with God himself and his word, to a right estimate of the value of our privileges, and the amount of our obligations to God; and the rendering to him the praise due to his name; surely the study of it cannot be so dry and unprofitable an exercise as the neglect with which many and even good people treat it, and the uninteresting manner in which they speak of it, would make us believe. "The works of the Lord are great; sought out of all them that have pleasure therein." It may justly be regarded as one of the suspicious characteristics of the religion of the present time, that so many of its professors live in a wilful ignorance of the doings of the Lord in our land. And there can be no doubt, that when the Spirit is poured from on high, as there will be a return to the Lord, so there will be a commemoration of his mighty works. They have been so many and so marvellous, that he will yet most certainly form a people for himself to shew forth the praises of them. We might have shewn how much the remembrance of these is fitted to encourage the faith of his people amid all the trials and discouragements they may have to encounter. But having engrossed too many pages already, let it at present suffice to remind the indulgent reader of his duty, in the words of the Psalmist, "O give thanks unto the Lord; call upon his name. make known his deeds among the people. Sing unto him, sing psalms unto him, talk of all his wondrous works. Remember his marvellous works that he hath done; his wonders and the judgments of his mouth; O ye seed of Abraham his servant, ye children of Jacob his chosen."\*—*Presbyterian Magazine.*

---

#### ART. VI. *A Case of Affliction.*

MR. EDITOR,—I am a man of sorrows, belonging to a class of sufferers, of which the members are not small in these days. Few of us have laid our griefs before the public. But I think we should no longer smother them. I will tell you mine, in the simplicity of my heart, not doubting your sympathies will take the right direction. I belong to a certain church and parish, and the top-stone of my sorrow is, that I CANNOT MANAGE MY MINISTER. Here are several sorrowful topics.

In the first place, he will have opinions of his own in spite of me. There were once blessed days in this parish. A puff from me would put the Rev. Mr. Weathercock, our former pastor, into any position I thought desirable. I do not think he had a theological opinion, which I had not trimmed into the shape I thought it should sustain. When he first came among us, there were many points on which he was given to understand there was difference between him and the present complainant, and that it was not becoming in him to be at variance with a person of such influence in community. I soon had the happiness of disco-

---

\* Psalms cv. 1, 2, 5, 6.

vering that we exactly agreed, though my ship had not swung the breadth of a barley-corn from her moorings. And why should it not be so? Is not a minister, by the highest authority, called "the servant of all?" Now a man serves me, if he straitens his theology into a parallel line with mine. And my former pastor was certainly a servant of this description.

But alas! the change! My present pastor has not a particle of the weathercock about him. As to his theological opinions, he has the hardihood to have a mind of his own. He appears so settled in his views, that I should as soon think of upheaving the Andes as to change them. I bluntly told him once, he was wrong on certain points, supposing it would shake him some to find himself differing from me. But I did not perceive the slightest change of countenance on the discovery of so important a fact. Indeed he was presumptuous enough to make some advances toward setting me right. And in fact, he did set things in such a plausible light as to give him credit for his good sense, to say nothing of the uneasiness he occasioned my own mind. But instead of being the servant of us all, and whiffing about to our several opinions, I honestly fear we shall yet be the servants, and he will bring us all to his own mind. He has had the art to do this already in the cases of so many, that I am alarmed, and if the thing is not stopped, I fear there will not be a scape-goat from his opinions amongst us. I almost fear that I shall not be such a goat myself as to escape.

And I am sorrowful also, that I cannot manage him any better in regard to various measures for promoting religion in the parish. To the honor of his predecessor I affirm, that he never made any movement till he had given me an inquiring look; and my opinions filled the sails or blew up the ship, just as in my sovereignty it was judged best. I was consulted with the most complimentary and gratifying deference. If there were any failures in this due respect to my skill in taking care of Zion, the community had not long to wait for some impressive tokens of my sense of injury.—How precious, sir, to stand at the helm in these matters, and to have the prerogative of saying, "this will not do," and "that will not do," and to have one's conscious wisdom and power honored in the obsequiousness of all concerned.

But my present pastor is a ruthless robber of my happiness in this respect. He pursues his own course very much as if I were an utter nonentity. Instead of crouching before me submissively, as "the servant of all" is duly bound, in asking my decision, in nine out of ten of his plans he passes me utterly by. I seem to be no more seen than the stars after sunrise; whereas I seemed once to be the principal luminous points in the firmament. And when he does consult me, and finds a non-occurrence, he insists upon a fair statement of the reasons of my dissent, which in many cases is a downright provocation. Just as though a man ought always to have reasons for his dislike, or was bound to tell them if he had!

And sorrow upon sorrow compels me to say, I cannot manage him any better in the matter of *preaching*.

Peace to the memory of the former pastor. He was perfectly docile here. I have known him, when about uttering some peculiar sentiment, to cast a glance of inquiry toward my pew, and shape what followed by the gloom or splendor of the horizon in that direction.

But if you were to see our present pastor in the pulpit, you would not think he cared a herring what mortal thought of him. He will

drive at a point with the most presumptuous earnestness in spite of the known dislike of a score of us.—He sends all sorts of missiles against all sorts of sins, without its seeming any concern of his whom he hits or how deep the wound. He seems to act on the principle, that the truth is a sort of piece of artillery, upon which it is his business to lay the match, and if any man stands in the way of the shot, that it is his own responsibility. Now this way of doing things just upsets a dish here and another there, which stood on their own bottoms during the reign of our former pastor. Men that had enjoyed an unbroken skin, during that whole period, are now from time to time most sorely wounded. And I myself am among that unhappy number. And this too, notwithstanding all former exemption, and my high standing in society. I verily believe the preacher would as soon level his rebukes at my sins as at those of the greatest villain in the parish. The former pastor used to cut up the wicked of the lower classes grandly. And well was I pleased at every shot thrown in that direction. But the present pastor, while he does the same, spreads his net also for other fish. He has adopted the principle of giving “to every man a portion,” and therefore there is not a soul of us who is not reached from time to time by his arrows. Now I like sharp-shooting in the direction I might prescribe; but the matter of being a target myself is what I cannot brook.

I told him lately about his preaching. There was no little wrath in my heart, with no little of a hurricane in my countenance and voice. I thought he would palliate and paddle away like a frightened duck. But there was not the slightest appearance of consternation about him. I hoped, too, if he was not to be frightened, he would at least grow hot under the excitement of my assault. But he cruelly disappointed me here also. He was as cool as a “Lapland idol carved in ice.”—He treated me with so much kindness and politeness, that my special wonder was excited that a man, who could cut one all to pieces so in the pulpit could be so benevolent a sort of being as I found him. But yet, as if to show that he would not heal any of my wounds, he pressed me in this very interview with several questions, which were as bad as the pressure of as many bayonets. For instance: “were the painful things uttered true? did they strike at any thing but sin; could you have been “hit of the archer,” if there had not been in you something,” &c. &c. Who could fail of being scandalized at such questions, who had any of that nobleness of soul which conscious wealth and influence in community inspire? Who wants to be teased with difficult questions, when he expected rather to find humiliation and retraction in him who has the impudence to ask them? Instead of there being confusion of face, as the result of that interview, where I had anticipated seeing it, I have the sorrow of believing it must have been seen in precisely the opposite direction.

There are various other trials of a similar kind; but I will trespass no longer upon your patience at present. That you may have my case at a glance, I would say in a word, my whole trouble is, that *I cannot manage my pastor*. He will have his own opinions—he will make his own measures—he will preach in such a manner as he is pleased to think best. And as to my being able to control him in any of these things, I seem to have no more influence than I have over the fixed stars. How precious the memory of the past! The Rev. Mr. Weathercock flew around to any point, under the breath of my influence. I had only to hint my good pleasure, to have every thing crook:

ed straitened at once. Opinions, measures, preaching, all swung from their moorings in the gale, and found their resting place in the precise line of my own desires. But the former things are passed away. My sceptre is broken! My throne is demolished! I am as weak as other men. Any sympathy or aid in your power, Mr. Editor, would be gratefully received and duly acknowledged by

Yours in much affliction,

SIMON.

—*Boston Recorder.*

#### ART. VII. *Heaven's Attractions.*

The following beautiful extract is from the writings of the late Dr. Nevins.

"I have been thinking of the attractions of heaven—what there is in heaven to draw souls to it. I thought of the *place*. Heaven *has* place. Christ says to his disciples, "I go to prepare a *place* for you." It is a part of the consolation with which he comforts them—that heaven is a place, and not a mere state. What a place it must be! Selected out of all the locations of the universe—the chosen spot of space. We see, even on earth, places of great beauty, and we can conceive of spots far more delightful than any we see. But what comparison can these bear to heaven, where every thing exceeds what ever eye has seen or imagination conceived? The earthly Paradise must have been a charming spot. But what comparison can these bear to the heavenly? What the Paradise assigned to the first Adam, who was of the earth earthly, compared with that purchased by the second Adam, who is the Lord from heaven? It is a purchased possession. The price it cost the purchaser every one knows. Now, having purchased it, he has gone to prepare it—to set it in order—to lay out his skill upon it. Oh, what a place Jesus will make—has already made—heaven! The place should attract us.

Then I thought of the freedom of the place from the evils of earth. Not only what *is* in heaven should attract us to it, but what is *not* there. And what is not there? There is no *night* there. Who does not wish to go where no night is? No night—no *natural* night—none of its darkness, its damps, its dreariness—and no *moral* night—no ignorance—no error—no misery—no sin. These all belong to night; and there is no night in heaven. And why no night there? What shines there so perpetually? It is not any natural luminary. It is a *moral* radiance that lights up heaven. "The glory of God doth lighten it, and the Lamb is the light thereof." No need have they there of other light. This shines every where and on all. All light is sweet, but no light is like this.

And not only no night there, but "no more *curse*." Christ redeemed them from the curse of the law by being made a curse for them. And "no more *death*." The last enemy is overcome at last. Each, as he enters the place, shouts victoriously, "Oh death—oh grave!" "Neither *sorrow*." It is *here*.—Oh yes—it is here—around, within. We hear it—we see it—and at length we feel it. But it is not there. "Nor *crying*," no expression of grief. "Neither shall there be any more *pain*; for the former things are passed away." And what becomes of *tears*? Are they left to dry up? Nay, God *wipes* them away. And this is a

sure sign they will never return. What shall cause weeping, when He wipes away tears.

I have not said that there was *no* sin in heaven. I have not thought that necessary. If sin was there, night would be there, and the curse, and death, and all the other evils—the train of sin. These are not there, therefore sin is not. No, “we shall be *like* Him; for we shall see him as he is.”

What *is* there, since these are not? *Day* is there—and there is the *blessing* that maketh rich—and there is *life*, immortality—and since no sorrow, *joy*—“fulness of joy—joy unspeakable”—and *smiles* where tears were—and there they *rest*, not from their labors only but from cares, and doubts, and fears. And *glory* is there, an “exceeding and eternal weight.”

Then I thought of the *society*. It is composed of the *Elite* of the universe. The various forms of angels who kept their first estate—as humble as they are high—not ashamed of men. Why should they be, when the Lord of angels is not ashamed to call us brethren? The excellent of the earth also—all the choice spirits of every age and nation—the first man—the first martyr—the translated patriarch—the survivor of the deluge—the friend of God, and his juniors, Isaac and Israel—Moses, the lawgiver and Joshua the leader of the host—the pious kings—the prophets—the evangelists and apostles, Paul, John—the martyrs—the reformers—the Puritan fathers—the missionaries, Swartz, Brainerd, Martyn—Carey and Morrison have just gone up; and the young brothers who ascended from Sumatra—and another, connected with missions, *Wisner*, has been suddenly sent for to heaven.

Is that all? Where is he that used to lisp “father, mother”—thy child? Passing out of your hands, passed he not into those of Jesus? Yes, you suffered him. If any other than Jesus had said, “Suffer them to come to me,” you would have said, No. Death does not quench those recently struck sparks of intelligence. Jesus is not going to lose one of those little brilliants. All shall be in his crown.

Perhaps thou hast a brother or a sister there; that would draw you towards heaven. Perhaps a mother—she whose eye wept while it watched over thee, until at length it grew dim and closed. Took she not in her cold hand, thine, while yet her hand was warm, and said she not, “I am going to Jesus—follow me?” Perhaps one nearer, dearer than child, than brother, than mother—the nearest, dearest—is there. Shall I say who? Christian female, thy husband. Christian father, the young mother of thy babes. He is not—she is not, for God took them. Has heaven no attractions?

Heaven is gaining in attractions every day. True, the principal attractions remain the same; but the lesser ones multiply. Some have attractions there now, which they had not but a few months ago. Earth is losing. How fast it has been losing of late! But earth's losses are heaven's gains. They who have left so many dwelling places of earth desolate, have gone to their father's house in heaven. What if they shall not return to us? We shall go to them. That is better.

But the principal attractions I have not yet mentioned. There is our father—our heavenly Father—whom we have so often addressed, and as such, in prayer. He that nourished and brought us up, and has borne us on—He that has watched over us with an eye that never sleeps, and provided for us with a hand that never tires: and who can pity too. We have never seen our heavenly Father: but there he re-

veals himself. There he smiles; and the nations of the saved walk in the light of his countenance.

And there is He, to depart and be with whom Paul desired, as being "far better" than to live. There is his glorified humanity. If not having seen, we love him; though we now see him not, yet believing, we rejoice with joy unspeakable and full of glory; what will be the love and the joy, when "we see Him as he is?" There is He.

Heaven *has* attractions—many, and strong—and yet who would think it? How few feel and obey the heavenly attraction! How much more powerful earth acts upon us!—How unwilling we are to leave it even for heaven.

---

ART. VIII. *Religious and Missionary Intelligence.*

We meet with the following interesting communication in the Christian Intelligencer. It is from the pen of the Rev. Robert Baird, and addressed to the Rev. Dr. Proudfit, Corresponding Secretary of the Foreign Evangelical Society; under the patronage of which Society, and with the view of promoting its object, it is, that Mr. B. is now travelling in Europe. Our readers will doubtless peruse this communication with much interest. It is dated, Paris, Sept. 21, 1836.—ED. REL. MON.

SAXONY.—From Berlin I went to Dresden. My visit to Saxony was wholly for the Temperance cause, and of very short duration. It was almost wholly with the view of seeing Prince John, the brother of the present king of Saxony, and endeavoring to advance that cause through his influence. That Prince, though young, is distinguished for his literary attainments and his philanthropic efforts.

Of the state of religion in Saxony, I can only speak in a very general manner. Whilst the Royal family is Catholic, as is well known, the great bulk of the people are Protestants. The most perfect toleration exists in this kingdom. In the city of Dresden, which has a population of between 70,000 and 80,000 inhabitants, there are ten or twelve Protestant churches, some of which are very large; whilst there is but one—a large cathedral—Roman Catholic church. It is estimated that three-fourths of the population of that city are Protestants, and the remaining one-fourth Roman Catholics. The population of the entire kingdom is about 1,800,000.

The state of religion in the Protestant churches in Saxony is deplorable enough. Few of the pastors are orthodox. There are, however, some evangelical ministers; and among the people there is said to be a strong desire, especially on the part of the older persons, to hear the gospel preached again in the churches. One of the most distinguished Rationalists of Germany preaches in the St. Mary's church at Dresden.

This is the celebrated Dr. Ammon, who has by his writings exerted a wide-spread, and for the truth, a baneful influence in Germany. It is believed, however, that even in Saxony, evangelical religion is beginning to revive a little. The Lord grant that it may soon make great progress.

**CENTRAL GERMANY**—On leaving Saxony, I passed through Saxe-Weimar, Saxe-Gotha, and Hesse-Cassel to Frankfort-on-the-Maine. The state of religion in these small states is far from being as encouraging as in Prussia. Rationalism here has almost unbounded sway in the Protestant churches, whilst the number of evangelical pastors is comparatively small. At Weimar is Roehr, and at Saxe-Coburg is Bretschneider two of the most distinguished neologists of Germany, whose writings have exerted an extensive influence most fatal to true religion.

Frankfort is one of the Free cities of Germany, and is a place of much wealth, and a point of great importance. It has a population of about 50,000 souls. There are in that city 6 Lutheran churches, 1 German Reformed, 1 French Reformed, 1 Moravian, (very small and destitute of a pastor,) and two or three Roman Catholic. Of the ministers of that city, the two French pastors, one German Reformed, and two or three Lutheran are considered evangelical in their doctrines. Religion is in a very low state in that city.

I may add, that there is preaching in the English language in Frankfort this summer, for the first time, I believe, in any regular way by a minister belonging to the Established church of England. This is important; for the number of English people who reside in Frankfort, united with those who annually visit it for longer or shorter periods, is very considerable. And there is hardly a point in Europe which is more favorable, in regard to situation, than Frankfort for exerting a good influence throughout the continent. Much ought to be done there to promote true religion.

**GERMAN STATES ON THE LOWER RHINE.**—The countries which border on the Rhine below the entrance of the Maine, viz. Hesse-Darmstadt, Nassau, and the Western or Rhenish Provinces of Prussia, have, to a great extent, a Catholic population. Such is the population of Mayence, Coblenz, Cologne, &c. There are, however, some Protestant churches in those cities; and in some cases those churches are evangelical. At Dusseldorf, and throughout the valley of Barmen, there are not a few evangelical pastors, upon whose labors the Lord has smiled. In general, the country which borders the Lower Rhine, and indeed that which borders the Upper also, is a country still covered with the thick darkness of Popery. Truth is, however, gaining ground slowly in some places, and even with considerable rapidity in a very few. But I will not attempt a more minute description of the state of things in this portion of my travels, being sensible that my journey was too rapid to allow me to acquire satisfactory information respecting many places.

**HOLLAND.**—From Germany I passed into Holland. My stay in that country was not long, but long enough to permit me to visit the most important cities. Holland must ever be a very interesting country to the friends of liberty, science, and the Protestant religion.

As to liberty, one can never forget or cease to admire the protracted and dreadful struggle which the Seven Provinces, as the country was then called, made to free themselves from the yoke of bondage, and the almost incredible sufferings which that memorable contest cost.

As it regards science, it may truly be said that no other country in the world, containing an equal population, has produced so many men who have adorned and advanced science and literature as Holland has

furnished. For three centuries this has been so. And even at this moment that country is inferior to none in the number of her men of learning, nor in her institutions for giving a suitable education to all classes of her population. In addition to a good school system for the instruction of all the youth in the branches of elementary knowledge, there are four Universities in that country, viz. those of Utrecht, Leyden, Amsterdam, and Groningen. The two former are well known, as among the most distinguished in Europe. That of Utrecht has at present upwards of 500 students, of whom 250 are theological, and under the instruction of four professors. The University of Leyden has 570 students, of whom 220 are theological, and under the instruction of four professors. The University of Amsterdam is little more than nominal; whilst that of Groningen is quite respectable and has probably some three hundred or three hundred and fifty students. The whole number of young men in the four Universities of that country are, this year estimated at 1590; a number certainly very large for a country which has a population hardly reaching three millions.

As it regards the Protestant religion, no country has contended more earnestly for it, and none has produced greater theologians. For that was the country of Grotius, of Witsius, Vitranga, and of a host of others, whose writings have adorned the church and powerfully illustrated and established the truth.

For a long period after the Reformation true religion made extensive and permanent progress in Holland. And even at this day, it is believed that there are not a few devoted men among the 1,238 ministers of the gospel who belong to the Reformed Dutch Church. Besides that denomination there are a number of churches belonging to the Lutherans, a few congregations of the Walloon church, and one or two other minor sects. There are also two churches for the English, one Episcopal and the other of the Kirk of Scotland at Amsterdam; the same number at Rotterdam; and one Episcopal at Harlæm. Each of these churches is supplied with two pastors, except the one at Harlæm, and all are supported by the Dutch Government. There is a large number of Jews in Holland, there being no less than 22,000 at Amsterdam, and 7 synagogues. There is a French Reformed Church in each of the most important cities. That at the Hague is large, and is supplied with decidedly evangelical preaching from the eloquent and distinguished Mr. Secretan.

It is not to be disguised, however, that the pure religion of the gospel has greatly declined in Holland within the last 50 or 60 years. The doctrines for which the friends of truth so nobly, though not always with charity and a proper spirit, contended in the beginning of the 17th century, and which were confirmed by the Synod of Dort in 1618 and 1619, and are embodied in the *Confession of Faith* the *Heidelberg Catechism*, and the *Canons* of that Synod,—and which combined constitute the Symbolical Book of the Reformed Dutch Church, have long ceased to maintain that universal supremacy which they once enjoyed in that church. To these doctrines every pastor, professor, teacher of a school, until 1799, were required to subscribe in the most explicit manner. But at that epoch, the connexion of Church and State was dissolved, and religion greatly corrupted by French arms and French philosophy. And when the ancient order of things was re-established in 1816, and a Synod called in the year succeeding to regulate the affairs of the church, there was proof enough furnished that the sound orthodoxy of the Reformed



Dutch Church had suffered much. That Synod ordained that a subscription to the formularies of the church—the *Confession*, the *Catechism*, and the *Canons of the Synod of Dort*, which have just been mentioned,—*so far as they are agreeable to the word of God* is all that is necessary on the part of those who enter the sacred office. This fact and many others show that there has been a departure from the rigid orthodoxy which for so long a period prevailed in the church of Holland. And at the present time, whilst I suppose that it would be wrong to say that there is not a very considerable body of sound and devoted ministers in that church, it is not to be denied that the churches are generally in a state of great spiritual deadness.

There is however, at this time a most remarkable work going on throughout Holland, which may, with the blessing of God, exert a great and good influence. A new sect has been forming from the Established Dutch Church, during the last two years which now amounts to several thousands, and which the persecution of the civil authorities is likely to augment very rapidly. It is probably premature to speak positively, at this day, respecting this remarkable religious movement. But I am of the opinion that it bids fair to advance the kingdom of Christ greatly. At the same time there is room to fear that the opposition which those who belong to this sect are encountering, may lead to very grave consequences ere long. It is to be hoped that the serious-minded sovereign of that country will yet take such a course as will prevent so direful an issue. I ought to add that the ministers and leading laymen who constitute this sect do not profess to hold any other doctrines than those recognized in the ancient standards of the Reformed Dutch Church, as settled by the Synod of Dort; and in fact, that the principal cause of their secession from the established church, is the alleged fact that that church has, to so great a degree departed from the true faith. The king has lately issued an ordinance by which, under certain very onerous but probably practicable regulations, this new sect can hold their meetings and act as a church, until they shall be recognized by the competent authority, (the Legislature) as a church, or denomination entitled to a place under the protection of the laws, and on the same footing with the other denominations which are recognized by the state.

I have spoken thus generally of this subject, because however interesting a more minute history of it might be, it would of necessity be too long for this report.

It remains for me to say that I have reason to think that the principal object of my visit to Holland, will be accomplished, which was to secure the translation of the History of the Temperance Societies in America and elsewhere, which I had written, into the Dutch language and its publication. That task I expect will, in a few months, be accomplished, through the efforts of Professor Herring and Baron Golstein at Utrecht, two warm friends of the cause. I will only add that there are no temperance societies yet in Holland, although there is evidently an interest awaking in behalf of this great object. The fact that vast quantities of gin and other ardent spirits are manufactured and consumed in Holland, or exported to other countries, constitutes a most powerful reason why the friends of religion and good morals in that country should arouse to promote this cause. At the same time, it is quite certain, I think, that this great enterprise will meet many and great obstacles in that country, and much labor and time will probably be required to carry it forward.

**BELGIUM.**—I spent some time in Belgium, on my way to Paris, for the prosecution of several objects connected with my mission to Europe. This is a very important country. It has a population of about four millions and two hundred thousand souls. Notwithstanding the Roman Catholic religion is the religion of almost every body that makes any pretensions to religion, there is no other country on the continent of Europe in which there is so perfect a toleration of all others. This is a most important fact.

There are few Protestant churches or ministers in Belgium. The door is, however, widely opened for good effort. The Rev. Mr. Boucher, of Brussels, is laboring with much prospect of success in that important city, which is the capital of the kingdom. At Ghent, at Devismes, and Antwerp, there are evangelical ministers; making in all some five or six. Their hands need greatly to be strengthened. And the appeal which is made by those brethren to the churches in America ought by no means to be disregarded.

There is great room in Belgium for the distribution of good books and tracts. And it is cheering to see that the British and Foreign Bible Society, through the agency which it maintains at Brussels, is every year scattering far and wide through the kingdom the sacred Scriptures. May the Lord smile upon these and all other proper efforts to advance his cause in Belgium.

**CONCLUSION**—It was my intention to have subjoined some remarks :  
 1. On the hindrances which the Gospel, every where in those parts of the continent which I have visited, meets from the connection of the church with the state, and the interference of civil governments. 2. On the dreadful influence which a want of discipline, and the erroneous views which pervade the Protestant churches, generally, on the subject of admitting people to church membership, have exerted, and must continue to exert, so long as they are permitted to exist to corrupt the church of Christ. And 3. On the importance of having every city in Europe where there is any considerable number of English and Americans residing, no matter for what length of time, supplied with able and zealous ministers of the Gospel, not only with a view of benefitting them, but also of aiding in promoting the work of the Lord among the native population. But the great length of this Report compels me to postpone the consideration of these important topics.

**SYRIA.**—The following communication from Mr. Smith, dated Beyroot, March 17, 1836, on a deeply interesting subject, closely connected with the propagation of spiritual Christianity in Syria, and perhaps throughout the dominions of the viceroy of Egypt, will sufficiently explain itself.—*Missionary Herald.*

*Acquittal of a Druze, arrested for becoming a Christian.*

An event has recently occurred here, having so important a bearing upon our labors and prospects, that I hasten to report to you the leading circumstances connected with it.

You are aware that apostacy from Mohammedanism is prohibited by Moslem law under penalty of death; and that this law has hitherto been strictly executed. Yet it has been a question of much interest to missionaries, whether, under the influence of the innovations recently introduced into this country from Europe, this law would not become a dead letter. Lately this question has become one of great practical in-

terest to this station in relation to the Druzes, as you will learn from our last joint letter. But we hardly thought, when penning that letter, that it was so soon to be tried.

The Druzes are not really Moslems, but in consequence of their profession, they have ever been treated as such by the law; and recently, on the ground of this profession, soldiers have been levied from among them, as from the other Moslems. It is true that some have from time to time in years past joined the native Christian sects in Mount Lebanon, without molestation; but then it was done in secret, under a local government that favored Christianity, and the converts were therefore never complained of to the Mohammedan authorities. The fact, however, has for years been well understood, and here we found ground for encouragement. We hoped, should any convert of ours be seized for punishment, to be able successfully to plead established precedents. But the local authority, which was favorable in those cases, being papal, is opposed to us, and could not be expected to lift a finger in our aid.

The case which I am about to relate to you is that of the Druze, whom I mentioned in my letter of December 2d, as the only one, who, together with his family, still persevered in attending regularly upon our instructions. My first acquaintance with him was in September or October last. He was brought to me as one who wished to put himself and family under our instructions and embrace Protestantism. Though a native of my immediate neighborhood, he had spent a part of the several last years in a village not far off, belonging to the mountains. There he had two of his sons baptized by the Maronites, and had professed himself openly to be no longer a Druze, but a Christian. He had been prevented from receiving baptism, however, by fear of his relations, who had once gone in a body and beaten him. He now wished to remove his family again to his house in my neighborhood, if I thought he would be in no danger. Having then a good deal of influence over the Druzes around me, and over his relations among the rest, I told him to bring his family down, send his children to school, and attend upon every opportunity of religious instruction, and I trusted no harm would befall him.

He followed my advice, and from that time he and his family were regular attendants upon our religious services, and four of his children were in our schools. He professed a strong attachment to the Saviour, was an attentive hearer of the word, and evidently made progress, as well as his wife also, in religious knowledge. Both were anxious for baptism, openly declared themselves Protestants, and were known as such by all. Even an officer of the emeer besheer respected him in this character, leaving him unmolested, on finding in his hand a testimony from me that he was a Christian, while he was seizing all his Druze neighbors for soldiers. He was never admitted to our church, nor did we consider that we had sufficient evidence of the conversion of his heart. Yet he was regarded by the public as having to all intents and purposes joined us.

He was thus living quietly at home, when, somewhat more than a month ago, it was reported to me one Sabbath evening that some of the officers of the governor were searching for him. I immediately sent out and brought him from his hiding place to my house, where, according to rights granted in this country to Europeans, no one would venture to take him without my leave, or at least that of my Consul. In this asylum he and his sons remained more than a fortnight, the officers almost every day searching for them in the neighborhood. I repeatedly sent

to inquire of the select men of the Moslems who sent these officers, what was wanted of him; and was uniformly answered that the Governor had heard that he had become a Protestant, and wanted to see him to inquire what had induced him to take such a step. As it was well known, however, that he was with me, and the governor made no demand of me for him, and the search for him gradually ceased, I began to think that the affair had no other origin than the complaint of an enemy to these select men merely, and that they would carry it no farther. The man also, being poor, and unable to live without laboring, could not continue long thus inactive. Accordingly having the offer of an oven about an hour distant, under the government of the mountains, he was induced to take it, being by trade a baker. Here it was thought he would be safe, as the governors of Beyroot have never been allowed to seize men within the territories of the mountains. He accordingly moved his family thither for a permanent residence, hoping when the present search was over, to attend our meetings every Sabbath.

He was hardly settled here before the government, contrary to all usage, sent out a number of officers and seized him as he was working at his oven. The crime alleged against him, was the same as already mentioned, that he had become a protestant. On the road he was severely beaten to make him confess that he was a Moslem; and on reaching the city, was thrust into prison. Fearing that he might through fear deny Christ, I visited him as soon as possible in prison, and asked him what he intended to profess himself, whether a Christian or a Moslem, and urged him to make the profession he intended to abide by, as upon it would be based the steps we intended to take; declaring to him at the same time, that if he was a Moslem, we had nothing more to do for him; but that if he were a Christian, we would do what we could. In reply he professed before perhaps a dozen Moslems, whom my presence had drawn together, that he was a Christian, and that were they to burn him at the stake, he would die a Christian. These by-standers immediately reported my visit to the governor, and I was hardly gone before he was thrust into the inner prison, and ordered to be put in chains. My visit proved very opportune. He had not then been brought before his accusers; but soon after they came and tried every means by promises and threats, to make him say that he was a Mohammedan. With unshaken firmness he persevered in declaring himself a Christian, and they at length left him still in the inner prison. Such a confession had never been made in Beyroot before; and much public attention was attracted by it. The poor man in his dungeon, aware of the danger of his situation, seemed to spend much of his time in prayer, and was often heard by his fellow-prisoners, in the watches of the night, calling upon Jesus Christ to help him. He even sent directions to a friend respecting the disposal of his few effects, in case he should be martyred, thereby showing his calculation to persevere unto death.

Whether any thing could be done by us for his release appeared very doubtful. He was in the employ of no European when seized, so that he could not be claimed as a protected subject. Nor had we, as protestants, any religious rights in the country by treaty, which could give ground to any official interference whatever. There was no way but to see that the case was brought as fairly as possible before the higher authorities of the land, and then left to be decided according to what might be their views of justice and toleration. Nor were we unwilling, on the whole, that such a test should be presented to them, that we might know what was to be expected of them hereafter.

The American consul at Beyroot, who took a deep interest in the case, addressed a letter to Soleiman Pasha, next in power to Ibrahim, and who was then at Sidon, on his way to Beyroot. This was favorably received, and the pasha replied with kindness, adding a wish that the persecuted family should send a petition to him, by which the facts might be brought before him, so that he might be ready to judge when he should arrive at Beyroot. This was accordingly done, and the requisite evidence bearing on the case was prepared. A petition was also sent to the governor. Mr. Smith proceeds in the narrative—

Having sent this petition, we felt that we had nothing to do, but to commit the case to God, and wait for his providence to work out the result. Upon this result we felt that important consequences depended. Should it be unfavourable, all further inquiry might be checked among the Druzes, through *fear* of persecution. Should it be favorable, it would be almost an epoch in Mohammedan government, establishing the precedent, before untried in a legal tribunal, that a Druze, notwithstanding his profession of Mohammedanism, has the right to embrace Christianity, and that, even in the protestant form. Thus would the door be opened wider among the Druzes, and more countenance be given to our labours in the country.

The poor man had his food daily sent to him by us, with messages to cheer him. Inducements to persevere he needed not, as he was fully determined upon this from the first, and never wavered. The case was prolonged. Soleiman Pasha's arrival was delayed from day to day, and nothing heard from him, except a word now and then from Mr. L., diplomatic agent of several European consuls, attached to the pasha's suite, that he was still interesting himself in it.

At length the pasha arrived; and the poor prisoner's wife immediately waited on him, and continued waiting at his gate daily. Every obstacle was thrown in the way of her access to him by the governor, and generally only the presence of the consul's janissary could get her admittance. Sometimes she was told to come to-morrow, and sometimes she was promised his release. Once or twice she received orders from the governor, as she supposed, for his release, which produced no effect. But it appeared in the end, that all these hinderances were created by the governor. The pasha was well disposed, wishing only to accomplish the object without the appearance of European influence, and without stirring up Moslem fanaticism. The governor's last pretext for delay was, that as the man belonged to the mountain, he would give him up when an officer of the emeer should demand him; thinking, doubtless, that he had so prejudiced the emeer that no such demand would be made. But it so happened that the officer of the village where Kasim was seized, was within the reach of our influence. Word was immediately sent to him, and he came down and demanded the prisoner. Driven thus from every subterfuge, and threatened at last by Mr. Lapi, with being deposed from his office, he finally presented himself in person at the door of the prison, and told Kasim to go forth free.

Thus terminated, after an imprisonment of seventeen days, the first case of a converted Druze called to confess Jesus Christ before a Moslem tribunal. How great the change of Moslem ideas of toleration indicated by its favourable result! So great has been the fear of Moslem wealth in similar cases, that Druze nobles of the highest rank, in embracing Christianity in their mountain fastnesses, have not dared even to

this day to let it be publicly known, and have concealed their religion in the veil of hypocrisy.

The poor man immediately came to us from his prison, thanking the Saviour for his deliverance. Even for his imprisonment also he thanked the Lord, only complaining of some vicious boys, who were allowed to come daily and curse his religion; and of his brother, who had mocked him in his dungeon, wishing that he might come forth from it, only to enter his grave.

The man and his wife still appear well, they are constant attendants at our family devotions, are thankful and interested recipients of instruction, and three of their children are in our families, constantly enjoying religious and other privileges. I trust their ignorance, which is yet great, may give place to intelligent views of truth, and that God may write their names in the book of life.

---

ART. IX. *Miscellany.*

**SABBATH VIOLATION.**—*Be sure and wind up the clock on Sunday!*—I passed the night in D——, with an enterprising citizen, and in the morning as he was stepping into the stage to be absent for a week, he said to his wife, ‘my dear, be sure and wind up the clock on *Sunday.*’ He was a good citizen, and believed his Bible, and had often read the divine direction about the Sabbath. ‘In it thou shalt not do *any.*’ I wonder he had not said ‘be sure and have all your little matters adjusted before the Sabbath, that you and your children may spend the whole day serving God, and preparing for eternity.’—But instead of that he said, ‘be sure and wind up the clock Sunday.’ This direction run through my mind for hours, and as the thought expanded a little, I found my friend D—— was much like other people, reserving many little things to be done on the Lord’s day. I thought as I passed the streets, that I could see many long beards that were to be cut on Sunday, and many counting the time till Sabbath, that their boots, shoes, and clothes might be brushed. I could see others accustomed to look upon their stray sheep or cattle, to walk around their distant fields of grass and grain, to see whether the fences were all safe or to learn whether the flocks and herds did not need some attention that could not be well afforded on any other day.

Others make the Sabbath a delight because they can hear and tell the news as they go to and from the church, and at the recess, and in the family circles after their return. They really learn more upon the Sabbath than they do from their visitors, periodicals and books, the other six days. A worldly man once said, ‘I love to go to church, it is such a capital place to hear the news.’

Many singular plans are devised about the house of God. Appointments are made for visiting; errands are done to save time; friends meet and exchange their messages of love and friendship; pleasure boats, pleasure coaches and horses, are in great demand upon the Lord’s day.

Many who find diseases creeping upon themselves or their children, wait till Sabbath, and then seek medical advice, so that many physicians and apothecaries must do twice as much business, as upon other days. It is not strange for the sick to see multitudes of pretended friends upon

that holy day. They are left without consolation or aid six days, but on the seventh their rooms are crowded to suffocation, and many a sufferer has lost his life by this periodical kindness.

Most of courts sit Monday, and I know one eminent lawyer who *will* go on Saturday, or will *not* go till Monday, and he is exerting a most salutary influence upon the bar, in that whole region. Others both judges and lawyers, (some standing high too in the church,) do not 'remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy,' but in sight of the common people who look up to professional men for example, ride across the country on the Sabbath so as to be ready at Court.

The Jews used to make the day previous, a day of preparation for the Sabbath, but we strangely reverse it, and make the Sabbath a day of preparation for the week, and also a time to bring up numerous little arrears, that are deferred till some more leisure day.

This systematic Sabbath breaking, has become so common, that if the best of your readers will examine themselves carefully, they will find some form of this sin habitual.—*Cincinnati Journal*.

---

**IMPORTANT ADVICE TO CLERGYMEN.**—"Take heed to yourselves, that your graces may be maintained in life and in action.

For this end preach to *yourselves* the sermons you study, before you preach them to others. If you were to do this, for your own sakes, it would be no labor lost. But I principally recommend it, on the public account and for the sake of the church. When your minds are in a holy frame, your people are likely to partake of it. Your prayers and praises, and doctrine will be sweet and heavenly to them. They are likely to feel it when they have been much with God. That which is on your hearts most, will be most in their ears. I confess that I must speak it by lamentable experience, that I publish to my flock the distempers of my soul. When I let my heart grow cold, my preaching is cold; and when it is confused, my preaching is confused also. And I have often observed in the best of my hearers, that when I grow cold in my preaching, they have grown cold accordingly. The next prayers I have heard from them, have been too much like my sermons. You cannot decline or neglect your duty, but others will be losers by it as well as yourselves.—If we let our love decrease, and if we abate our holy care and watchfulness, it will soon appear in our doctrine. If the matter show it not, the manner will; and our hearers are likely to fare worse for it. Whereas, if we could abound in faith, and love, and zeal, how would they overflow to the refreshing of our congregations! Watch, therefore, brethren, over your own hearts. Keep out lusts and worldly inclinations; and keep up the life of faith and love. Be much at home, and much with God. If it be not your daily, serious business to study your own hearts, to subdue corruptions, and to "walk with God," all will go amiss with you, and you will starve your audience. Or if you have an affected fervency, you cannot expect any great blessing to attend it. Above all, be much in secret prayer and meditation. There you must fetch the heavenly fire that must kindle your sacrifices."—*Baxter*.

---

**INATTENTIVE HEARERS.**—The causes of inattention are 'multiform and mixed.' In some cases it arises from the monotonous train of thought in the preacher—the want of interest which he manifests in his subject—the dullness of his manner—the lukewarmness of his address—

and a familiarity with his principal topics and leading propositions. While in others it is occasioned by a display of reasoning without its power—by the appearance of fervor without its heart—and by an affectation of earnestness which seeks to move the passions without first enlightening the understanding. These are cases where the attention of an audience is apt to flag for the want of that stimulus which the mind almost invariably demands. It behoves ministers, then, to look well to their master, and to their manner, and to their spirit, when they see evidences of inattention in those whom they are called to address; for it is possible that the evil may exist in themselves rather than in their hearers. Or at least that they are chargeable with a portion of the inattention which they perceive in others.

But hearers are often inattentive when these causes do not exist. The most faithful and laborious and able preachers find among their auditors many who seem to have assembled for no other purpose than to while away an hour of that time which hangs heavily upon them. Instead of having their minds intent upon the subject under discussion one is engaged in calculations of profit or loss—another in balancing the probabilities of success in some anticipated speculation or adventure; another in making comments upon passing events, and still another—and perhaps this embraces a large majority of inattentive hearers—is thrown in a kind of reverie, half asleep and half awake—now catching a sentence uttered from the pulpit—now losing another in the vacuity of thought—and now a thousand incoherent images real and visionary flit across his mind in rapid succession and touch it so lightly in their passage that memory cannot recal them. For proof of this, ask, what was the text?—the text is forgotten. What was the subject? The subject is not remembered. What doctrine was illustrated or what duty was enforced?—It cannot be told, and all this by way of apology is usually attributed to a treacherous memory. Or if perchance the text after some effort is recalled, you can gather nothing more of the discourse from one of your inattentive hearers.

If we would search for the rest of the matter we shall find that this inattention is partly the result of habit. The mind has never been accustomed to fix itself upon any thought and pursue it with steadiness of purpose to a definite conclusion. And hence is it that weariness is superinduced whenever the intellect of such persons is taxed, as it often is, in a well arranged and able discourse. But this is not all. In their own feelings there is no congeniality with the truths which are uttered. Their affections are estranged from the subject, and if they think of it at all it excites unpleasant sensations. Or perhaps they may be conscious of their own delinquency, or of their own exposure to danger; and to avoid looking it full in the face, they strive to withdraw their thoughts from considerations which are unpleasant and the urging of which creates feelings of repugnance.

Now there are two cases in which attention is elicited. The first is where the truths of the gospel are loved and ardently loved. Then the mind is open to conviction, The heart pants after more knowledge of God and of his revealed will, and feasts upon those thoughts which are even familiar, drawing from them richer and still richer nourishment and thus is strengthened and encouraged and emboldened to do the will of God. The other is where the mind is awakened to see that danger is real—or where the latent enmity of the heart puts on its vigor and strength. An impulse is thus given to the mind which it cannot resist.



Other subjects cannot engross his thoughts. It must dwell upon the truths uttered, even though they may be hated and repelled. And one of two results ensues, There is either a renovation of heart—a subjection to the spirit of Christ—or the enmity is confirmed, and indifference supervenes, when the Spirit is withdrawn, and the last state of that man is worse than the first.

But is it not strange that Christians should be inattentive, when the truths of that gospel to which they are indebted for life and salvation are proclaimed? Can they be inattentive, and still retain the exercise of faith and hope and charity? If they detect themselves in this spirit, is it not a sufficient reason for them to examine the foundation upon which they are building?—to ask themselves whether they have any title to the endeared appellation by which they are called? And is it strange also that sinners should be inattentive, when a subject of so much importance as salvation through the Cross of Christ is presented to them? But strange as it is, the fact is indisputable, and shows the alarming state of apathy respecting their immortal interests, into which they have fallen; and from which unless they are awakened before their death-knell tolls, they will then awake to hear their final sentence and sink to everlasting ruin.

PARVULUS.

YALE COLLEGE.—The whole number of students this year, is 570. The following is the list of the faculty and instructors:

Rev. Jeremiah Day, S. T. D., LL. D., President; Hon. David Daggett, I. L. D., Kent Professor of Law; Thomas Hubbard, M. D. professor of the principles and practice of Surgery; Benjamin Silliman, M. D., LL. D., professor of Chemistry, Pharmacy, Mineralogy and Geology; James L. Kingsley, LL. D., professor of the Latin Language and Literature; Eli Ives, M. D., professor of the theory and practice of Physic; William Tully, M. D., professor of *Materia Medica* and Therapeutics; Rev. Nathaniel W. Taylor, S. T. D., Dwight Professor of Didactic Theology; Jonathan Knight, M. D., professor of Anatomy and Physiology; Timothy P. Beers, M. D., professor of Obstetrics; Josiah W. Gibbs, A. M., professor of Sacred Literature; Samuel J. Hitchcock, Esq., instructor in the Science and Practice of Law; Rev. Eleazar T. Fitch, S. T. D., Livingston Professor of Divinity; Rev. Chauncey A. Goodrich, S. T. D., professor of Rhetoric and Oratory; Denison Olmsted, A. M., professor of Natural Philosophy and Astronomy; Theodore D. Woolsey, A. M., professor of the Greek Language and Literature; Charles U. Shepard, A. B., lecturer in Natural History; Anthony D. Stanley, A. M., professor elect of Mathematics; John O. Colton, A. M., tutor in Greek; Seth C. Brace, A. M., tutor in Latin; Alphonso Taft, A. M., tutor in Natural Philosophy; Ebenezer A. Johnson, A. M. tutor in Latin; Samuel W. S. Dutton, A. M. tutor in Greek; Samuel St. John, A. B., tutor in Latin; Nathan P. Seymour, A. B., tutor in Mathematics; Samuel G. Whittlesey, A. B., tutor in Mathematics; James D. Dana, A. M., assistant to the professor of Chemistry; Francois Turner, *Bachelier-es-Lettres et Licencie en Droit dans l'Universite de France*, instructor in the French language; Robert Bakewell, instructor in Drawing and Perspective.—*N. Y. Ob.*

TEMPERANCE AMONG SEAMEN.—The ship *Switzerland*, Capt. Charles Hunt, sailed on Friday forenoon for Charleston and Havre, having on

board a temperance crew from the sailors' boarding house in Purchase street, called the "Sailor's Home," and probably no ship ever left this port with a better crew,—eleven of them are members of a Temperance Society, and five are professors of religion.

Before the ship cast off from the wharf, they were assembled in the cabin and addressed by their pastor, Rev. Mr. Lord, Chaplain of the Seamen's Church in Purchase street, in a very interesting manner, enjoining upon them to perform their duties to their officers, to their owners, to their shipmates and to their God. After which a prayer was offered by Rev. Mr. Rogers, of the Franklin street Church. A more impressive and interesting sight could not well be conceived; the hardy sons of the ocean, kneeling whilst uniting in the fervent prayer of the reverend gentleman, and we doubt not that the effect of this closing scene will be beneficial to their future characters. These eleven young men all look forward to the period when they will attain the command of a vessel, three of them having been mates of vessels heretofore, but a desire to continue for a time longer with their companions, has led them to go in a subordinate capacity, and we trust that their ambition to rise will meet with encouragement from our ship owners. A library of books, of limited extent, but sufficient for their use, has been furnished—and each book is endorsed "Forecastle Library of Ship Switzerland," comprising a variety of interesting, useful and entertaining works,—and they also are provided with nautical books and instruments for improvement in navigation.

The "Sailor's Home," in Purchase street, is what it purports to be—a home for the sailors, where they are treated like men and like civilized beings. It now has near thirty inmates, and all seamen who have been there once will go to no other house, upon their return to port. We trust our enterprising ship owners will encourage this establishment, by suggesting to the crews of their vessels coming into port to go there; and by sending there for crews, and thus keeping them out of the hands of the sharks of landlords and shipping agents.—*Boston Mercantile Journal*.

---

USHER'S HABIT OF CATECHISING.—He found the fruit of this to be very great and pleasing, even among the ordinary sort of people, upon their coming to receive the Lord's Supper; because they, bringing in their names, had constantly some account taken of their fitness, which was found to be considerable, and to derive itself very much from frequent catechising. He used constantly to have his own family instructed every Friday in the afternoon, for a full hour together, and the younger part of his auditors every Lord's day before the evening prayer and sermon. He found catechising an excellent way "to build up souls in the most holy faith," and that none were more sound and serious Christians, than those who were well instructed in these fundamental principles. This was the way Reformation was advanced in Europe, and Christianity in the primitive days; and this will be found the principal way to keep them alive, to maintain their vigour and flourish. The first Reformers from the Popish defection laboured abundantly in this, and saw and rejoiced in the great success thereof. It is affirmed by Hegesippus, in his ecclesiastical history, "That by *virtue of catechising*, there were few nations in the world, (I think he says none) but had received an alteration in their heathenish religion within forty years after the passion of Christ." And I have read it as a usual complaint of

some Jesuits, "That they found there was but little hope of bringing back to the Romish church, or of unsettling or discomposing such Reformed Churches as were constant and serious in the use of catechising."

---

ART. X. *Home Affairs.*

MIAMI PRESBYTERY. Mr. Editor—In your October number there is a notice of a resolution passed by the Associate Presbytery of Miami, sanctioning and recommending the American Bible Society, as a proper means of distributing the scriptures. In order that the truth may be more fully known, it seems proper to note this farther representation—the resolution was passed at their meeting by a small majority. And at the semi-annual meeting, succeeding all the ministers belonging to the Presbytery being met, so many dissents were entered as to make a majority of the whole—partly, because it is conceived the notice before given is defective, and calculated to give the erroneous idea, that the majority of the members are in favor of the resolution; and partly because it may have the effect to prevent some from contributing to the Associate Synod's Society, for distributing the Bible with psalms, but chiefly because it is apprehended it may do injury to the cause of a scriptural psalmody, and a faithful testimony for all the truths of Christ, for us to give our aid to the American Bible Society, while we have easy access to a better way. I think it needful that this public statement respecting the resolution, should be laid before your readers.

Respecting the resolution on the subject of a mission to the heathen, it may not be amiss to state that there was a large minority of the ministers in the Presbytery opposed to it: Not but that they fully believe, that to all the extent of our power, we are to endeavor to send the gospel to every one of the human family; but while they do this, they are not afraid, nor unwilling to meet popular and public odium, if it be needful, by contending, that we may as effectually promote the spread of the gospel by laboring in a sphere of less notoriety; and farther, that in our circumstances, as a witnessing church for us to go into an effort at a foreign mission, is a measure fraught with serious danger.

J. W.

---

LOWER CANADA.—The following is an extract of a letter from Rev. J. P. Miller, relating to his late missionary tour in Lower Canada.

"I spent about six weeks in Lower Canada—found a number of people much concerned for a more pure dispensation of gospel ordinances than that which they have access to. I preached in different places, and organized two congregations, one at Hemmingsford, the other at Beech Ridge. In these two places (which are by the present road eighteen miles apart.) I admitted to the fellowship of the church about fifty persons. In Hemmingsford I dispensed the sacrament of the Lord's supper. Both these places are in Beauharnais county. Beech Ridge is twenty one miles from La Prairie, which is opposite to Montreal. The other place is fourteen miles west of the village of Champlain, and near the line between the United States and Lower Canada."

---

WHAT I HAVE HEARD. Mr. Editor—I have heard the societyism

of the day vindicated by many intelligent men; and again I have heard it denounced as unscriptural. I have heard a minister of the gospel in his application of a sermon preached from 2nd Chronicles xix. 2. ("And Jehu the son of Henani, the seer went out to meet him, and said to king Jehoshaphat, shouldest thou help the ungodly, and love them that hate the Lord, therefore is wrath upon thee from before the Lord,") condemn the Temperance Society, the Home Missionary Society, Anti-Slavery Society, &c. &c. At another time, I have heard the same minister, in the application of a sermon preached from Jeremiah vi. 16. ("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,") condemn in no measured terms the combinations of the day, particularly that of the Temperance cause; saying that we never hear of the great good they are doing, except through the trumpet of their own sounding; that we have no intimation of such combinations in the scripture, except it be that in Revelations xiii. 5, giving an account of the beast with seven heads and ten horns, speaking great things and blasphemies. I have heard the same minister say that an association got up to oppose and counteract Popery, was placing the business of putting down the beast into the hands of the world. I have heard it argued and that by a minister of the gospel too, that the principle of entire abstinence from intoxicating drinks, was an unscriptural principle, founding his reasoning on such scriptures as the following—Judges ix. 13. "And the vine said unto them, should I leave my wine, which cheereth God and man"—Psalm civ. 15. "And wine that maketh glad the heart of man."—Isa. lvi. 1. "Yea come buy wine."—also upon Pauls direction to Timothy, and our Saviour's example in making wine at the marriage supper. On the other side of the question, I have heard it argued, that the principle of entire abstinence had the sanction of holy writ, principally supporting the argument by Romans xiv. 21. "It is good neither to eat flesh, nor drink wine, nor any thing whereby thy brother stumbleth, or is offended, or is made weak." Proverbs xxxi. 4. "It is not for kings, O Lemuel, it is not for kings to drink wine, nor for princes strong drink"—also by the example of the Rechabites, Jer. 35. I hope for the edification of those whose minds are unsettled on these subjects, that some of your correspondents will, through the medium of the Monitor, give the principles of societyism, a full and scriptural investigation.

J. S.

**MR. BRECKENRIDGE'S LETTER.**—According to promise, we present to our readers in the present No. Mr. Breckenridge's Letter to Dr. Wardlaw. We have been astonished at the boundless praise which many of our cotemporaries have bestowed upon this letter. Viewed as a specimen of *recrimination* it is certainly well done. Dr. Wardlaw charges the American government and nation, with the sin of slavery; Mr. Breckenridge flies into a passion at this, and in a long letter shows that Great Britain herself is guilty of many such sins, as great, and even greater! This is the sum and substance of his highly extolled letter. It is entirely destitute of argument. There is nothing in it to show that the above charge made against our nation is not true. This is not even attempted. On the contrary, it seems to be admitted; for the whole tenor and drift of this long letter, amounts simply to this—**"True, we Americans are a guilty people, but you Britons are**

abundantly more so." This letter has been regarded by some, as an able defence of the character of the American nation; but, in our opinion, *recrimination* forms but a poor defence of character. After all, the letter in question is not destitute of interest, and we hope also, that it may be made useful. The description it gives of the evils tolerated by the British government, may be a means of turning the attention of British Reformers and Philanthropists to those evils, with a view to their speedy removal.

ADVERTISEMENT.—Just published, by William S. Young, No. 173, Race street, Philadelphia, the whole works of the REV. EBENEZER ERSKINE; consisting of Sermons and Discourses, on the most important and interesting subjects, with an enlarged memoir of the author, by the Rev. D. Frazer, from the London edition of 1826, in three volumes. Price from 3 25. to 5 50, varying according to paper and binding.

Any person procuring subscribers for five copies, and forwarding the money to the publishers, will be entitled to a sixth copy gratis.

To those who purchase twenty copies, or more, a discount of twenty per cent, will be made; and where five dollars, or more, are enclosed, remittances may be made at the expense of the publishers.

As the price of the work is very low, and the edition not large, subscribers and others are assured that it will not hereafter be diminished.

The Author being well known, the usual Recommendations were deemed unnecessary. The following favorable testimonials have been selected from the writings of clergymen equally eminent for literary talents and evangelical piety.

"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.*

"It is with particular pleasure the author embraces the opportunity of acknowledging his vast obligations to Mr. Erskine's Sermons on the Assurance of Faith. He wishes the reader carefully to peruse this excellent performance, in order to direct and enlarge his views of this subject."—*Rev. Archibald Hall's "Treaties on Faith."*

"Ralph and Ebenezer Erskine's works are voluminous, highly evangelical, the productions of minds strongly attached to truth, devotional, and zealous."—*Dr. Williams' "Christian Preacher."*

The Rev. Dr. Erskine, of Edinburgh, speaking of Messrs. Boston, E. Erskine, and other writers of the same class, observes, "Their evangelical strain, is, indeed, justly valued by many serious Christians, of almost all denominations."—*"Sermons, Vol. I."*

THE  
RELIGIOUS MONITOR,

AND

EVANGELICAL REPOSITORY.

---

FEBRUARY, 1837.

---

ART. I. *Adherence to a Scriptural Profession.*

“He that sweareth to his own hurt, and changeth not.” Ps. xv. 4.

In the beginning of this psalm, a very important question is asked by a serious inquirer: *Lord who shall abide in thy tabernacle, who shall dwell in thy holy hill?* It is evident, that the design of this inquiry is *not* to learn on what ground a sinner is to be accepted before God: but what it is, which affords evidence, that he is already accepted; and so prepared for waiting upon God in ordinances *here*, and in a course of preparation for dwelling with him eternally in Heaven *hereafter*. God meets the inquirer at once with an answer. He affords him suitable matter for self examination; that he may readily determine what is his true character: and among other things to this purpose, it is said in this verse, that such a person is one, *who sweareth to his own hurt and changeth not.*

Although these words are an answer to a plain practical question, and therefore might be expected to contain plain matter for self examination, yet their meaning has been either perverted, or generally overlooked.

When a few years ago, the public were awakened to the evils of freemasonry, and many of its members were led to make a disclosure of its secrets; their conduct was condemned in the bitterest language, by the devotees of that blood-stained, impious institution. They were branded as perjured persons, who having broken the oath of God, were unworthy of any confidence with men; Scripture was pressed in to confirm the decision—it was common to bring forward this passage, in proof, that *a godly man will not change though he swear to his hurt.*

This we call a miserable perversion; made no doubt for the same purpose, that the Bible is paraded in front of masonic processions—to impose upon the ignorant. If the spirit of inspiration ever designed to exhibit *this* as a mark of christian character—the fidelity with which a man observed his masonic oaths and obligations—then some of the most desperate ruffians, and profane infidels might with confidence lay claim to this sacred character. But before the advocates of free-ma-

sonry can avail themselves of this text; there is a small matter which *they* may overlook, yet which those who do not set a very high estimate on their institution, must insist upon their noticing, that is, this verse speaks *only* of such swearing as is *lawful*. If involved in an unlawful oath, it is not the keeping of it which is matter of duty, but repenting of our sin, washing our hands from all connection with it, and doing away any injury we may have inflicted upon society, by frankly acknowledging its evil tendencies. Unless therefore the masonic oaths and obligations are lawful, it would be just as proper to bring forward this text, to prove that Herod was bound by his oath, to take off the head of John the Baptist; or that those forty Jews were bound by their oath to kill Paul; or that David was bound by *his* oath to cut off Nabal and his house, though he blesses the Lord for preventing him, (see 1 Saml. xv. 22, also 32 and 33:) or that the undutiful son mentioned by Christ, who dedicated to sacred purposes, what should have gone to the support of his aged parents, was bound by his oath or vow, to withhold it from them—as to bring it forward to prove that a man is bound by his masonic oaths, to make no disclosure of the nature, the design, or acts of the institution. Let its advocates then prove that its oaths *are* lawful; until this is done, it must be an imposition upon the ignorant, to pretend to prove from this passage, that those who have divulged their secrets, have violated any moral duty. But instead of proof, all that has hitherto come from this quarter is bare assertion: “free-masonry is an ancient institution,” “it is a harmless thing,” “it is a charitable institution.” It makes us a little cautious in receiving these assertions, when we remember, that the supporters of the man of sin have said similar things, concerning *their mystery of iniquity*. “The Roman Catholic is an ancient religion,” “the inquisition is a harmless thing,” “Jesuitism is a well meaning institution.” *Every one that doeth evil hateth the light, neither cometh to the light, lest his deeds should be reproved.*

But dismissing this as a gross perversion of the word of God, we may notice the sense in which this passage is commonly understood, which is: that such is the solemn nature of an oath to a godly man, that though he should swear, to do that which might afterwards be attended with civil or pecuniary loss or hurt, yet he will not change, but faithfully perform his oath. It must be acknowledged that *this*, unlike the former application of the passage, contains a truth; yet we much question, whether this is *exclusively*, or even *principally* meant, as the mark here laid down of a godly character. For if so, it would be useless to a vast majority of Christians: perhaps not one in ten thousand ever took such an oath. Of what use could it be then to call upon all going up to the holy hill and tabernacle of the most high, to try themselves by a *mark*, which (where oaths are not improperly taken,) must be of such remarkable rare occurrence? But those to whom this portion of the inspired word was first given, would have no difficulty in understanding what the psalmist here intended by *swearing*, neither would *we*, were it not that a fashionable dislike of some peculiar features of divine ordinances, has led us to overlook the language in which they are set forth.

Making a public profession of religion, is in scripture called *swearing*: because we therein appeal to the great searcher of hearts, to witness our sincerity in receiving and resolving to adhere to the truth, as it is in Jesus, to the end of our lives—this as really and as solemnly, as if there was superadded *the form* of lifting up the hand to Heaven, and

swearing by Him, that liveth for ever and ever. Quotations of this use of the word might be multiplied: let a few suffice, Deut. vi. 13. Thou shalt fear the Lord thy God, and serve him, and *swear* by his name:” Jer. v. 2. “And though they say the Lord liveth, yet they *swear* falsely:” and 7th ver. “Their children have forsaken me, and *sworn* by them that are no gods,” that is, they have renounced their profession of the true religion, and professed idolatry: Isaiah xlv. 23, 24. “Unto me every knee shall bow, and every tongue shall *swear*. Surely shall one say, in the Lord have I righteousness and strength.” And the Apostle Paul in quoting this passage, Romans xiv. 11, instead of *swear*, uses the word *confess* or *profess*, which he must therefore have considered of the same signification. Some may consider that these and similar passages speak of public, solemn covenanting. This is no doubt correct. Making a profession, and covenanting, although distinct ordinances are inseparably connected. They are like the ordinances of prayer and praise, *distinct*, but *inseparable*. We cannot pray without praise, nor can we praise without prayer; neither can we make a profession without covenanting, nor can we covenant without making a profession; and by the way, those who deny that public covenanting is a distinct ordinance in New Testament times, *because* a profession answers every purpose, ought in a consistency with this mode of reasoning, to deny that praise is a *distinct* ordinance: for we have prayer, it might be said, and prayer answers every purpose of praise: the argument would be just as conclusive in the one case as in the other.

We see then, that the language here used by the psalmist, would be easily understood by every Israelite. Though not one in ten thousand of them perhaps had ever taken such an oath to man, as would turn out to their pecuniary or civil hurt, they had all sworn to the Lord, by professing the true religion; and in maintaining this profession with steadfastness, and performing its duties with fidelity, they might in various ways be exposed to *hurt* in the world. Hence, every time that they ascended the hill of the Lord, each one might put this trying question to himself, how do I stand to my profession, amidst the various temptations to change to looseness, and unfaithfulness, which are daily thrown in my way? And this same *mark* is just as suitable for self-examination now, as it was in the days of David—*All that will live godly in Christ Jesus shall suffer persecution*. They must be exposed to *hurt* in various ways, in adhering and carrying out into practice, the profession of the *truth* which they have made; and in these days of change, when steadfastness has become a reproach, and the sacred obligations of a profession are either forgotten or disregarded, we consider that this passage affords very suitable matter for instruction and self examination. We have seen that making a public profession of religion, is in scripture called *swearing* to the Lord; and if entered into aright, it is as solemn a matter yet, as it ever was, and may properly be called by that name; therefore it follows, that a man is as much bound to adhere to the *truth* which he professes, as he is to declare the *truth* under oath—a departure in the one case is perjury, as well as in the other, yea a more aggravated species of perjury—nothing prevents us from seeing this, but that the world thinks otherwise.

What is here said, applies only to a scriptural profession. We are to *swear in truth, in judgment, and in righteousness*. We should not enter into a profession in such a careless manner, as we fear is common, but with prayerful deliberation, and a careful comparison of it with the



law and the testimony. We should not embrace such a profession as is fashionable in the world, or such as we expect to sit easiest upon our shoulders—but such as is most agreeable to this standard. If then we have entered into such a profession, believing in judgment and in righteousness, that it is agreeable to the word of God; according to the character here given of the godly man, we will not *change* from it, whatever *hurt* we may be exposed to, on account of it. Our views remaining unchanged concerning its scriptural character, there is no earthly reason, no circumstances which human ingenuity can devise, that will form an excuse for relinquishing it—such conduct would be as inexcusable as *perjury*. This is the truth of God, and how should it put to shame many who lay claim to the christian character, while they unblushingly act in violation of the *mark* here laid down by the spirit of inspiration, and *change* from what they have *sworn*, for no other reason than the personal *hurt*, to which they have been exposed.

Thus for example, one *changes* because he cannot conveniently attend upon ordinances, where dispensed agreeable to his profession, while by *changing* somewhat, he may have them at his own door, and so be saved of all this kind of *hurt*. This was one cause of that extensive *change* which took place in the reign of Jeroboam, from the worship of the true God, to that of the calves, at Dan and Bethel.

Another *changes*, because the congregation or branch of the church with which he has been connected is small and despised—the support of a gospel ministry is therefore burdensome; and after all, no credit nor worldly profit in continuing with them; but by *changing* somewhat he can be saved from this kind of *hurt*, and even turn his profession to a good account, in advancing his credit and interest.

Another *changes*, because he is exposed to some *hurt*, in carrying out his profession into practice, such as observing fast days, attending to family worship, &c.—when interfering with the eager pursuit of worldly business—or perhaps a lucrative employment is offered in some of our post offices, canals, or rail roads, at the expense though of violating, or hiring others to violate the Lord's day—by *changing* somewhat he can be saved from this kind of *hurt* too—either by joining a branch of the church, which tolerates such things, or dropping a profession altogether.

Another *changes*, because his feelings are *hurt*, by the reproaches and contempt cast upon a scriptural profession, by the world and false brethren, and in this way the most sacred duties are treated. Thus when we are urged by such characters, to hear the instruction which causeth to err; or otherwise to have fellowship with the unstable and erroneous; if a refusal is given, the reply generally is; ah, you dare not; you are *sworn* against it. Yes, we are *sworn* against it, and he who regards his oath *will*, instead of being ashamed of it, like the Apostle Paul, glory in his bonds. But many cannot bear this kind of *hurt*, they either forsake their profession, or drop its distinguishing character.

But it would be endless to enumerate the various ways in which we may be exposed to *hurt*. in adhering to, and carrying out our profession into practice. And what a trifling *hurt* is often sufficient to cause the unstable and wavering, to renounce the good profession which they once made? As Christ says of the stony ground hearers: because they have no root in themselves, as soon as persecution or tribulation ariseth, because of the word's sake, by and by, they are offended.

But the godly man will not *change*, though to his *hurt* he *swear*. He regards the oath of God, which is upon him—he regards the truth of

God, having a sweet experience of its excellency—he regards the praise of God more than the praise of men; and he regards the hidden manna of which he now eats, and that inheritance which he hopes to enjoy, as ample compensation, for any *hurt* to which he may be exposed, in adhering to Christ in the world.

Reader hast thou made such a profession? Every time thou ascendest into the hill of the Lord, examine thyself, as to the consistency and firmness, with which thou art adhering to it, when exposed to *hurt* in the world.

R.

---

ART. II. *The Scriptural Manner of Almsgiving.*

This age has been boasted of as that of change and improvement. The same spirit that influences many in the common arts, seems to have excited others in the matters of religion. Indeed, it has been asserted by some of the patrons of “new measures” in divinity, that the same tedious process in converting the soul, is not needed as in former times, but that as great improvements have been effected of late in the church as outwardly in the world.

It is to be hoped that the members of our communion, being not only in name, but in the account of other denominations, “Seceders,” are not led away by such foolish and delusive doctrines, knowing that the work of grace is compared to that of nature in scripture, and that the works of nature never change, but we still see, “first the blade, then the ear, after that the full corn in the ear.” Yet as the children of Israel mingled with the heathen and learned of them their way, there is a danger of being led astray by the abounding novelties of the day, surrounded as we are by those who make it their occupation “either to tell or to hear some new thing.”

The charitable societies of our age are regarded by many as novelties, and improvements, far surpassing any thing of former times. Some of our connection have been led into their support, and it may be questioned, if they have not done well, while deprived of any other opportunity of honoring the Lord with their substance. Still, it may be well to inquire, if there is not a “more excellent way,” especially when we see, after considerable experience, that some of these societies are the instruments of vast evil, and others productive of no good, by the counteracting of divine providence, and the withholding of the blessing. Have we not seen Bible Societies corrupt the word of God by the circulation of the Apocrypha along with the Holy Scriptures? If this error have been corrected, is there not now just ground to fear that the sense has been most dreadfully perverted in many of the new translations, when it is found, that the Anabaptist heresy has been endeavored to be propagated by such means, tending to destroy all respect for the Old Testament as an authoratative revelation to Christians, and unsettling or razing the whole foundations of our faith? Have we not found that an expensive system of hired management and agency, has, in many cases, nearly absorbed the streams of christian charity, and generally been the means for the dissemination of error and the propagation of heresy throughout the land? If such considerations have led

many to withdraw their support from some of the most popular institutions of the time, and seem to be bringing every denomination of christians to confine their contributions to the support of the schemes that are patronized and managed by their own sects, may it not become us well to inquire what rule the scriptures give us for direction in such cases, and to see if we are all acting in conformity to it, doing nothing without a "Thus saith the Lord," for our authority, and not refusing to perform any duty which he has commanded?

If we find our warrant for the use of the Scripture Psalms, from their introduction into the worship of the Old Testament Church under divine direction, their being approved and employed by our Saviour in his bringing in the New Testament Dispensation, and their command to be sung by all christians from an inspired Apostle, surely, similar duties, equally authorized, must be incumbent upon us. Our divines of the Reformation seem to have been at no loss in thus interpreting our warrant for charitable contributions upon the Sabbath. In their systems of divinity, in treating of the duties to be performed on the Sabbath, few of them fail to mention our works of charity. The same is distinctly specified in the Standards of our Church, drawn up by the Westminster Assembly, and received by the Church of Scotland.

In spite of all these facts—the information which some have of the ancient systems of divinity, and the zeal which they manifest in other instances for the Larger Catechism and Directory of Worship—we have heard of some, in those congregations where this duty is unhappily neglected for ordinary, contend against it, and, exhibiting a righteousness exceeding that of the scribes and pharisees, refuse to handle money upon the Sabbath. Such conduct seems to be countenanced by the impression under which some labor, that our charitable contributions on the Sabbath, ought to be applied only for the relief of the poor; and in a country, where the ameliorating spirit of the gospel has so far prevailed in our legislation as to make a legal support for the poor impetuous on the community, it is thought, that our Christian Almsgiving may be superseded. But though the poor were to cease out of the land, or though they were all amply provided for by the State, we will find that there are other objects to which our charity ought to extend.

In the time of Joash, when this mode of offering was introduced, and in that of Josiah, when it was revived, the money thus raised was applied to the repair of the temple. After the return from Babylon the Jews continued the custom, and their writers call the chest into which their offerings were put the "box of righteousness," and its contents were said to be applied, not only for the relief of the poor, but also for the purchase of salt for burnt-offerings, and for the defrayment of such other expense connected with their worship as had no other provision. When we find that our Lord approved of this mode of offering in his commendation of the poor widow, when we find it enjoined upon the Corinthians "with all that in every place call upon our Lord Jesus Christ," as well as it was enjoined upon the Apostle Paul himself by his brethren in the apostleship when receiving from them the right hand of fellowship, and by him upon the churches of Galatia, it is a duty the observance of which we may well conclude, we cannot evade without the neglect or contempt of a divine ordinance.

If there are no poor among us, needing our christian sympathy, in the "way of giving and receiving," if we had such funds by the observance of this duty, objects of charity might, perhaps, be found among

our neighbors, without our needing to send so far, as the pious Corinthians or Macedonians did, when sending to Jerusalem. If a secret society which long existed, but only within a hundred years past, relieved its poor, who had formerly contributed to its funds, if sinners thus love sinners, and boast of their charity, as a cloak and excuse for their wickedness, how much would the gospel of Christ again be recommended by the zealous endeavors of christians, in the performance of this duty? But though there might be found no temporal suffering to relieve, within the bounds of our knowledge and effective charity, it is a peculiar recommendation of the gospel, that it is preached to the poor, and viewing the spiritual want of the world, there is field enough for occupancy and labor. There are weak congregations of our own denomination, that might thus be assisted; there are many seeking the ordinances of grace from us, with a feeble cry, by reason of the inadequate return, which they can make in temporal things. By supplying such wants, it might be hoped, that the blessing of many "that are ready to perish, would come upon us."

From one quarter of our church, we hear much of a desire to send a Missionary into some foreign distant field of labor. Without inquiring whether the conversion of a Chinese, would be more glorifying to God than that of one of the multitudes around us, being in error by the perverse teaching of corrupted men, or left in ignorance by the neglect of all; without inquiring, if there is not something like a cry from the "man of Macedonia," from our accessible neighborhoods, which are still neglected, and something like the prohibition of the spirit, not suffering to enter into Bythinia, in the difficulties and want of success, which many missionaries have in foreign stations; it becomes us to see if we have embraced the scriptural method for supporting what we have already undertaken, and if we may expect the divine blessing by acting according to his direction, and waiting on his time.

There seems then to be "utterly a fault" among us, that in so many of our country congregations, the solemn duty of charitable collection is neglected on the first day of the week. It is a duty which is left to the conscience of each, when he is to lay by himself apart from his common stock, and to treasure it up with the rest of the Lord's people. It is a tribute of praise in temporal things, which God would have from all. It seems a proper acknowledgment of the Lord's goodness in past provision, and a trusting to him for future supply. It is a duty from which none are excused, but must be performed according to the measure of our success, whether by giving much or little, whether constantly, or occasionally, when we cannot always. A duty may be omitted through necessity, but it must not be neglected through contempt.

It may not be seemly for Ministers to talk much of money-matters; but religion takes cognizance of all our concerns; and while "money answereth all things," it is profitable in the worship of God, as well as in the business of the world. It is not money itself, but the love of it, which is "the root of all evil." The commendation then which some ministers have had, for never mentioning it in the pulpit, seems very doubtful praise, especially when it is known, that in such a case, avarice may be increasing among the flock; and in such a rate, in one instance of this kind, it is recorded, that the chief manager of the salary, claimed the legal allowance, as a recompence for his service in the holy thing.

Here then, where so many calls are made upon us, for the performing

of our alms, in the manner which our Saviour reprov'd; when there are so many societies that publish their list of benefactors, and blazon their names and offerings on the pages of their reports; while so much is expended on a system of management, which, in most cases gives the most crafty and designing an advantage over the more simple and sincere; here let us set forth the scriptural duty of honoring the Lord with our substance, and hallowing all to him, by the consecration of a part on the first day of the week. Here a fund may be provided for necessary repairs and accommodation in our places of meeting; for the relief of poor saints, if such be held in captivity or slavery, or oppressed with poverty; for the sending of the word of God, or the Messengers of salvation to those that ask and need: and from the choice of our managers, the same as those to whom we confine the management of our other church concerns, we may hope for faithfulness, and that their zeal will lead to such expenditure as will be most advantageous to the cause of religion and the glory of God.

Surely it becomes all to consider their ways in this respect. Those that have been in the habit of thus consecrating their substance, should reflect if they have done it from mere custom as a tradition from the fathers, or from such motives as God requires. Those who have neglected it ought to bear in mind, that if from the necessity of the times, amidst the early settlement of a new country, this duty could hardly be practised through the scarcity of money, no such excuse remains now amidst the unexampled prosperity which this land enjoys, and the wise provision which our rulers have made of returning to the more common use of the precious metals divinely sanctioned by scriptural example, as the circulating medium of the world. If we reproach others justly for departing in doctrine from the standards of the church, let us see that we no longer do so in practice by the neglect of this duty. If we regard the sneers or censures of the world, as holding in this to "weak and beggarly elements," as displaying conduct unworthy of the age, let us remember that we have the divine call and warrant, and the "foolishness of God" will be found "wiser than men, and the weakness of God stronger than men;" that thus the rills of christian charity collected in the noiseless offerings of the saints, descending like the drops of rain from each congregation that is ready to "consecrate unto the Lord this service," when all united, shall become a mighty river of blessing, breaking forth from the threshold of the temple, watering all the earth.

FINIS.

---

### ART. III. *The Deceitfulness of Riches Choaking the Word.*

Our Lord instructs us, that there is but one right way of attending on gospel ordinances, that represented by the good seed in the good ground; they who in honest and good hearts receive it with faith and love, and practice it in their lives. But there are many wrong ways; many ways in which men may deceive themselves and others, and finally miss the great object to be sought, the salvation of their souls. There is the wayside hearer, the careless, irregular, and forgetful hearer; who goes away, and quickly loses the precious treasure that had been put into his hand, because he took no pains to lay it up in his heart.

There is the stony ground hearer, the hasty convert, and superficial student of divine things, who being ignorant of his own ignorance, thinks himself far advanced, and begins with great zeal, but not having counted the cost, he is not able to finish. Then there is the thorny hearer, as he may be called, he who hears, and may have a considerable understanding, and correct judgment of the truth; but he is so encumbered with the things of the world, that he can make little or no progress in religion. "The cares of this life and the deceitfulness of riches, choke the word, that it becometh unfruitful." Now it is to be observed, that all these classes of hearers are regularly, each, one step higher than another; the wayside class take no hold or interest in the word whatever, and therefore make no profession of religion whatever, the seed never sprung at all, so as to appear above ground; the stony ground hearer advanced one step farther, and took some kind of hold of the truth, and made a corresponding profession; those among thorns went still one step farther, and it is supposed that they had really the root of the matter in them, the good seed sprung up, and though the thorns choked it, yet they did not kill it; it still lived, but was not lively, strong or flourishing, it became *unfruitful*. These make a profession, and may continue in it, they may even be real believers, but the features of the carnal man are so very prominent, that the image of Christ can scarcely be discovered in them at all. This is an exceedingly evil and dangerous case, and while it may include both the wayside and stony ground hearer, we see that real believers may also fall into it; and indeed any one who will seriously consider the spirit and practice of professors, must be convinced that it is lamentably prevalent in the church at the present day. I propose therefore to endeavor to open up the nature of this evil a little, in the few following remarks.

The subject presents two points of inquiry. First, wherein consists this deceitfulness of riches? Secondly, how does it choke the word?

In speaking to the first of these, we might observe in general, that there is no deceitfulness, properly speaking, in riches themselves, the deceit is in the heart of man, and with the great deceiver of men; but it is acted so frequently, so successfully, and in such a variety of forms, by means of worldly riches, that the phrase, "the deceitfulness of riches" is very expressive. More particularly then I observe,

1st. There is a great deception as to the subjects of this evil. The poor are apt to think they cannot be in danger of it, because they have no riches, but here is a mistake, for the evil is not limited to any particular quantity of worldly possessions, or indeed to possession at all, but has its root in the frame and temper of the mind towards these things. To be rich, is a very indefinite expression, depending altogether on the imagination of him who is said to be rich, or of those who think him so. He who has nothing, thinks if he had the thousands which his neighbor possesses, he would be very rich, whereas that same neighbor finds he has need for it all, and looks as far above him as the other did, for the place of riches. If he who has always been poor, should by some occurrence obtain a few hundreds, he may experience all the benefits of riches, sense of abundance, satisfaction and the like, or all the evils of riches, as pride, ambition, love of the world. &c. as fully as he who has all his life been familiar with thousands. Even those who have nothing are not exempt from this danger: when they employ their minds unduly in schemes for the obtaining of riches, when they look enviously on the abundance of the rich, when they yield to discontent with the low circumstances in

which God has placed them, when they picture to themselves some particular degree of wealth, as the place of happiness, and the object of their pursuit, and in many other ways they may show that they are as deeply infested with the disease, as the miser who cannot have his treasure removed from his sight.

2d. There is a great deception as to the extent of this danger. On the one hand it is admitted as a duty, to be diligent in business, as well as fervent in spirit, to provide things honest in the sight of all men, to labor, working with the hands the thing that is good, not only so as to meet our own necessity, but that we may have to give to him that needeth, and it is a mark of a godly man, to guide his wordly affairs with descretion. On the other hand any man of sound judgment will admit that excessive application to wordly business, or undue anxiety, or too much thought about wordly things, is sinful and dangerous, that covetousness is a direct breach of the divine law, &c; but the line between the duty and the sin, is not so easily discovered, and men are often far beyond it before they are any thing aware of it. It is quite a common estimate to look on all those employments that are counted lawful between man and man, as not liable to objection here; and as to the degree of application to such employments, the greater, the more commendable, provided the express letter of the law is not violated; but if we will measure by our Lord's standard, we must make very many exceptions. In the carrying on of business, it is found that as the scale is extended, the labor is proportionably diminished, and the profits increased, therefore it is often thought wise to do so, even by incurring so much debt; this is wordly wisdom; but in more correct terms, such a man is carried beyond the line of duty, by the deceitfulness of riches: when men enlarge their business unnecessarily, either from a love to business itself, or from the mere desire of gain, they are sinful in love with the world; because otherwise engaged with it, than as a means of life, which is its proper use. Whenever a man's business leads him to violate any of God's precepts, either in letter or in spirit, he may be sure he is deceived by a sinful desire of the world. For instance, though it is considered most reasonable, that a man should take his produce to the best market, yet if that market be such a distance, that he must encroach upon the Sabbath, in making his business there, it is plain that he is drawn by the deceitfulness of riches into a snare, for God never calls any of his people to such a station, or marks out any man's lot so that he must necessarily trample on the ordinances of his grace, or neglect them, (I speak now of those who act reluctantly,) it would be inconsistent. The same may be said of those who leave the place of ordinances and religious society, removing to new countries that they may more easily obtain possessions, though this is so common, that it is considered not only lawful but commendable. When men have so much love for gain, that they can have none for the good of their fellow-men by their business, they are without doubt entangled by the deceitfulness of riches. When men make the acquisition of worldly things their first object, whether they pursue it more or less eagerly they are in the same case; for this is directly contrary to the Lord's direction "seek ye first the kingdom of heaven and his righteousness." Finally, Whatever is not consistent with contentment even in the temper of the mind, proceeds from this deceitful and sinful love of riches, "Let your conversation be without covetousness and be content with such things as ye have." The apostle makes no medium between contentment and covetousness.

3d. There is a great deceitfulness in the promises and prospects that riches seem to hold out to those that are pursuing them. These prospects vary according to the particular course in which the man seeks his object. Those who look on some particular degree of wealth, (perhaps not the most extravagant,) as their object, readily think that it is within their reach, and will afford them contentment, but they may be many ways deceived in this; they may labor all their days and never reach it, they may not know when they have reached it; and to a certainty happiness will not be found to have its abode at any degree of wealth; very often the desires enlarge as fast as possessions and keep the man still at the same distance from his object; very often cares and troubles are found attending such a measure of wealth, which did not at all appear when looked at from a distance, so that the pursuer finds himself even further behind than he was; and in many other ways are they deceived. Those who point out no particular measure of wealth to themselves, as their resting place, but indefinitely, that at some future period they will retire and enjoy the fruits of their industry in peace; and in the mean time they enlarge the scale of business, or apply to it with the utmost diligence, so as to hasten the desired period—O! how often and how miserably are they deceived! The desire of enlarging the scale of business, is of a growing nature, and care, and charge, and bustle increase with it; and “when goods are increased, they are increased that eat them;” and he who imagines himself master and owner of all, is in fact the servant of all. And in a word the deceitfulness of this plan cannot be better illustrated than is done in our Lord’s parable of him, whose grounds produced abundantly, and who thought of enlarging his scale of business, by pulling down his barns and building greater, and who by and by would retire from business and say to his soul, “take thine ease,”—but God said to him, “thou fool this night shall thy soul be required of thee.” O what a soul ruining deception was he under! and all they also who follow him. Those who are allured by the prospect of riches, by emigrating to new countries, very often draw such a picture to themselves as the following: That their funds, which are comparatively small in an older settlement, would readily procure a greater portion of land in a better soil; where they could raise their livelihood with less labor, and could scarcely fail of becoming independent in a short time. And if they have families, they can also settle them around them with the same good prospects; and then they promise themselves contentment.

But they often find their scheme so defective, as to prove wholly a deception. They may no doubt find rich soil, on easy terms of purchase; but perhaps no health on it, and that would counterbalance many advantages, and would at once mar the beauty of the picture they had drawn. In respect of society also, they often find a matter of grievance they had not thought of; many of the conveniences of life are wanting and their want severely felt; very generally they find themselves overwhelmed by a multitude of heavy labors that must be performed, before they can begin to live with any comfort, and it requires all their days to fight through them; and not uncommonly their family instead of settling around, are actuated by the same motives that brought them there, and proceed to some other region which is said to be far superior. So that when all things are fairly balanced, one against another, the advantage is small and their fine prospects vanish. I have been more particular on this point, because this spirit of emigration is the raging epidemic of the present day.



4th. There is a deceitfulness with the possession of riches also, to engross and fasten the affections. In order to be successful in business there must be such a close attention, and such a persevering study of the principles and method of money-making, that by the time riches are acquired, the mind has taken such a bent towards these things, that the man does not himself know how much he loves them; he is not happy unless engaged in them one way or other; that is the subject he can converse on, with fluency and acuteness beyond all others. By the same deceit also, is the practice of some strongly marked. Men of wealth are very apt to feel the advantage they have over others, and to improve it, and by experience they have acquired such skill and sharpness in dealing as often to come very near to fraud and extortion, without their observing it; (I speak now of those who are not wholly devoted to the world.) The possession of riches will also imperceptibly nourish vanity, pride, luxury, self-sufficiency, and the like.

5th. There is one other deceitfulness of riches to the possessor, as to their durability. There is a proneness in the natural heart to trust and rest in riches, at least for temporal maintainance and comfort; and circumstances are often such as would seem to warrant some confidence; a man's possessions may be such that it would seem very improbable that he should ever consume them. Yet at best and at most, they are but "uncertain riches"—"Treasures that moth and rust may corrupt, and thieves break through and steal"—liable to all the various and unavoidable reverses incident to human affairs; neither is it possible for any man to secure himself against these. It is related of Archbishop Adamson, that he used to boast, that he was certain of these three things never failing him, his learning, his riches, and the king's favor. Yet the loss of these was almost the first thing that befel him, so that he was shortly reduced to utter want. Such examples may also be found in every age. When riches seem most secure, they take to themselves wings and fly away as an eagle towards heaven.

[To be continued.]

---

#### ART. IV. *Brief Exposition of Important Texts.*

"Praise the Lord, praise him with the sound of the trumpet; praise him with the psaltery and harp." Psalm cl. 1, 5.

"And I heard a voice from Heaven as the voice of many waters, and as the voice of a great thunder; and I heard the voice of harpers, harping with their harps." Rev. xiv. 2.

Perhaps there are few objections, to the use of the scripture psalms, more common amongst the advocates of a human psalmody, than the one drawn from verses similar to that in the psalm quoted above. It is urged that the Psalms of David were written to suit the Old Testament Church, and therefore unfit now to be sung; that we cannot now offer sacrifices, nor call upon one another to praise the Lord with the harp and psaltery and cymbals, since sacrifices are abolished, and the use of instrumental music was peculiar to the Old Testament worship. This I believe is the substance of the objection; and it is principally for the purpose of answering it, that I have quoted in connexion the passage in the book of Revelation. Indeed with this reference to the use of images drawn from the temple worship, as not inconsistent with the views and worship of new Testament saints, I might leave the passages

to explain each other. It may be well however, to consider the objection more at large.

1. And first, in answering it, I might call the objectors to place it by the side of the solemn declaration of Jehovah by his servant Paul. "*Whatsoever things were written aforetime were written for our learning, that we through patience and comfort of the scriptures might have hope.*" (Rom. xv. 4.) As if the Apostle under divine guidance, had designed then, and throughout all ages, to answer and silence forever all such objections as we are now considering; after quoting the ninth verse of the sixty-ninth psalm, as referring not to David, but to the Messiah, he thus asserts, that the whole book of revelation was written for us; written to be received and used by us, in the way, and for the express purpose for which Jehovah gave and instituted it as the guide of his church. The inspired penman does not say, that in reading or singing this psalm, "our lips speak nothing but the heart of David"; but that it was written of, and refers to Christ; yea and that all the scriptures of the Old Testament, whether they typified the sufferings, or predicted the glory of the Redeemer, or call upon us to serve and praise the Lord, were written for our instruction and consolation.

2. This objection to the singing of these divine songs would take away from the use of the church, the whole of the Old Testament. If on account of these references to the temple service, the psalms themselves should not be sung, then *neither should they be read*. We should read with as much reverence and awe the word of God, as we sing it. It is the voice of God that addresses us, and we are bound as really to make every word our own, and apply it to ourselves, when it is read, as when it is sung. Of course this objection, in its spirit and its tendency, would make the greatest portion of the word of God a sealed book to the church. Then no ministers in the pulpit, no master of a family, must presume to read in God's worship, what is written in Moses, the Psalms and the prophets; because they were penned to suit, and adapted to the peculiarities of the Old Testament church. True, instrumental music was peculiar to that church, and is now abrogated. This is evident from its being peculiar to the temple-worship, its typical signification, and its entire omission by Christ and his Apostles in the primitive church. Instrumental music was never used by Christ or his disciples, nor enjoined as a religious observance on the church. The singing of these psalms however, was both practised and enjoined by Jesus and the apostles, acting under His divine inspiration. (Mark xiv. 26. Acts xvi. 25. Eph. v. 19. Col. iii. 16. James v. 13.) This practice then of Christ and his apostles, which has in it all the force of a positive institution; the original appointment, which has never been repealed; and the divinely sanctioned use of these sacred songs, all unite in proclaiming, that their use is binding on the church now, and till her glorious head either audibly forbids their use, or till he opens his heavens, and proclaims, that time shall be no longer. How absurd then, in the face of this divine warrant, and these divine examples, to urge, that because the music to which these sacred songs were once set, and the instruments, by which they were once sung, are done away, that therefore, the psalms themselves should not be used, or that it is improper either to sing or read words and expressions in these psalms, that have a peculiar reference to the instrumental music of the temple service? Do the objectors indeed not know, that a typical and spiritual meaning is couched under them? Do they really think, that these words and expressions, "praise Him with the sound of the trumpet; praise Him upon the loud cymbals,"—refer

to nothing but abrogated rites of the ceremonial law, and that the church of God has nothing more to do with these, his psalms and words, than if they were blotted forever from the Bible? Is it not evident from Eph. v. 19. Col. iii. 10, and other passages, that in reference to the use of instrumental music in the former dispensation, we are now commanded to *make melody in our hearts* to the Lord; and that the timbrel, the harp, the psaltry and cymbal, with which we are commanded to praise the Lord, *typify* that holy joy, and those enraptured feelings of gratitude and love, with which, in these His own words, we are to sing Jehovah's praise?

3. This sacred book of psalms and hymns, and spiritual songs was, as its very title proves, given to the church to be sung. Now it would be as sinless to object to the style of the books of Moses and the prophets, and the blasphemy would be just as excusable, which would attempt to blot out from the whole Bible, all reference to the temple worship, as to attempt to exclude on this account, any portion of the book of psalms, from that use in the church, for which it was expressly given. In the book of Revelation, and especially in the Epistle to the Hebrews, the duties incumbent upon us, and the blessed privileges to which we are looking forward, are described in language borrowed from the Old Testament dispensation. Who does not know, that in the New Testament, the tribes of Israel are often referred to as denoting not the natural posterity of Jacob, but the church—the true Israel of God? How often are Jerusalem and Zion, used to designate the church? And is this too Jewish, and does it savor too much of the ceremonial dispensation to suit christian lips? How often are believers termed “the circumcision,” because renewed and changed in heart: “the seed of Abraham,” because they possess the same faith, trust in the same Saviour, and look forward to the same Heaven? And because the New Testament is thus full of images drawn from the Jewish temple and worship, must it also, on this account be changed? Again, when in the New Testament, Christ is said to be “our passover sacrificed for us,” to stand before the throne “a Lamb as it had been slain,” are we to understand it literally? When He is said as our High Priest, to have entered into the holy place with His own blood, are we to understand it literally? Is the “blood of sprinkling,” the blood of the mediator of the new covenant, through which alone we can come before God, the Judge of all, and stand unconsumed, the material blood shed on the cross? And is the Mount Zion, where Jehovah reigns, the literal Mount Zion in the land of Judah? We read of an altar *in Heaven*, of a golden censer, of incense offered, of the ark of the Testament in the temple of Heaven, of harpers harping with their harps before the throne. Now, must we suppose a *material* harp, a material censer, and incense and ark; and that the Son of God really appears in the outward form of a Lamb that was slain in the world of glory, or, that these passages are so Jewish, as to be unsuitable to the condition of the New Testament church? Does not every believer in reading these expressions, attach to them a spiritual meaning? Does he not view them as symbolical of gospel subjects? and if in one case, why not in another? If the altar, and temple, and sacrifices, and incense, and harps are to be viewed as typical of evangelical truths, when found in Hebrews and the Revelation; why not when found in the book of Psalms? These very references to the worship of our elder brethren, should endear the inspired songs to our hearts. Should we not love to take up in our lips, the very words which saints and martyrs sung with

delight; those very hymns which Heaven was opened to reveal to the church, and God the Spirit spake for the "learning" of all generations, by his inspired servants? Does it not give a sweet and holy delight to the heart, to think that we are singing the very words which God gave from Heaven; which our elder brethren sung; which once dwelt on the lips of our suffering and dying Redeemer: which inspired apostles did not deem unsuitable for christian worship; and which, as the promises and praises of the living God, have dwelt on the lips, and filled with rapture the hearts of his people in every age? And must we now be told that *expressions* typical of that holy joy, and grace with which we should praise the Lord, and which the Jews themselves viewed as intended principally to intimate, that every power of the soul should be stirred up, and employed in Jehovah's service, render these psalms unfit to be sung? These expressions and psalms were all given by the God of wisdom to the church, as a system of praise. His seal is upon them all. It has never been cancelled, and there can be neither sin, nor falsehood, nor danger, in the right use of words He has given us; while there may be danger, fearful danger, in opposing or slighting them. We have seen the spirit and tendency of the objection under consideration, and may we not in view of its sinfulness say: let no one repeat it as an objection to the use of these inspired psalms, till he is willing to tear from the sacred records, the whole of the *Old Testament*, which Jesus has commanded every age to search, as testifying of Him: let him not, till he is willing to blot out of the *New Testament*, all and every reference to the temple service, breathe a single objection to the psalms on this account: let him not, till he is willing to say, that the psalms on account of these expressions, are not fit to be read, say that they are improper on this account to be sung: let him not, till he is willing to say, that the *services of Heaven*, with its temple, and altar, and censer, and incense, and ark, are too full of ceremonial rites and references, *to suit the christian church*: let him not, till he is willing to say, that the *worship of Heaven*, with its "harpers harping with their harps" is *too Jewish for him*, reproach on this account the book of Psalms: and till then, let us not be blamed for laboring, and praying, that the time may soon come, when these psalms, and hymns, and spiritual songs of God the Spirit, shall be preferred by all the professed followers of the Lamb, to the imperfect and polluted hymns of men: when all shall feel, that every psalm, and every verse of every psalm is a lesson, and a message of mercy to his soul, from the Eternal: when all shall reverence these psalms as the voice of their judge; and tremble to utter a single reproach against this, or any portion of God's word, which they would shudder to think of uttering, if standing immediately before His throne: when all shall deem it an unspeakable privilege, amid the confusion and error, with which the multitude of human hymn books have filled the church, to be able to drink at a pure fountain, and rest the soul on songs of praise, which alone possess the seal of infinite wisdom, and which alone have any right to the superscription written over them by the finger of God, *the book of psalms*: when he shall turn all people to this "pure language, that they may all call upon the name of the Lord, to save him with one consent."

---

"Salute one another with an holy kiss." Rom. xvi. 16.

"Ye also ought to wash one another's feet." John xiii. 14.

These injunctions were given in reference to the customs of eastern countries. Thus the injunction in Rom. xvi. 16, was given in allusion

to the custom common amongst the Jews, to kiss each other in token of friendship, when they met. Thus pretending friendship, Joab kissed Amasa, when he took his life, and thus Judas with a kiss, betrayed the Lord. Christians however, on this account, were soon slandered by the heathen around them, as licentious and profane in their religious assemblies, and the practice seems soon to have been laid aside in the church. As a token of brotherly affection, this kiss is said to have been generally given before the dispensation of the Lord's supper. This custom is not binding on us. The friendship and brotherly love, signified by such outward actions, is all that the voice of inspiration requires; the feelings of christian affection, not the outward act itself. Hands may be shaken, and the most courteous modes and expressions of salutation used, while cold indifference, or the deceit of a Judas, and the murderous hatred of a Joab, may fill the heart. In opposition to this sin of dissimulation, the apostle here enjoins christians to cultivate a real and brotherly regard for each other. Alas, for those, whose tongues like Joab's can say, "art thou in health my brother?" and then, like his sword, stab at the life of that brother's reputation. "Let love be without dissimulation."

And thus in John xiii. 14, it is the spirit of the injunction we are to regard. It was a custom in those warm countries, after travelling, to provide water to wash the feet. It was a way of expressing kindness and friendship to a guest which could not be omitted without marked disrespect. (Gen. xix. 2. Luke vii. 44.) Still we are not to imagine that this is binding on us, as a *religious ordinance*. It was never so observed by the church. It was a custom peculiar to a people residing in hot climates, and all that is now binding on us is the temper of mind, signified by this custom. It teaches us, that from the example of our Lord's condescension and kindness, we should be ever willing and ready to relieve the wants, and promote the welfare of all men, and especially of the household of faith. This particular mode of manifesting brotherly love, is not now binding, but the thing signified—a spirit of humility and kindness, an ardent desire to promote not only the comfort of the body, but especially the salvation of the soul, included in our Lord's injunction here, and is obligatory on all his followers in every age. "Let this mind be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus." Be kindly affectioned one to another." Ye are journeying to the grave: "Let all bitterness then, and wrath, and anger, and clamour, and evil speaking, be put away from you, with all malice; and be ye kind one to another." Ye are going to heaven: "See that ye fall not out by the way." The moment is drawing near, when "the rich and the poor shall lie down alike in the dust:" In "lowliness of mind then, let each esteem others better than themselves." Death will soon tear your earthly possessions from your grasp; place them beyond his reach, by giving them to Christ, in relieving his members, and supplying the wants of the poor; then shalt thou have treasure in Heaven, and the blessing of Him "who, though He was rich, yet for our sakes became poor."

---

"Howbeit when He, the Spirit of truth is come, He will guide you into all truth." John xvi. 13.

Not into all truth connected with human science, and a knowledge of the arts; as the Jews supposed, and as seems to be intimated in our translation. This knowledge is indeed the gift of God, but proceeds not from the teaching of the Spirit spoken

of here. In the original, the definite article is prefixed to "*truth*," and thus limits and explains its meaning. It is literally, "he will guide you into all *the truth*," that is, *the truth* by way of eminence, the truth as it is in Jesus, "the whole counsel of God." Now while what is here said of the teaching of the spirit, refers in a particular manner, to the apostles, it is also true of his saving influences on the hearts of all his people. He guides his people to himself, *only by the truth*—the scriptures of the Old and New Testament. If the soul is converted, it is by the word as an instrument, applied by the spirit. If saving knowledge is communicated to any of our guilty race, it is through the scriptures of truth, applied by the teachings of the spirit. If the darkened understanding is enlightened, and the dead soul quickened, it is by this voice of the Saviour—this "word of the Lord," speaking to us from Heaven, and made effectual by God the spirit. O how highly then should we prize this precious book. Every "jot and tittle" of this *will* of our Father and our God; every one of those words which are "able to save the soul," should be to us inestimably precious. And if we do thus love it, can we hear no Macedonian cry for help from the dying heathen, addressed to us—no entreating voice from the destitute in our own land, calling to us; "think on me, when it is well with thee, and show kindness I pray thee unto me"—kindness to my dying soul, and deny me not the bread of life? "Faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God," and O leave not, for the sake of gold that perisheth, a soul, an immortal soul to die eternally, ignorant of that only word, and that only "name whereby we must be saved."

W. E.

---

ART. V. *Presbyterians in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.*

*Life of Andrew Melville, by Thomas McCrie, D. D.*

As this work is rare, not having been reprinted in this country, our readers might be more gratified if we would simply give extracts from it, than that we should, after the example of modern reviewers, merely make it the occasion of saying what we wish on the subjects of which it treats.

Dr. McCrie has been long favorably known as a Biographer and Historian—so faithfully has he delineated the character of our Reformers, that we are enabled to see beauties and excellencies in them, which we had not observed before. We may have hitherto revered their memory, on account of their unflinching integrity and stern virtues; but it is after reading his graphic touches that we become first in *love* with them. Indeed he almost practices on us the delusion of making us feel as if we had known them.

We become interested in Melville from his very infancy; he is introduced to our notice a poor orphan boy; deprived of father and mother when he was young, and sickly in body, he was dependant on his eldest brother for care and subsistence. Richard Melville and his excellent wife, acted to him the part of parents in every respect. The kind and affectionate conduct of Melville's sister-in-law, elicits from his biographer a remark which seems so characteristic of himself, that we cannot refrain from giving it.

"There is something peculiarly interesting, though it does not always meet with the attention which it merits, in the reciprocations of duty and affection between persons placed in the relation and circumstances now described. By means of instinct, and by identifying the interests of parent and child, Providence has wisely secured the performance of duties which are equally necessary to the individual and the species. But without wishing to detract from the amiable virtue of parental attachment, we may say, that the kind offices which it dictates, when performed by those who stand in a remoter degree of relationship, may be presumed to partake less of the character of selfishness; and they are calculated to excite in the breast of the cherished orphan, a feeling which may be viewed as purer, and more enthusiastic than that which is merely filial—a feeling of a mixed kind, in which the affection borne to a parent, is combined with the admiration and the gratitude due to a disinterested benefactor."

As Melville evinced at an early age a capacity and taste for learning, his brother resolved to gratify his inclinations, by giving him the best education the country afforded. The reformation of religion being accompanied by the revival of letters throughout Europe, clearly shews that there is an important connection between them. Previous to the reformation, the original language of the scriptures was not taught in Scotland. Most of those who now adhered to Popery, and of those who afterwards wished to establish prelacy, were jealous of the introduction of Hebrew and Greek.\* In the year 1559, Melville entered the New College in the University of St. Andrew's. At this time he made use of the Greek text in his studies, "a circumstance which excited astonishment in the University." p. 12. When he left the University of St. Andrew's, he received the character of "the best Philosopher, Poet, and Grecian of any young master in the land." p. 14. "Having acquired all the branches of learning which his country afforded, Andrew Melville resolved to complete his education on the Continent. In autumn, 1564, being nineteen years of age, he set out for France." Having reached Paris, he commenced his studies in the University of that city. Melville had here fine opportunities of improving in religious and literary knowledge, as he attended the lectures of professors, who held a distinguished rank in their several professions. Melville left Paris in 1566, and went to the University of Poitiers, where he studied Jurisprudence. "In 1568, Admiral Coligna, at the head of the Protestant army, laid siege to this city, which was vigorously defended by the young Duke of Guise. The classes of the University being broken up, Melville entered into the family of a counsellor of Parliament, as tutor to his only son. When he was making rapid improvement in his education, this promising boy was prematurely cut off. Coming into his room one day, Melville found his little pupil bathed in blood, and mortally wounded by a cannon ball from the camp of the besiegers which had pierced the house. He lingered for a short time, during which he employed the religious instructions which he had received in comforting his afflicted parents, and expired in his tutors arms, pronouncing these words in Greek, *Διδασκαλε, τον δρομον με τσετεληκα*

\* Calderwood mentions, that Spottswood was ignorant of Greek. One of the articles of the libel raised in 1581 against Montgomery, Archbishop of Glasgow, was, "that, so farre as he could, he travellit to bring the original languages into contempt; abusing thereunto the words of the Apostle." 1. Cor. xiv. And tauntingly asking, "In what schools were Peter and Paul graduate?" Note in page 131.

—*master, I have finished my course.* Melville continued to retain a lively recollection of this affecting scene, to which he never could allude without tears." The siege being raised, Melville resolved to quit France, and repair to Geneva, for the prosecution of Theological studies. Beza, who was at this time professor of Divinity in the Academy, and a Minister of the city, was at their first interview highly pleased with Melville, who also became warmly attached to this powerful champion of the reformation. "The massacre of the Protestants, which commenced in Paris on St. Bartholomew's day, 1572, and which wrought such woe to France, was the occasion of extending Melville's acquaintance with the learned men of the age. Those who escaped the dagger of the murderer, took refuge in Geneva, whose gates were thrown open to receive them. One hundred and twenty French ministers were at one time in the city." The studies which Melville had now an opportunity of pursuing, were well calculated to qualify him for asserting as he afterwards did, the civil and religious liberty of his native country. "It was at Geneva that Knox first felt the hallowed flame of liberty kindle in his breast, and while he breathed the free air of that republic, he conceived the enterprise of breaking the fetters of religious and political bondage, by which his native country was enthralled. How deeply Melville's mind was imbued with these sentiments, appears from the uniform zeal which he afterwards shewed for the liberties of his country, and the firm resistance which he opposed to Popery, and arbitrary power." p. 51. The solicitations of his friends induced Melville to return to his native country. "This resolution he respectfully intimated to his colleagues, and to the magistrates, as patrons of the Academy: requesting their permission to demit the office with which they had honored him. His request was reluctantly granted. In a letter addressed to the General Assembly in their name, Beza among other expressions of the same tenor, testified, that Andrew Melville was equally distinguished by his piety and his erudition; and that the church of Geneva could not give a stronger proof of affection to her sister church of Scotland, than by suffering herself to be bereaved of him, that his native country might be enriched with his gifts." Melville left Geneva in the spring, 1574. During a part of his journey, he was accompanied by three Frenchmen—a Priest, a Physician, and an Officer of the army, all zealous Roman Catholics. Before they parted Melville had made the military gentleman almost a Protestant; and partly by argument, and partly by good humored raillery, he prevailed so far over the prejudices of the others, as that they had no objection to eat flesh on Friday, a practice which they at first regarded with much horror."

On Melville's return to Scotland two years after the death of Knox, he found the church in a very unhappy and divided state, a species of mongrel prelacy had been established by the famous convention at Leith, being made up of Presbytery, Episcopacy, and papal monkery. The loss sustained by the removal of Knox was severely felt. There still remained a number of excellent men, sincerely attached to the principles upon which the reformation had been established in Scotland, and not incapable of defending them. But there was wanting an individual inheriting the ardent and intrepid spirit of the Reformer, capable of giving an impulse and a voice to public sentiment, and possessing decision of mind to execute, as well as sagacity to discern those measures which were requisite to restore the church to her liberties,



and to fix her authority on a firm and solid basis." p. 108. It is on all hands chiefly ascribed to Melville's influence, that so great a degree of unanimity prevailed amongst the ministers. Being entitled to a seat in the General Assembly, from his being a minister of the church of Govan, and also a Doctor of Theology—he used all his influence to have the church established on true Presbyterian principles—his brethren co-operated with him, and in April 1578 they agreed that the Bishops should for the future, be addressed in the same style as other ministers. "At last the General Assembly which met in July 1580, found and declared the office of a Bishop, as then used and commonly understood, to be destitute of warrant from the word of God, and a human invention tending to the great injury of the church; ordained the Bishops to demit their pretended office *simpliciter*, and to receive admission *de novo* to the ministerial office, under the pain of ex-communication, after due admonition, and appointed the places and times at which they should appear before the provincial Synods, and signify their submission to their act. This famous act was agreed to by the whole assembly in one voice." Melville took a leading part in the Second Book of Discipline, and its success was owing in a great measure to his zeal and ability. He was on all the committees employed in collecting materials for it, and in reducing them into form.

The history of the various and multiplied trials of the church, during the regency of Morton, and the reign of the weak and pedantic James, of her contentings for the truth, and of the persecution she endured from proud and ambitious men, cannot but be still interesting to the well-wisher of Zion. In the history and biography before us, there is much that is *inspiring*, and calculated to encourage the heart of the believer in the God of Abraham. He who has promised that *he will have a seed to do him service while Sun and Moon endure*, will not want faithful witnesses to his truths and cause in the earth. Though they may be opposed by Kings and the great ones of the earth—yet *shall they not be utterly cast down, for the Lord upholdeth them with his hand*. They are enabled to do all things through Christ, who strengtheneth them.

After every means had been tried by the court, to bribe Melville, to join in their measures and had failed of success, recourse was had to intimidation. "Morton attempted to overawe him by authority, and to work on his fears by threatening to proceed against him for treason. While the Assembly were sitting, he one day sent for Melville to his chamber. After discoursing for some time on the importance of preserving the peace of the church and kingdom, he complained, the public tranquility was in danger from certain persons, who sought to introduce their own private conceits and foreign laws, on points of ecclesiastical government. Melville explained by telling his grace, that he and his brethren took the scriptures, not their own fancies, or the model of any foreign church, for the rule and standard of the discipline which they defended. Morton said, the General Assembly was a convocation of the King's leiges, and that it was treasonable for them to meet without his allowance. To this Melville answered, that if it were so, then Christ and his Apostles must have been guilty of treason, for they convoked hundreds and thousands, and taught and governed them, without asking the permission of Magistrates; and yet they were obedient subjects, and commanded the people to give what was due unto Cæsar. Having appealed in proof of this assertion to the *Acts of the Apostles*, the Regent scornfully replied, "Read ye ever such a *Act* as we did at St.

Johnston?" referring to the armed resistance which the Lords of the congregation made to the Queen Regent at Perth, in the beginning of the Reformation. "My Lord," answered Melville, "if ye be ashamed of that act, Christ will be ashamed of you." He added, that in a great crisis the conduct of men was not to be rigidly scanned by common rules, and actions, which in other circumstances would be highly censurable, may be excused and even approved; as our Saviour virtually approved those who introduced to him a palsied invalid by the roof of the house, without waiting the permission of the proprietor. At that time the kingdom of heaven suffered violence, and all men passed into it, without asking the leave of prince or emperor." The Regent biting the head of his staff, exclaimed in a tone of half-suppressed indignation, which few who were acquainted with his manners and temper could hear without alarm: "There will never be quietness in this country till half-a-dozen of you be hanged or banished the country." "Tush, Sir," replied Melville, "threaten your courtiers after that manner. It is the same to me whether I rot in the air or in the ground. The earth is the Lord's, *patria aut ubicunque est bene*. I have been ready to give my life where it would not have been half so well wared,\* at the pleasure of my God. I have lived out of your country ten years as well as in it. Let God be glorified: it will not be in your power to hang or exile his truth." p. 149.

In our limited space, we cannot give, even a condensed history of this period of the Reformation: having only proposed to ourselves to give a few extracts from a most interesting work. But while we refer the reader to the general histories of the period for a correct knowledge of ecclesiastical affairs, we cannot but give our opinion, that in the histories of the Reformation by Dr. McCrie more than in any other, the reader is enabled to catch the spirit of the Reformers; perhaps one reason, and a principle one may be, that the Dr. like every true Seceder imbibed the principles and spirit of the Reformers in an eminent degree.

The following spirited account of an interview which Melville had with the King gives us a very good idea of his character. A deputation had been appointed to wait on his Majesty and exhort him to prevent the evil consequences which would ensue from the measures which his counsel were pursuing, in permitting the popish lords who had been engaged in a conspiracy against the state, to return home from banishment. The deputies were admitted to a private audience of the King. They had agreed that James Melville should be their spokesman on account of the courteousness of his address. But he had scarcely begun to speak, when the King interrupted him, and in a tone of irritation challenged the meeting which had appointed them as illegal and seditious, and accused them of infusing unreasonable and unfounded fears into the minds of the people.—"James Melville was preparing to reply in his mild manner, when his uncle, unable to restrain himself, or judging that the occasion called for a different style, stepped forward and addressed the King. His majesty testified the strongest reluctance to listen to his discourse, and summoned up all his authority to silence him, but Melville persevered, and taking hold of the sleeve of the King's gown in his fervor, and calling him *God's silly vassal*, he proceeded to address him in the following strain, perhaps the most singular, in point of freedom, that ever saluted royal ears, or that ever proceeded from the mouth of a

---

\* Expanded.

loyal subject, who would have spilt the last drop of his blood in defence of the person and honour of his prince. "Sir, we will always reverence your majesty in public; but since we have this occasion to be with your majesty in private, and since you are brought in extreme danger both of your life and crown, and along with you the country and church of God are like to go to wreck, for not telling you the truth and giving you faithful counsel, we must discharge our duty, or else be traitors both to Christ and you. Therefore, Sir, as divers times before I have told you, so now again, I must tell you, that there are two kings and two kingdoms in Scotland: there is King James the head of this commonwealth, and there is Christ Jesus the king of the church, whose subject James the Sixth is, and of whose kingdom he is not a king, nor a lord, nor a head, but a member. Sir, those whom christ has called and commanded to watch over his church, have power and authority from him to govern his spiritual kindgdom both jointly and severally; the which no christian king or prince should control or discharge, but fortify and assist; otherwise they are not faithful subjects of Christ and members of his church. We will yield to you your place, and give you all due obedience, but again I say, you are not the head of the church. You cannot give us that eternal life which we seek for ever in this world, and you cannot deprive us of it. Permit us then freely to meet in the name of Christ, and to attend to the interests of that church of which you are the chief member. Sir, when you were in your swaddling clothes, Christ Jesus reigned freely in this land in spite of all his enemies: his officers and ministers conversed and assembled for the ruling and welfare of his church, which was ever for your welfare, defence and preservation, when these same enemies were seeking your destruction and cutting off. Their assemblies since that time continually have been terrible to these enemies and most steadible to you. And now, when there is more than extreme necessity for the continuance and discharge of that duty, will you [drawu to your own destruction by a devilish and most pernicious counsel] begin to hinder and dishearten Christ's servants and your most faithful servants, quarrelling them for their convening and the care they have of their duty to Christ and you, when you should rather commend and countenance them, as the godly kings and emperors did? The wisdom of your counsel which I call devilish, is this, that ye must be served by all sorts of men, to come to your purpose and grandeur, Jew and Gentile, Papist and Protestant; and because the Protestants and ministers of Scotland are over strong and control the King, they must be weakened and brought low by stirring up a party against them, and, the king being equal and indifferent, both shall be fain to flee to him. But, Sir if God's wisdom be the only true wisdom, this will prove mere and mad folly; his curse cannot but light upon it; in seeking both ye shall lose both; whereas in cleaving uprightly to God, his true servants would be your true friends, and he would cause the rest counterfeitly and lyngly to give over themselves and serve you." During the delivery of this confounding speech his Majesty's passion subsided. p. 393.

The king and court having resolved at all hazards to introduce Episcopacy into Scotland, as a first step it was proposed that the church should be admitted to a vote in the supreme council of the nation. "It was declared that prelacy was the third estate in the kingdom; that such ministers as his Majesty should please to raise to the dignity of bishop, abbot, or other prelate, should have a right to sit and vote in Parliament." Much difficulty was found however in persuading the

church to accept of this boon. After this was determined by Parliament, and before the meeting of the General Assembly, the King, fearful of Melville's influence over his brethren, determined to deprive him of a seat in the Assembly. "When his name was mentioned at the calling of the roll in the beginning of the assembly, his majesty challenged it, and said that he could not agree to the admission of one whom he had prohibited from attending on church courts. Melville defended his rights. His majesty's prohibitions he said, might extend to his place and emoluments in the university, but could not affect his doctoral office, which was purely ecclesiastical: he had a commission from his presbytery, and was resolved, for his part, not to betray it. Davidson spoke to the same purpose, and reminded the King that he was present as a Christian, and not as president of the Assembly. James attempted a reply to this distinction but had recourse to the ultimate reason of kings, by declaring that he would allow no business to be transacted until his will was complied with. Melville accordingly retired but not until he had delivered his sentiments briefly and nervously, on the leading business which was to engage the attention of the Assembly. He was commanded at first to confine himself to his lodgings; but no sooner was it understood that his brethren repaired to him, than he and his colleague, Jonston, were charged to quit Dundee instantly under pain of rebellion. Davidson complained next day in the Assembly; and another member boldly asserted the restriction laid on the university, and the interdiction now given, proceeded from the dread which the court had of Melville's learning. "I will not hear one word on that head," said his Majesty twice or thrice. "Then we must crave help of him that will hear us," replied Davidson. The highest eulogium from the mouth of James could not have done half so much honor to Melville as his present treatment of him did. He had procured a parliamentary statute in favour of the measure which he wished to carry; he knew that a great part of the elders stood pledged to support it by the vote which they had given in parliament: he had the commissioners of the church at his beck; and he had brought up a trained band of trusty voters from the extremities of the north. And yet, with all these advantages on his side, he dreaded to bring forward his motion, or to submit it to discussion, so long as Melville remained in the house, or even within the precincts of the town, in which the assembly was held." Bruce, Davidson, Aird, James Melville, and John Carmichael, were the chief speakers against the vote in Parliament; Pont, Buchanan, and Gladstones in support of it. The latter were supported by the king, who was always ready to interfere in the debate. Gladstones having pleaded the power which the priests had among the ancient Romans "*in rogandis et ferendis legibus*," Davidson replied, that at Rome the priests were consulted, but had no vote in making laws: "*praesentibus sacerdotibus et divina exponentibus, sed non suffragia habentibus*." "Where have ye that?" asked the King. "In Titus Livius," said Davidson. "Oh! are ye going then from the Scriptures to Titus Livius?" exclaimed his Majesty. There were flatterers present who applauded this wretched witticism; and they were encouraged to laugh at the old man, who pursued his argument with equal disregard of the puerilities of James, and the rudeness of his minions." 2d vol. p. 46.

The removal of Melville from Scotland was determined on as a necessary preparative to the execution of the projects of the court. Episco-

pacy still stood condemned by the church and the bishops remained destitute of all spiritual power.

Notwithstanding the number of ministers already in confinement, they judged it necessary to get rid of others, before they durst face an ecclesiastical assembly. Accordingly this was accomplished by one of those politic stratagems which James was so fond of employing. In the end of May 1606, James sent a letter to Melville commanding him "all excuses set aside," to repair to London before the 15th of Sep. next, that his Majesty might confer with him and others, his brethren, of good learning, judgment and experience, concerning such things as would tend to settle the peace of the church and soforth. Letters expressed in the same terms were received by his nephew James Melville and six others.

Melville and his associates had several interviews with the king, and his nobles and bishops, in all these interviews he appears to great advantage, showing the most noble intrepidity, though he knew he was a prisoner and that his enemies were eagerly watching that they might find something wherewith to accuse him, yet he not only exculpated himself and brethren from all blame, but also boldly attacked his accusers. They were frequently forced to go and hear the bishops preach in favour of their ceremonies, and against Presbyterian church government, without being permitted to answer them. "If ever the church of England had her days of chivalry, they had then passed by; else her champions would have deemed it foul scorn to attack antagonists who were not at liberty to defend themselves, or to return the blows which they received." p. 155.

The following extract may be interesting both as furnishing a pretext for M's confinement, and as giving an account of some English ceremonies, in which the same King was engaged who had before publicly thanked God that he was born in the church of Scotland, because it was more thoroughly reformed from ceremonies than any other.

"On the 28th of September they were required by a message from his Majesty, to be in the Royal Chapel early next day; and Melville and his nephew received a particular charge not to be absent. It was the festival of St. Michael, one of the *Dii minorum gentium* of the English, and was celebrated with much superstitious pomp. Several foreigners of distinction were present, among whom was the Prince de Vandemont, son to the Duke of Lorrain, and commander of the Venitian army. On entering the chapel, James Melville whispered to his uncle, that he suspected a design to ensnare them, and put their patience to the test. The chapel resounded with all kinds of music. On the altar were placed two shut books, two empty chalices, and two candlesticks with unlighted candles; and the King and Queen approached it with great ceremony, and presented their offering. When the service was over the Prince de Vandemont said, he did not see what should hinder the church of Rome and England to unite; and one of his attendants exclaimed, "There is nothing of the mass wanting but the adoration of the host." On returning to his lodgings, Melville composed the following verses on the scene which he had just witnessed:

Cur stant clausi Anglis libri duo regia in ara,  
Lumina cæca duo, pollubra sicca duo?  
Num sensum cultumque Dei tenet Anglia clausum,  
Lumine cæca suo, sorde sepulta sua?  
Romana an ritu dum regalem instruit aram,  
Purpuream pingit religiosa lupam?\*

\* For the sake of the English reader, who may be desirous to know the treason included

By means of some of the court-spies, who frequented the house in which the ministers lodged, a copy of these verses was conveyed to his Majesty, who was, or affected to be highly incensed against them; and it was immediately resolved to proceed against their author."

On the 30th of November, he was summoned to Whitehall, and brought before the privy council of England. Melville frankly acknowledged that he had made an epigram, of which that which was now shown him, was an inaccurate copy. He had composed it, he said, under feelings of grief, at seeing such superstitious vanity in a reformed church, under a king who had been brought up in the pure light of the gospel, and before strangers who could not but be confirmed in their idolatry by what they witnessed at Hampton court on the occasion referred to. He had given out no copy of the verses, and could not conceive how they had got to his Majesty; he was not conscious of having committed any crime. But if he had, he ought to be tried in his own country. "The Archbishop of Canterbury addressing him, began to aggravate the offence, arguing that such a libel on the worship of the church of England was a high misdemeanor, and even brought the offender within the laws of treason. This was too much for Melville to bear from a man of whom he had so unfavourable an opinion as Bancraft. He interrupted the primate. "My lords," exclaimed he, "Andrew Melville was never a traitor. But, my lords, there was one Richard Bancraft, (let him be sought for;) who, during the life of the late Queen, wrote a treatise against his Majesty's title to the crown of England; and here, [pulling the corpus delicti from his pocket,] here is the book, which was answered by my brother John Davidson." Bancraft was thrown into the utmost confusion by this bold and unexpected attack. In the mean time Melville went on to charge the Archbishop with his delinquencies. He accused him of profaning the Sabbath, of maintaining an antichristian hierarchy, and vain, foppish, superstitious ceremonies; and of silencing and imprisoning the true preachers of the Gospel, for scrupling to conform to these. Advancing gradually, as he spoke, to the head of the table, where Bancraft sat, he took hold of the lawn sleeves of the primate, and shaking them, and calling them *Romish rags*, he said, "If you are the author of '*English Scottizing for Geneva Discipline*,' then I regard you as the capital enemy of all the Reformed Churches in Europe. and as such I will profess myself an enemy to you and to your proceedings, to the effusion of the last drop of my blood: and it grieves me that such a man should have his Majesty's ear, and sit so high in this honourable council." After the council had deliberated for some time, Melville was called in and told that he had been found guilty of the sin of *scandalum magnatum*, and was to be committed to the custody of the Dean of St. Paul's until the pleasure of the King, as to his further punishment should be known." Melville was allowed to reside with his brethren in captivity, in the house in which they lodged, for several weeks. On the 20th of April, the Earl of Salisbury informed him that he was to appear before the English

in these lines, the following old translation of them which, though flat, conveys the sense, may be added.

Why stand there on the Royal Altar hie  
Two closed books, blind lights, two basins drie?  
Doth England hold God's mind and worship closs,  
Blind of her sight and buried in her dross?  
Doth she, with chapel put in Romish dress,  
The purple whore religiously express?

Council. Not wishing to alarm his friends he said, why do you ask the reason of his lordship's message? no doubt he wishes me to dine with him. But I shall disappoint him; for I mean to take my repast with you." At table he exerted himself to cheer their spirits; acquainted them with his meditations on the second psalm which he had indulged during his walk in the gallery of the Palace; and recited the verses which he had made on St. George, the tutelary Saint of England, whose festival had lately been celebrated with much foolish pageantry. James Melville, who at that moment could have wished that his uncle had never composed a couplet, addressed him in the words of Ovid:

Si saperem doctas odissem jure sorores,  
Numina cultori pernicioso suo:

To which he replied with his usual promptitude, in the next words of the poet:

Sed nunc (tanta meo comes est insania morbo)  
Saxa (malum!) refero rursus ad icta pedem.\*

"Well," said his nephew, "eat your dinner and be of good courage; for I have no doubt you are to be called before the Council for your altar verses."—"My heart is full and swells," replied he; "and I would be glad to have that occasion to disburden it, and to speak all my mind plainly to them, for their dishonouring of Christ and ruining of so many souls by bearing down the purity of the gospel and maintaining popish superstitions and corruptions." "I warrant you," said James Melville, who was anxious to repress his fervour, "they know you will speak your mind freely; and therefore have sent for you that they may find a pretext to keep you from going home to Scotland." "If God have any service for me there, He will bring me home: if not, let me glorify Him wherever I be. I have often said to you cousin, He hath some part to play with us on this Theatre." Within a short time two expresses were sent to inform him, the council were sitting and waited for him; upon which he rose, and, having joined with his brethren in a short prayer, repaired to the council-room.

His Majesty did not make his appearance; but he had placed himself in a closet adjoining to the room in which the council was met. A low trick, and disgraceful to royalty, by which the prisoner was encouraged to use liberties which he might not otherwise have taken, and which were soon heard by the person who was ultimately to decide upon his fate. The only charge which the council had to bring against him was the *epigram* for which he had formerly been questioned. Irritated as he was by what he had suffered and by what he had seen, he was not prepared to make apologies or retractions. The earl of Salisbury took up the subject, and began to reprove him for his obstinacy in refusing to acknowledge the primacy, and for the verses which he had made in derision of the Royal Chapel. Melville was so severe in his reply, both in what related to the King, and to the earl personally, that his lordship was completely put to silence." "In the end, not being able to induce him to swear to primacy, and not knowing any other way to revenge themselves on him they agreed to send him prisoner to the Tower."

"It is difficult to say which is most glaring, the injustice or the ridiculousness of the proceedings of the council, first and last, against Melville. He was no subject of England and no member of the English

\* Ovidii Tristia, Lib. II., Od. I.

church: he owed no fealty or subjection to the authorities of either. Called into that country by the letter, and detained in it by the will of his sovereign, he was placed under the protection of the royal authority. What had he done to forfeit this protection? Had he published a libel against the constitution of England? Had he intruded into her temples, or publicly insulted her worship? Had he attacked or even written a single line against one of her *established* rites? He had been forced to listen to discourses which he disliked, and to witness religious ceremonies which he detested. Was he also to be restrained from relieving his mind in private, by indulging in a literary recreation to which he had been addicted from his youth? Or, was it a crime to communicate the effusions of his muse to his brethren who sympathized with all his feelings, and shared in all his secrets? The only copy of the epigram which had been seen was taken by a court spy who haunted his lodgings for the base purpose of informing against him. But though he had been industrious in circulating it, where was the mighty harm? Was the Church of England in such a feeble and tottering condition as to be in danger from a few strokes of a quill? Did she, like the church of Rome, tremble at the report of a pasquinade? Were there none of all the learned sons whom she had brought up, and of whose achievements she was wont to boast, to rise up and defend her with the weapons with which she had been assailed, that she was obliged to call in the secular arm for her protection, and to silence the audacious satirist by immuring him in a dungeon?" p. 177.

"The injustice of Melville's imprisonment was heightened by the unnecessary severity with which he was treated in the Tower. A pretext was found for withdrawing the indulgence of having a servant confined along with him. No creature was allowed to see him but the person who brought him his food. He was not even permitted to beguile the irksome hours by his favourite amusement of writing. The use of pen, ink, and paper, was strictly prohibited him. But tyrants, though they can fetter and torment the body, have no power over the heaven-born soul. Melville's spirit remained unconfined and unbroken in his narrow and uncomfortable cell; and he found means of expressing the sense which he entertained of his unmerited sufferings, and his resolution to endure the worst which his persecutors could inflict. When his apartment was examined, its walls were found covered with verses which he had engraved, in fair and beautiful characters, with the tongue of his shoe-buckle. In this situation he was kept ten months." p. 197.

When Melville was thrown into the Tower, the fate of his brethren was fixed. His nephew was commanded to leave London within six days, to repair to New-Castle upon Tyne, and not to go beyond ten miles of that town on the pain of rebellion. He was not permitted to visit Scotland, even for the purpose of visiting his wife, when she was on her death-bed. And he at last died a prisoner in England. The rest of the ministers were confined in different parts of Scotland; and were prohibited from attending on church courts, and bound to procure a certificate of their good behaviour from a bishop or else to return to London within a limited time.

Among the fellow-prisoners of Melville was Sir Walter Raleigh and other distinguished personages. The rigour of his confinement was somewhat abated; and at length he was permitted to leave England. The Duke of Bauillon sent an application to King James, requesting



him to release Melville from the Tower, and allow him to come to the university at Sedan. Melville sailed for France, after having been a prisoner four years.

We give the following as a specimen of the epistolary correspondence which passed between Melville and his nephew. "His purse containing all the money which he possessed, and on which he depended for his support during the approaching winter, was stolen, probably by one of the keepers of the prison; but in his circumstances it would have been useless and dangerous to complain. He was under the necessity, therefore, of applying to James Melville, to whom he conveyed information of the unpleasant occurrence in the following delicate allegory. "I had lately in my possession upwards of twenty birds of the seraphic species, kept with no small care, and cherished in a warm nest under the shade of my wings. Whether they were tired of their confinement and seized with a desire for liberty, or what was the cause I am not prepared to say; but without bidding their unsuspecting host farewell, poisoning their airy wings, they fled, not to return, and have left me to deplore their absence. I soothe my grief by meditating on that beautiful discourse on providence contained in the sixth chapter of Matthew, and by the consciousness that I was not deficient in at least ordinary care. The saying, *The Lord will provide*, often comes to my mind. I have experienced the truth of it through the whole course of my life, my indulgent Father, out of regard to my infirmity, having prevented me hitherto from ever feeling extreme want.—The loss could not have been foreseen or provided against, and it is counterbalanced by another unexpected event, the friendly treaty respecting the affairs of our church which is in prospect; so that it would seem that the master of the feast and disposer of all events has seen meet to mingle for me a bitter-sweet cup."

This call was instantly obeyed. Indeed the purse of James Melville was always at his uncle's command, and his remittances were uniformly conveyed with such readiness and delicacy as made them appear rather as the performance of a filial duty, than as an act of generosity to a distressed friend. "Riches," says he in the letter which he sent along with the money, "take to themselves eagles' wings and fly away. But there is enough in the sacred promises to which you refer. He who has such securities may surely rest satisfied. Be of good courage, therefore, my father: the Good Shepherd will supply you abundantly with all good things. I shall send you money, and you will send me songs. Let us continue this mutual intercourse; and I have good hope that you will run short of verses for my use, before I run short of gold for yours." Melville's answer affords a beautiful example of the union of piety and gratitude. "Your succedaneum for the fugitive gold came most seasonably to my relief. So profusely beneficent has my divine and indulgent Father been towards me as even to exceed my wishes. O that I may be found grateful, and mindful of the benefits bestowed on me by him who has accepted me gratuitously in his Son! O that I may love him who first loved me, with all my mind, soul, and strength, and that I may bring forth the fruits of this love, by promoting the good of his church in these difficult times, and amidst all the ingratitude that abounds!" p. 219.

After having from public documents and private memoirs and letters, the history of Melville presented to our view, we may see that he "possessed great intrepidity, invincible fortitude, and unextinguishable ar-

dour of mind. His spirit was independent, high, fiery, and incapable of being tamed by threats or violence; but he was at the same time open, candid, generous, affectionate, faithful. The whole tenor of his life bears testimony to the sincerity and strength of his religious convictions. We do not find him making disclosures, even to his most confidential correspondents, of the secret communings of his heart with its God. But we find, what is a less equivocal proof of genuine devotion, a habitual sense of divine things, a subjection of mind to the divine will, and a uniform aim and desire to advance the divine glory, pervading and intermingling with all that he did or said. The spirit of his piety was strikingly contrasted with that compound of indifference and selfishness which is so often lauded under the much abused names of moderation and charity. "Thou canst not bear them that are evil and thou hast tried them that say they are apostles and are not, and hast found them liars," was the commendation which he coveted and which he merited. Possessing in a high degree the *perfervidum ingenium* of his countryman, sudden and impetuous in his feelings, as well as prompt and vivacious in his conceptions he poured a torrent of vigorous vehemence, regardless, resistless indignation, mingled at times with defiance and scorn, on those who incurred his displeasure. But his anger, even when it rose to its greatest height, was altogether different from the ebullitions of a splenetic or rancourous mind. On no occasion was it ever excited by a sense of personal injuries, which he meekly bore and forgave. And there was always about it an honesty, an elevation, a freedom from personal hate, malice and revenge, which made it respected even by those who censured its violence, or who smarted under its severity.

Notwithstanding the heat and vehemence displayed in his public conduct, he was an agreeable companion in private. His heart was susceptible of all the humane and social affections. Though he spent the greater part of his life in a college, he was no ascetic or morose recluse; and though "his book was his bride and his study his bride-chamber," yet he felt as tender a sympathy with his friends in all their domestic concerns, as if he had been himself a husband and father. The gay, good humoured, hearty pleasantry which appears in his familiar letters, evinces a cheerfulness, and kindliness of disposition, which continued, to the latest period of his life, unsoured by the harsh treatment which he met with, and uninjured by the fretting infirmities of old age.

His intellectual powers were confessedly superior. Possessing a vigorous mind, cultivated by study, he excelled all his countrymen of that age in the acquirements of a various and profound erudition. He was the first Scotchman who added a taste for elegant literature to an extensive acquaintance with theology." p. 329.

But, perhaps the reader may not be so interested in these details as we are, and may be weary of the length to which we have drawn this article. We will close with the concluding remark of the biographer. "If the love of pure religion, rational liberty, and polite letters, forms the basis of national virtue and happiness, I know no individual, after her Reformer, from whom Scotland has received greater benefits, and to whom she owes a deeper debt of gratitude and respect, than ANDREW MELVILLE."

A.

ART. VI. *A Protestant's Resolution, showing his reasons why he will not be a Papist.*

(Concluded from page 352.)

**Q.** What is the eighth error of the Papists? **A.** That the Protestants are heretics, for separating from them. **Q.** What say the Protestants to this? **A.** They say that it being granted, that the Protestants did separate from the church of Rome, yet they did it upon just grounds. **Q.** How do you prove that? **A.** Because they did it for the sake of Christ and the purity of religion, for which reason they are commanded so to do. 2 Corinth. vi. 15, 16, 17, 18. "What concord hath Christ with Belial, or what part hath he that believeth with an infidel? What agreement hath the temple of God with Idols? Ye are the temple of the living God, wherefore come out from among them and be ye separate saith the Lord, and touch not the unclean thing, and I will receive you, and will be a Father unto you, and ye shall be my sons and daughters, saith the Lord Almighty." **Q.** What was there in the Romish religion, that occasioned their separation? **A.** In that it was a superstitious, idolatrous, damnable, bloody, traiterous, blind, blasphemous religion—It were innumerable to count the many fopperies in their devotions in which they place religion, as the tooth of St. Christopher, the hair of St. Peter's beard, the shift that came off the back of the blessed Virgin Mary, and the dust and the vermin of some saints, which they keep. Valla, a person of great learning and eminence among them, saith "there are ten thousand such things in Rome. If the host fall to the ground, it must be licked up, the ground is to be scraped, and the scrapings reduced to ashes is to have a place among their reliques." Add to this, their holy water, their salt, their spittle, their holy oil, their beads, whippings, fish-days, pilgrimage, nunneries, crossing themselves, bapizing of bells, fonts, &c. So that the great Erasmus in his annotation, approved by Pope Leo X. saith their whole religion is almost brought to their superstitious treatment of reliques through the covetousness of Priests, the hypocrisy of Monks, fed by the foolishness of the people. In invoking the saints, adoring the host, and worshipping images; their worshipping of reliques, giving religious worship to such things as they do but fancy to be reliques, and not only when they are whole and sound, but when they are corrupted, they worship pieces of old rotten timber, which they pretend are parts of the real cross, on which our Saviour suffered. **Q.** But why do you say their separation being granted, do they not grant their separation? **A.** They need not, for the church of Rome, more properly separated from them, than they from the church of Rome, in that they broke off from the Apostles' doctrine, which the Protestants still retain, holding the head. The Papists having separated them from their company, and cast them out for the son of man's sake, Luke vi. 22. **Q.** What is the ninth error of the Papists? **A.** That the church of Rome is the only true church. **Q.** What say the Protestants of this? **A.** We deny it. **Q.** Why? **A.** Because the Roman church agreeth not with the definition of a true church. **Q.** What is a true church? **A.** The true church is an universal congregation or fellowship of God's faithful people—built upon the foundation of the apostles, and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone. **Q.** What are the marks of a true church? **A.** Such as these; pure and sound doctrine preached; the sacraments administered according to Christ's institution; the right use of ecclesiasti-

cal discipline. John x. 4. "The sheep follow him, for they know his voice." Eph. v. 26, "that he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word." Q. What is the tenth error of the Papists? *A.* Their praying to Saints and Angels. Q. What is the Protestants' opinion in this matter? *A.* That praying to Saints and Angels is a dangerous corrupting of holy worship and abominable in the sight of God. Q. How do you prove that? *A.* 1st. It is absurd and ridiculous, they being not capable of hearing our prayers, "Abraham is ignorant of us," Isa. lxiii. 16. 2d. they cannot be sure that they are all real Saints to whom they pray. Nay we know the Pope hath canonized many wicked men. 3d. It hath no warrant from the word of God but is forbidden, Math. iv. 10, "Him only shalt thou serve." 4th. It is idoltrous. 5th. It is injurious to the mediatory office of Christ, i. Tim. ii. 5, "There is one God and one Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus." 1 John ii. 1, "If any man sin we have an Advocate with the Father Jesus Christ the Righteous." Angels refuse it, Rev. xxii. 9, "see thou do it not, I am thy fellow servant." Q. What is the eleventh error of the Papists? *A.* Their doctrine of Purgatory. Q. What do you understand by Purgatory? *A.* A place in which Saints are purged after this life that were not wholly purged here, to the intent they may enter purer into Heaven. Bellarimine de purgat. lib. 2. cap. 6. Q. What is the Protestants' belief concerning Purgatory? *A.* That there is no such place; so the belief of it is dangerous and groundless. Q. How do you prove that there is no such place? *A.* From Rev. xiv. 13, "Blessed are the dead that die in the Lord, from henceforth, yea saith the spirit, for they rest from their labors" &c. Q. Why is it dangerous and groundless? *A.* 1. Because there is no ground for it in Scripture. 2d. Because they that belong to God can be no where afflicted, but he is afflicted with them, Isa. lxiii. 9, "In all their affliction he was afflicted." 3d. Because it denies the fulness of Christ's satisfaction. 4th. Because hereby the horrid nature of sin is lessened. 5th. Because the Saint's confidence and comfort is hereby impaired; the desire that Paul hath to be dissolved, is that he may be with Christ, Phil. i. 23. Q. What is the twelfth error of the Papist? *A.* That some sins are venial. Q. What is the Protestants' belief in this point? *A.* That no sin is in its own nature venial, but every sin is deadly, and deserves eternal Damnation, Deut. xxvii. 26, "Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things written in the book of the Law, to do them." Ezk. xviii. 4. "The soul that sinneth it shall die." Rom. vi. 23, "The wages of sin is death." James ii. 10, "Whosoever shall keep the Law, and offend in one point, is guilty of all." Q. What is a thirteenth error of the Papists? *A.* Their doctrine of merit. Q. What is the Protestants' opinion in this thing? *A.* That the reward of good works is not deserved by them that receive it. Q. How do you prove that? *A.* 1st. Because good works are rewarded merely out of mercy and grace, Ps. lxiii. 12, "Unto thee O Lord belongeth mercy, for thou rewardest every man according to his work." Rom. xi. 6, "If by grace then it is no more of works, otherwise grace is no more grace; but if it be of works, then it is no more of grace, otherwise work is no more work." Tit. iii. 5, "Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to His mercy He saved us." 1 Pet. i. 13. "Hope to the end for the grace that is to be brought unto you at the revelation of Jesus Christ." 2d. Because eternal life is the gift of God, Luke, xii. 32, "It is your Father's good pleasure to give you the kingdom." Rom.

vi. 23, "The gift of God is eternal life." 3d. Because believers owe all to God, therefore can merit nothing from Him, Luke xvii. 10, "When ye have done all that you can, say, that ye are unprofitable servants, we have done that which was our duty to do." 1 Cor. iv. 7, "What hast thou that thou didst not receive, now if thou didst receive it, why dost thou boast as if thou hadst not received it?" 1 Cor. vi. 19, "Ye are not your own." Phil. ii. 11, "It is God that worketh in you, both to will and to do of his good pleasure." Q. What is a fourteenth error of the Papists? A. Their works of supererogation. Q. What say the Protestants to this? A. That they who in their obedience attain the greatest degree, fall short of much which in duty they are bound to do, much less, can they do more or have any oil to spare, wherewith to help others, Math. xxv. 9, "The wise answered not so, lest there be not enough for us and you." Q. What is every man bound to do? A. To full conformity in the whole man to the righteous Law of God. Q. Is not this to be under the Law and not under grace? A. Believers are not under the Law as a covenant of works, but as a rule of life, Math. v. 17, "Think not that I am come to destroy the Law and the Prophets, I am not come to destroy, but to fulfill." Rom. vii. 12, "The Law is holy and just and good," ver. 22, "I delight in the Law of God, after the inward man." Q. May not Saints do more good than they have need of for themselves? A. No, "When you have done all that is commanded you, say you are unprofitable servants," Luke xvii. 10. Q. What is a fifteenth error of the Papists? A. Their corrupting the doctrine of justification. Q. Wherein do they corrupt it? A. They tell us we must be justified by our own righteousness and that a perfect righteousness within us. Q. What mean they by a perfect righteousness within us? A. Any degree of charity is their righteousness in perfection. Q. What is the Protestant doctrine concerning justification? A. That believers are justified freely by the grace of God, whereby he accepteth them as righteous only for the righteousness of Christ imputed to them. Q. How do you prove that? A. By these scriptures, Rom. iii. 24, "Being justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus," chap. v. ver. 8. 9. "God commendeth his love toward us in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us, much more then being now justified by his blood, we shall be saved from wrath through him." chap. x. 3, "They being ignorant of God's righteousness, and going about to establish their own righteousness, have not submitted themselves to the righteousness of God." Eph. i. 6, 7, "To the praise of the glory of his grace wherein He hath made us accepted in the beloved. In whom we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins according to the riches of his grace." Q. What is a sixteenth error of the Papists? A. Their worshipping of images. Q. What is the Protestants' belief? A. That it is not lawful to make images of God, nor to direct our worship to an image, or by the help of an image, or to give religious worship to any creature, Math. i. 10, "Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve." Rev. xix. 10, "See thou do it not, I am thy fellow servant and of thy brethren." Q. What is a seventeenth error of the Papists? A. Their preaching and praying in an unknown tongue. Q. What say the Protestants? A. That public prayer is not to be made in unknown tongue, but in such a language as is understood by the people. Q. What mean you by prayer? A. Confession of sin, petition for grace, intercession for others, and

giving thanks. **Q.** Why must we not pray in an unknown tongue? **A.** Because it cannot be for edification, 1 Cor. xiv. 26, "Let all things be done to edifying," ver. xvi. "How shall he that occupieth the room of the unlearned say amen at thy giving of thanks, seeing he understandeth not what thou sayest." **Q.** Why may we not preach in an unknown tongue? **A.** 1st. For the same reason, because it is not for edification, and so plainly against the word of God, 1 Cor. xiv. at the beginning. 2d. Because it is against the custom of the primitive christians to have public prayer or preaching, or the administration of the sacraments in a tongue not understood by the people. 3d. Because the original tongues are not known to all the people who have a right unto, and interest in the Scriptures, and are commanded in the fear of God to read and search them. **Q.** What is the eighteenth error of the Papists? **A.** Their doctrine of indulgences. **Q.** What do the Papists mean by their indulgences? **A.** An absolution from the guilt of punishment by the satisfactions which are contained in the Church treasury. **Q.** What is the Protestants' belief in this matter? **A.** That Popish indulgences are the worst of cheats and abominable injuries to Christ and Christians. **Q.** How do you prove that? **A.** Because there is no pardon of sin but by the mercy of God, through the blood of Christ, Rom. v. 1. "Being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ." Eph. i. 7. "In whom we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins according to the riches of his grace." 2d. Because there is no such thing in Scripture, as that the merits of one saint, should be able to make satisfaction for the sins of another. 3d. It is most injurious to Christ, who needeth not any merits of saints to be added to his satisfaction, "for by one offering he hath perfected forever, them that are sanctified." Heb. x. 14. **Q.** What is a nineteenth error of the Papists? **A.** Their forbidding Priests to marry. **Q.** What do they speak of marriage itself? **A.** They do not forbid all marriage, but speak disgracefully and contemptuously of it. **Q.** What say the Protestants in this matter? **A.** That the popish doctrine forbidding to marry, is a devilish and wicked doctrine. **Q.** How do you prove that? **A.** 1st. Because it is that which God not only alloweth, but in some cases commandeth, making no exception of the Clergy from others. Math. ix. 11. "All men cannot receive this saying, save they only to whom it is given" 1 Cor. vii. 2. "To avoid fornication, let every man have his own wife." Chap. ix. 5. "Have we not power to lead about a wife, a sister as well as other apostles, and as the brethren of our Lord and Cephas?" 1 Tim. iii. 2. "A bishop must be blameless, the husband of one wife." Tit. 1. 6. "If any be blameless the husband of one wife, having faithful children." Heb. xiii. 4. "Marriage is honorable in all, and the bed undefiled, but whoremongers and adulterers, God will judge." 2d. Because it leads to much lewdness and villainy, as fornication, adultery, incest, sodomy, murder, &c. Because this doctrine is a badge of Antichrist, 1 Tim. iv. 1. "The spirit speaketh expressly, that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits and doctrines of devils, (ver. 3.) forbidding to marry." **Q.** What is the twentieth error of the Papists? **A.** Denying the doctrine of assurance. **Q.** What say the Papists of it? **A.** That a believer's assurance of the pardon of his sin is a vain and ungodly confidence. **Q.** What is the Protestants' belief in this matter? **A.** That it is not only our privilege that we may, but our duty to labour after assurance, that our sins are pardoned. 1 Pet. i. 10. "Give dili-

gence to make your calling and election sure, for if ye do these things ye shall never fall." **Q.** How doth it appear to be our duty? **A.** 1st. From the nature, use, and end of the holy scriptures, which are a good foundation of assurance, Rom. xv. 4. "Whatsoever things were written aforetime, were written for our learning, that we through patience and comfort of the scriptures, might have hope." 2d. From the nature of conscience and its power. 1 John iii. 19, 20, 21, "Hereby we know that we are of the truth and shall assure our hearts before him. For if our hearts condemn us, God is greater than our hearts, and knows all things. If our hearts condemn us not, then have we confidence toward God." 3d. Because it hath been attained by others, as Job, David, Paul, &c. 4th. Because God hath appointed ordinances that believers may have assurance. **Q.** What is a one and twentieth error of the Papists? **A.** Their doctrine of seven sacraments. **Q.** What is a sacrament? **A.** A sacrament is an ordinance of Christ, consisting of visible signs representing, sealing and applying Christ and the benefits of the new covenant to believers. **Q.** How many sacraments are there in the New Testament? **A.** Only two, Baptism and the Lord's Supper. **Q.** Which be those other five that the Papists have added? **A.** 1, Confirmation; 2, Extreme unction, 3, Matrimony; 4, Holy orders; 5, Penance. **Q.** Why may not these five be sacramental as well as the other two? **A.** 1st, Because there is not sufficient parts in any of them to make a sacrament. Prov. xxx. 6, "Add thou not unto his word lest he reprove thee, and thou be found a liar." 2, Because there are no parts of a sacrament in any of these but what is included in Baptism and the Lord's Supper. **Q.** What is a two and twentieth error of the Papists? **A.** Their doctrine of Transubstantiation. **Q.** What do they understand by Transubstantiation? **A.** That by the consecration of the bread and wine there is made a conversion of the whole substance of the bread into the substance of the body of Christ, and of the wine into the substance of the blood of Christ. **Q.** What scripture do they allege for this? **A.** John vi. 51, 52, 53, 54, 55. **Q.** What say the Protestants to this assertion? **A.** 1st, That Christ blessed bread and wine, therefore did not destroy them. 2, That it is bread and wine which Christ hath commanded his ministers to administer, and his people to receive. 3, That the Apostle himself doth no less than three times call it bread and wine after Consecration, 1 Cor. xi. 26. 27. 28. **Q.** What other reasons do the Protestants give against transubstantiation? **A.** 1st. it takes away the great evidence of the first witness of Christianity, 1 John i. 1. "That which we have heard which we have seen with our eyes, which we have looked upon," &c. 2d. It makes void the whole institution, 1 Cor. xi. 23. 24. "I have received of the Lord, that which also I delivered unto you, that the Lord Jesus, the same night in which he was betrayed, took bread, and when he had given thanks, he brake it and said, take, eat, this is my body, which is broken for you, this do in remembrance of me." 3d. It will not allow men the privilege of beasts, to judge by their senses, as seeing, smelling, tasting, &c. **Q.** What is the three and twentieth error of the Papists? **A.** Their denying the use of the cup to the people in the sacrament. **Q.** What is the Protestants' belief in this matter? **A.** That every communicant hath an undeniable right to the blessed cup in the Lord's Supper. **Q.** How do you prove that? **A.** 1st. From the institution of this sacrament and our Saviour's command annexed thereto, Math. xxvi. 27. "He took the cup and gave thanks, and gave it to them saying, drink ye all of it."

2d. From the example and appointment of the Apostles, Mark. xiv. 23, "And they all drank of it." 3d. Because without the cup a man cannot answer the end of this sacrament. "As often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord's death till he come." 1. Cor. xi. 26.

4. Because the same right we have to Christ's blood, we have to the cup. Matt. xxvi, 27, 28. "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." Luke xxii 20. "This cup is the New Testament in my blood, which is shed for you." 1 Cor. x. 16. "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ?"

Q. What is the twenty-fourth error of the Papists? *A.* Their doctrine of the Mass. Q. What do they understand by the Mass? *A.* That which the Protestants according to scripture call the Lord's Supper, Papists call the Mass; whereby the sacrament is made a sacrifice, and offered up to God. Bellar. lib. 1. de missa cap. 1. What say the Protestants to the Mass? *A.* That it is a vain and idolatrous thing as used by them. Q. Why vain? *A.* Because by Christ's sacrifice God is sufficiently satisfied, and the repenting sinner fully secured. Heb. x. 12. "This man after he had offered one sacrifice for sins, forever sat down on the right hand of God."

Q. Why idolatrous? *A.* Because they make it a mere idol, not only worshipping it as God, but trusting therein for salvation as in Christ himself. Q. How do you prove that the Mass is not the very same sacrifice with that of Christ crucified on the cross? *A.* 1. God appointed Christ for a sacrifice, but never the Mass. 2. The Mass is not the same sort or kind with that of Christ crucified. Q. Wherein lieth the difference? *A.* 1. It was the sacrifice of the very body born of a virgin, but the Mass of a piece of bread. 2. There was a shedding of blood, but the Mass is an unbloody sacrifice. 3. It had the due proportion of a man, but the Mass is a wafer. Q. Are there no more errors of the Papists? *A.* Yes many, but these are sufficient to make the Protestants abhor their church and doctrine. Q. Where was the Protestants religion before Luther? *A.* In the Bible doctrinally, and in its fruits in the hearts and lives of all good men. Q. Where were the disciples first called christians? *A.* At Antioch the disciples were first called christians. Acts xi. 26. Q. Then the name of christians had not its rise from Rome? *A.* No. Q. What doth the name christian put us in mind of? *A.* It putteth us in mind of what Christ hath done for us, and the many benefits we obtain from his life, death, resurrection and intercession. Q. What more? *A.* It is a remembrance to us of what we should do for Christ, in gratitude for what he hath done for us. Q. Do not Popish Priests, Jesuits and others, that die for treasons and murders, die like christians? *A.* No, true christians at their death will give glory to God. Q. Do they not give glory to God? *A.* No, if they did they would confess their just deserts that bring them to that punishment. Q. Why do they not confess their treasons and murders, &c. when they come to die for them? *A.* Because their church forbids them to confess to Protestants, whom they call heretics. Q. How doth that appear? *A.* In that they receive absolution upon condition that they die concealing the crime for which they die. Q. Upon what principle do they proceed in this? *A.* Upon this principle; that no man owes his enemy truth? Q. Why so? *A.* Because he owes him what then may be a means for his preservation. Q. What use do they make of this principle? *A.* That the Protestants being adver-



saries to the church of Rome, her sons owe them nothing but ruin and destruction, and the vilest of means which they can use for that end are meritorious and glorious.

I have not inserted the quotations under the five last questions in regard, the authors are so numerous; if the Papists shall deny it, let the reader peruse what the Protestants have quoted out of the Romanists' own books, and he will find that they do not only make this kind of perjury blameless but necessary; breach of oaths is with them no less than a virtue or a necessary duty in many cases, especially when any thing of moment is to be opposed, which is against the laws of the Roman church; against that particularly of the general council of Lateran under Pope Innocent the third, which forbids all favor to be shown to heretics, under the sorest penalties and decrees—that favorers of heretics are under the excommunication, if they will not break their oaths made in favour of heretics, and that by the sacred decree of their church, he must be forsworn if he will not be excommunicated, and thereby exposed to the violence of every hand, (as Sir Edmond-bury-Godfrey was.) Yea, one that hath taken the oaths of allegiance and supremacy, according to their doctrine, sins mortally, and puts himself into the state of damnation, not if he takes these oaths, (for that their Priests may dispense with) but if he keeps them. So Pope Martin the fifth, declared in writing to Alexander, Duke of Lithuania, "know (says he) that thou sinnest mortally if thou keep thy oaths with heretics." Apud Cochlaum ii. 5. Hist. Husitatum. Hereby it appears that no Papist can possibly give any security which may be trusted, that Protestants shall enjoy any thing which it is in their power to deprive them of, for the greatest securities that can be given in this case, are engagements of faith and truth; God being invoked for confirmation in solemn oaths. But their religion hath laid such strong bonds upon them, to break all bonds that may favour the Protestants, that it leaves no hope of salvation to them, who will not at their death take upon their salvation, the greatest untruth if the Catholic cause may be helped by it? For another general council, that of Constance, hath determined that no faith is to be kept with heretics, in the nineteenth session of that assembly—that no safe conduct given by the Emperor, King, or Secular Prince to heretics, or any defamed for heretics, though with a design to reduce them, by what engagements soever they have obliged themselves, shall hinder those heretics, from being destroyed, though they come to the place of judgment, relying upon such security: As in John Huss' case by Pope John the twenty second. Hereby Protestants may understand what reason they have to trust to nothing among Papists, but what will keep them out of their power; seeing the principles of that religion, (not private men's opinions, but the determinations of councils) bind them to observe no faith or truth or common honesty with those whom they account heretics. No, not when life is concerned; rather than a Protestant shall be safe in any of his concerns where they can reach them. It is a virtue, a duty in their religion, to snap asunder all security (by which the world hath hitherto been preserved) to ruin a heretic.

They who would see more of this at large may read the Jesuits' morals, the practical divinity of the Papists and mystery of Jesuitism, besides the late instances which they have given at their deaths, who have been executed for treasons and murders, denying these things for which they suffered, though proven upon them as clear as the sun at noon day;

occasioned by their awe, the Priests have upon them; being so far led away with them, that the obedience of the dying Proselyte is prevalent even above his considerations of a future state. This will be more apparent if we consider that hundreds of Irish Papists are executed in the kingdom of Ireland every year for murders, thefts, &c., and though taken in the very act, yet when they come to die, usually take it upon their deaths, and as they must appear before the great Judge that knows all things, that they are as innocent of the fact for which they die as the child unborn. For they have discharged their consciences by confessing to the Priest and received his absolution, it would bring an odium on their religion, and would be a strengthening of the hands of Protestants if the Priests should suffer it. Whereas on the other side, could they persuade the simple people to believe they died innocent, they hope it may lay a stain upon that religion, which they call so often by the name of heresy. And though those Priests have always that regard to their church, as to impose upon the prisoners, to let the world know he dieth a Roman Catholic; yet he hath also much care of the man that he must not desire the prayers of any but Papists.

These things being so usual among them, any considerate man will easily judge without breach of charity, upon what ground such men are seduced to commit a sin, and then out-face the truth of the matter of fact even in the face of death. J.

P. S. Comparatively few in the United States will at present give credit to the above, but unless there be a true and sincere repentance both in the church and the nation and abandonment of their wicked ways, there will ere long be as few that will not be soundly convinced of it. G.

---

ART. VII. *Answer of A. H. to the queries of Q.*

MR. EDITOR.—

In the December No. of the Monitor I perceive an article signed Q. proposing certain queries relative to some resolutions passed by the Presbytery of Miami, and communicated by me for insertion in the Monitor. In the tone of sarcasm which the queries breathe I cannot recognize that Christian spirit which distinguishes the honest enquirer, and which puts the most favourable construction upon the doings of a brother or an association of brethren that they will bear. Instead of this, the piece abounds with insinuations against the motives and designs of the Presbytery of Miami, calculated as far as the writer's influence extends, to injure said Presbytery in the public estimation. The writer has, in my humble opinion, justly exposed himself to the rebuke administered to misguided zeal of old, "Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of." Your correspondent near the close of his remarks tells you that he has scarcely been able to persuade himself that the resolutions in question were the doings of a church court at all. In other words, he entertains some suspicion that they are a base forgery, and that my signature has been affixed to a statement which I could not but know was false. Truly a brotherly supposition; and a strange one to announce after all the odium which he has attempted to heap upon the Presbytery. Methinks he might have spared himself the unnecessary labour of

holding up the Presbytery of Miami to public gaze as a body of unprincipled men; till he became fully persuaded that they had done the deed of which he complains. But then a fine opportunity would have been lost of showing his smartness, and possibly too, of venting his spleen against a Presbytery respecting which some good men seem disposed to ask "can any good thing come out of Nazareth?" From the considerations above specified I would consider myself perfectly exonerated from any obligation to notice the remarks of your correspondent, were it not that the Presbytery is unjustly assailed, and that impressions exceedingly remote from truth and righteousness may in certain quarters be made.

The first subject of your correspondent's animadversion is the Presbytery's resolution, recommending the distribution of the Holy Scriptures to the destitute, through the instrumentality of the American Bible Society and its auxiliaries, to the consideration of the congregations under their care. The writer labours to prove that this resolution is incompatible with our witnessing profession, and also with subordination to the Synod's authority. To support this position he refers your readers to the act of Synod adopting regulations for the purpose of uniting all their people in a Bible Society for promoting the circulation of the Scriptures with the metrical version of the Psalms. The Presbytery had "not forgotten," this when they passed the obnoxious resolution, nor did they in adopting the one, intend in the remotest degree to oppose the other; any more than they designed their contemplated effort on behalf of *foreign* missions to interfere with the acknowledged claims of *domestic* missions. When the act alluded to was passed by the Associate Synod, I believe that all the brethren present from this Presbytery concurred very cordially in its passage, and I am not aware that a solitary individual among them has to this day taken any ground inconsistent with it. Some of them I know, according to their means, have always contributed to the funds of both institutions. But according to this writer, the Synod's act was passed in opposition to the American Bible Society, so that the one cannot accord with the other. This I consider a slander on the Associate Synod. Where is the record of it to be found? Is it in the Synod's act either as published or recorded? If not, were the Synod either ashamed or afraid to let the world know their purpose? Had this been the Synod's object would they not have openly avowed it, and publicly warned their people of the danger? Most assuredly they would. I am not ignorant of the hard things which were said by some individuals, when the subject was under discussion; but neither should your correspondent be ignorant of what was said by others in reply, and that too by some of the most experienced and influential members of the Synod. The members of the Presbytery of Miami who were present (as far as the writer knows) approved of the measure proposed, as praiseworthy in itself, and calculated to answer an important purpose, which the American Bible Society could not answer; and it is believed that they are still of the same mind. All therefore that is said about a change of measures, a change of mind, &c. is wholly irrelevant and out of place. The Presbytery acknowledge no change of views on the subject. They have acted on principles which by some of them at least, were freely and fully avowed on the floor of Synod, when the act referred to was passed. On the general question respecting the claims of the American Bible Society it would be improper here to enter. All, therefore that I consider it necessary to say farther on this part of the Queries is that

when the Presbytery of Miami address a recommendation to their people on any subject of truth or duty, they claim the privilege of framing it themselves. They think that they are competent to the task, and at all events, from the specimen which your correspondent has given, they will be disposed to do it in their own bungling way, rather than employ his aid.

The 2nd resolution adopted by the Presbytery of Miami respects Foreign Missions. This appears to be the principal subject of the writer's animadversion, and if the Presbytery did wrong in its adoption, it certainly merited to be so, for it is doubtless calculated to produce important results one way or other. A goodly portion of the writer's remarks on this subject is predicated on the supposition that China is to be the field of labour first selected. The Presbytery, however, have not yet said so, and it is as yet uncertain whether they will. But the suggestion of China as the field of action need excite no surprise. It is not a new thing. If your correspondent had adverted to the memorials on this subject laid on the Synod's table long ago, he would have found the same suggestion there. It is possible that there may be a more promising opening for missionary effort among some of our native tribes than in the Chinese Empire, and perhaps Q is in possession of some information on this subject that has not reached Miami. If so we would be thankful to have it communicated. But if the information received should lead the Presbytery to the deliberate conclusion that there is in Providence a fairer prospect for disseminating the pure light of the gospel in China than elsewhere, I can see no particular reason why the selection should call forth your correspondent's indignation, more than any other. As to his sarcastic sneer respecting the Presbytery's acquaintance with the Chinese language, the only remark that it seems to call for is, that it is believed they are as well acquainted with it as they will be fifty or probably one hundred years hence.

One of your correspondent's leading objections to the measure proposed appears to be the fact that there is still much vacant ground within our own immediate jurisdiction at home, which remains to be occupied. If this objection has any meaning it must be this, that it is improper to make any effort to evangelize the Heathen until such times as we cannot find sufficient employment for our missionaries at home. This is a principle which the Presbytery of Miami cannot recognize as sanctioned by the law and the testimony. Were it once admitted, it is believed that it would inevitably lead to the conclusion that neither the Associate Presbytery of Miami, nor the Associate Synod, nor any other ecclesiastical body in the United States of America, ever can engage in the work of Foreign Missions.

But have the Presbytery the funds necessary to defray the expense of such a mission? This is admitted to be an important practical question. It is one, however, which is already answered in the very language of the Presbytery's own resolution. But they proceeded upon the principle that "the silver and the gold are the Lords." Nor do they look for any miraculous supply. They believe that the people under their care *can* do much, and they have no reason to doubt their willingness in a cause which they believe God approves. It is, I believe, a general truth which it may not be out of place here to state, that lack of funds for great and valuable objects is to be attributed not so much to the people as to their leaders. But after all should there be a deficiency, what then? Why, perhaps "the American Board of Foreign Missions

will supply it." Well, and suppose they did. Would the money be desecrated by coming from such a source? Would there be any dereliction of principle in receiving money from this or any other association to promote the cause of God in our own way? But there is a design in the introduction of this topic. "Perhaps the Board would also furnish the Missionary." This I cannot but pronounce a vile insinuation. It is evidently designed, and well calculated, to excite public odium against the Presbytery of Miami as if they were hostile to our well known principles on the subject of church fellowship. When this appears, from any overt act of the Presbytery, to be the case, the zeal of our Brother, will have legitimate scope, and I trust it will not spare. There are two queries inserted in the middle of the paragraph under consideration that seem to be somewhat insulated, but they are both of a practical nature, and deserve some notice. 1st. To what Presbytery would the sphere of the Missionary's labours belong? In reply. I would say that were the strange anomaly to present itself of a missionary from the American Board of Foreign Missions sent forth by an Associate Presbytery, I would be disposed to say that the sphere of his labours, would belong to no Presbytery at all. But if the Presbytery's resolution be understood according to its plain common sense meaning, I think, the simple answer will be that the sphere of his labours will belong to the Presbytery who gives him his commission. The 2nd query is, "Is it consistent with Presbyterianism to send one alone to the Heathen?" I answer, that however *inexpedient* it may be in ordinary cases, I see nothing in it inconsistent either with Presbyterianism or approved example, any more than there is in sending forth one alone to labour among the destitute at home.

Another formidable objection to the resolution in question is that it is "snatching the Synod's business out of their hands." Does the writer really think that the business of missions, whether foreign or domestic, belongs exclusively to a Synod, and that Presbyteries have no authority in the case but as a Synod pleases to give it to them? If so I must beg leave to differ from him *toto cælo*. Indeed he seems himself to hesitate whether this is tenable ground, for he immediately modifies the expression thus "or at least anticipating them in it." I cannot see and the Presbytery did not see, the inconsistency here charged. As well might we be charged with anticipating the Synod when we presented our memorials more than a year ago. But wherein does the inconsistency lie? The writer appears to place it in our acquiescence in what was done by the Synod at its last meeting, and then returning home, and passing the resolution in question. There are some mistakes here that need to be corrected. First, it is not altogether a fact that all the members of this Presbytery who were present acquiesced in what was done by Synod. True, none of them either dissented or protested, but some of them did labour to have the subject more fully discussed, and opposed (though ineffectually) the abrupt termination of the discussion. Again, the writer appears to imagine that the resolution in question is a new thing, got up after the adjournment of Synod. Here he is mistaken, for it has been lying on our table for consideration long before. But after all, where is there a shadow either of inconsistency or disrespect in our resolving that we will go forward in what we believe to be our duty, even should our Brethren decline to move along with us; and that on the other hand, we will endeavour to be prepared to co-operate efficiently with the Synod, should they (as we hope they will) see their way clear to go forward? I confidently assert that were every Presbytery

under the Synod's care to adopt a similar resolution, the way would be prepared for the Synod to act with promptitude, and they would not find their hands tied down by insuperable difficulties for years to come.

The *publication* of these resolutions appears a strange thing to your correspondent. Here I alone am answerable, and as a great man said on a certain occasion, "I take the responsibility." I may, however add, that the Presbytery of Miami never have practised concealment in their transactions. They are willing that the whole church, and the world too, should see their course, and have the opportunity of judging for themselves whether it is in accordance with the word of God and our witnessing profession, or not. And especially in matters of such "general interest" as those embraced in these resolutions.

One thing more, and I have done. Your correspondent thinks that these resolutions are strangely associated with the solemn exercise of public covenanting. It is evident that the Presbytery of Miami did not consider the association an unnatural one, for the first resolution was passed a short time before, and the second immediately after, this soul-inspiring work. And whatever Q. may think on the matter, I must believe that in this the Presbytery were right, until he prove that there is something in the Secession Testimony or in our Covenant Bond, inimical to the dissemination of gospel light among those who are perishing for lack of knowledge;—a task which, for the sake of his own credit and that of the Secession church, I trust he will not undertake.

To conclude, I consider the strictures of your correspondent as being a covert attack on the whole business of missions to the Heathen. This is my apology for any severity of stricture in which I may have indulged; for I cannot but consider that minister of the cross of Christ who opposed Christian missions to the Heathen, as acting in direct contradiction to the declared will of the Master, who has said, "Go into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature." A. H.

#### ART. VIII. *Religious Intelligence.*

The following is from the Report of Rev. R. Baird, a portion of which we published in the last Monitor.

DENMARK.—From Hamburgh I went to Kiel, where I staid but a few hours, and thence went to Copenhagen, where I staid several days and became acquainted with several influential persons to whom I had letters of introduction.

Denmark is a country with which many interesting historic recollections are connected. The military achievements of this almost insular kingdom for many centuries were such as to affect almost the whole civilized world. In later times the power of that nation has become insignificant in comparison with the great kingdoms which have risen up in Great Britain, France, Prussia, Austria, and Russia.

To the christian the history of this country is interesting; for here the doctrines of the Reformation found security, and pure religion for a long time flourished. And here too the spirit of modern missions early showed itself, and led to the sending forth of holy men to carry the gospel to the heathen.

It is true, however, that Denmark, like all the rest of Protestant Europe, has experienced a sad declension in vital piety. The causes of this deterioration are the same which have been so powerful in the other Protestant countries of Europe, and of which I shall speak in another place.

There are about one thousand ministers of the gospel in Denmark, belonging to the Lutheran church, which is the prevailing denomination of the kingdom. There are eight Bishops, whose power is chiefly that of superintendence, in that church. These Bishops are appointed by the King. Besides the Lutheran churches, there are a few of the German Reformed, and these are mostly in the Duchy of Holstein. There is a Moravian church, as I have already stated, at Altona, one at Copenhagen, and one at Fredericksfelt where there is also a settlement of this excellent community, at which there are boarding-schools for the education of youth.

There is a French settlement of the descendants of refugees, who fled from France at the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes, at Frederica on the coast of Jutland. I believe that this little flock is now without a pastor, and that the last minister whom they had was the excellent Rieu, whose interesting memoirs have been published in the United States.

There are two English churches in Denmark, one at Copenhagen, attached to the British Embassy, to which the Rev. Mr. Ellice ministers; the other is at Elsineur, to which the Rev. Mr. Wade preaches. They are both small. The Rev. Mr. Wade is decidedly evangelical in his doctrines, and has been the instrument of doing much good in the village of Elsineur, as well as to the English and American seamen, and others who visit that port.

There are but few Roman Catholics in Denmark, for in this kingdom the principles of the Reformation were almost universally adopted by the people, supported by the efficient influence of the Government. There is one Catholic church at Copenhagen, and a few in the Duchies of Holstein and Schleswich. There is also one Jewish Synagogue at Copenhagen.

In regard to the state of evangelical religion in this kingdom, the investigations which I have been able to make discover an affecting picture of a deplorable declension from the high estate which it once enjoyed. For the last fifty or sixty years, the reign of Rationalism has been wide and desolating. But, thanks be to God, a brighter day is certainly beginning to dawn on the churches in this land. There is a little leaven which is beginning to work, and we may hope that its influence will yet reach to every part of the kingdom.

There are two Universities in Denmark. One is at Copenhagen, in which there are nearly one thousand students. In the theological department of this institution there are four professors, and between 300 and 400 students. And although there is not one of these professors evangelical in doctrine, but on the contrary, all are more than ordinarily opposed to such doctrines, yet a larger number of the students are evangelical in their faith and practice than have before been found at that University for a long time. It is true that the number of such young men is small in comparison with the whole; but still it is enough to encourage the children of God greatly.

The other University is at Kiel. It has about 200 students, of whom 50 or 60 are in the theological department, under the instruction of

four professors, not more than one of whom is considered evangelical. But there is a most excellent pastor in that city, the Rev. Mr. Harms, who is probably the most important minister of the gospel in Denmark. He is, under God, the great instrument of the religious revival which is now gradually making progress in the kingdom.

There are eight Lutheran churches in Copenhagen, to which 24 ministers are attached. But with the exception of the Bishop of the city and the adjoining district, and the Rev. Messrs. Grundvig and Simonson, (and they are not regular pastors at present,) I cannot learn that there are any who are truly evangelical in their sentiments.

But deplorable as the state of the overwhelming majority of the Lutheran and Reformed churches in this kingdom unquestionably is, yet there is something to encourage. There are still some faithful preachers of the gospel. Nor is this country sunk down into the gross and avowed infidelity which now abounds in some nominally Roman Catholic countries. Though there is but little observance of the Sabbath in that strict and holy manner in which it ought to be observed, yet there is that general regard for religion which leads the bulk of the population to attend, more or less, the churches of the living God. There is indeed a sad declension from vital piety, but there is still a prevalent regard for the forms of religion. And there is reason to believe that the Great Head of the church will raise up faithful pastors, through whose labors true piety will revive in the churches,—such men as Wesley and Whitfield were to the churches in England and America in their day. Indeed this blessed work is commenced. There are now a goodly number of ministers, mostly young men, who preach the truth in various parts of the kingdom. The Rev. Mr. Grundvig, who is himself a distinguished writer and an evangelical preacher, told me the very pleasing fact of there being in one district on the island of Zealand as many as seven or eight devoted young ministers of the gospel, whose labors the Lord is blessing. Among them are two brothers of the name of Fenger, who are distinguished for their zeal and evangelical piety. These things, it is true, only show that this is but the “day of small things,” but even this “is not to be despised.” May the Lord gloriously and speedily revive his work throughout that beautiful and interesting country!

Something has been done in Denmark for the Bible cause, and probably the country is pretty well supplied with the sacred scriptures. Something, but not much, has also been done for the Tract cause.

The early efforts of the Danish churches and government in behalf of missions to the heathen are well known. At present the government maintains a few missionaries who labor in Greenland and in the West India Islands. There is, however, a missionary society, supported by the voluntary contributions of the churches, which is doing something for the heathen, chiefly or rather exclusively, I believe through the institution and missionary society of Basle in Switzerland. Although but little is yet done in that way, yet it is interesting to see that this blessed spirit is returning again to the Danish churches. It is the harbinger of brighter times.

In relation to the temperance societies, little has hitherto been done in behalf of this good cause in Denmark. The attention of a few philanthropists, it is true, has been for some time called to the subject of temperance societies which they had heard of as existing in America and England, but no effectual step had been taken towards their forma-



tion in that country. During my short stay I did all that I could for this important cause ; a cause which ought to be considered important in Denmark, for there is a very considerable consumption of ardent spirits in that kingdom, though less, I have reason to believe, than in some of the other northern countries of Europe. I either distributed or put in course of judicious distribution, forty copies of the history of the temperance societies in the French language. And I was greatly gratified to know that the king, who is a very benevolent man, and greatly beloved by his subjects, received with much interest the copy of the work which was presented to him, and expressed his desire that something might be done to advance the cause within his dominions. I have also made arrangements to have some one or two hundred copies of the edition of the same book in the German language sent into that country for distribution : and I am not without hopes that God will smile on these incipient measures.

CATHOLIC SWITZERLAND.—A correspondent of the N. Y. Observer writes as follows respecting a *schism* in certain of the Popish Cantons of Switzerland :—

But I will not dwell upon these political quarrels. Switzerland presents a topic of deeper interest to religious men, namely, the schism now more and more manifest in the Catholic Cantons, and which will end perhaps in the formation of a church entirely independent of the Holy See. I have repeatedly referred in my letters to the preparations of the Swiss Catholics for breaking the yoke of Popery. New information has lately been received particularly respecting the Cantons of *St. Gall*, *Lucerne* and *Berne*.

At St. Gall, an intelligent priest named *Louis Fuchs* published a sermon entitled ; “ *Without Christ, there is no Salvation, either for the State or the Church.*” In this sermon he established the following propositions : 1st, that the bishop ought to convoke regularly all the members of the clergy of his diocese to form a Synod, and to have no other authority, in this Synod, than that of president : 2dly, that the time is come to be freed from the servitude imposed by the pope ; 3dly, that the Roman Catholic church needs a fundamental reform in its doctrine, worship, hierarchy and discipline ; 4thly, that the mass ought to be celebrated in the vulgar tongue ; 5thly, that the celibacy of the clergy is opposed to the Holy Scriptures, and to the natural inclinations of man ; 6thly, that perpetual religious vows are an abuse. This discourse, which attacks all that our reformers attacked in the sixteenth century, produced upon the Catholics of St. Gall a deeper sensation because the author was a priest. The opposition, which had long existed in the minds of men, but feared to show itself, now appeared openly. Not only many lay-members of the Romish church, but a considerable number of ecclesiastics, adopted the opinions of Mr. Fuchs. The people demanded from all quarters a radical reform in popery, and the representatives of the country were quite disposed to listen to their just complaints.

But a violent storm gathered over this courageous and pious priest ; for the church of Rome never yields its prerogatives without a struggle. Instead of persuasion, it employs physical force, and not till this fails, will it consent to leave the field of battle. Mr. Fuchs was suspended by the bishop from all his ecclesiastical functions. In vain the most honorable citizens, and principal magistrates of the country espoused the cause of a priest whom they loved and respected. The bishop was

inflexible. Soon after came a letter of the pope, condemning the errors of Mr. Fuchs, and declaring him unworthy to have the charge of a religious congregation. This rigor of the holy see produced a totally different effect from what Rome expected. Public sentiment declared itself more and more strongly in favor of Mr. Fuchs, and the council of State of St. Gall appointed him librarian of the abbey. The canons of the metropolitan church conspired against the lawful government, and were driven from the canton. The pope's nuncio in Switzerland published two vehement protests against the reforms introduced into the church of St. Gall. But his clamors and threats had no effect. The legislative council, the government and the people were tired of popery; they had opened their eyes to the superstitions and impostures of a communion which raised the authority of man to a level with the authority of God, and nothing could change their determination. Now, (and the Catholic journals themselves avow it,) *seperation is effected in the eastern part Switzerland.* Rome has lost several thousands of souls, and will doubtless never succeed in recovering them. The adherents of the holy see exult and sound the note of victory whenever they succeed in converting two or three individuals; but let them show us a people, abandoning the reformation to submit to Romish despotism, as we see at this moment the people of St. Gall abandoning Rome to embrace the reformation.

We pass to the canton of Lucerne. The city of Lucerne has been for three centuries the centre of Catholicism in Switzerland. There the nuncio of the pope resided; there the machinations were contrived which held the people under the despotism of the holy see. How often for two hundred years, has war been excited, at Lucerne, between the Catholic and Protestant cantons! This city has been a lofty tower, a fortress, from which Rome has cast burning arrows against her enemies. But her day of power is gone, and the pope, seeing Lucerne in revolt, may well say with Cesar, "*Et, tu, Brute!*"

There were in the seminary of Lucerne two fanatical professors, named *Kaufmann* and *Wilder*, who attacked the civil authority and taught doctrines contrary to the commonwealth; they have been deposed. The *landamman* or first officer of the canton, Mr. Pfyffer, was president of the conferences of Baden, where measures were adopted to confine the power of the holy see within proper limits. Mr. Pfyffer made a forcible address, in which he said that Switzerland, having achieved political liberty, must also achieve religious liberty. The conduct of this magistrate is in accordance with his professions; he pursues with much firmness and perseverance, plans of reform which he judges useful to his country. The Pope's nuncio at first tried to form a party of obedient and devoted Catholics, to contend against this anti-Romish movement; but he found no support in the mass of the people; and having no hope of success, he left the city of Lucerne and now resides in the borough of Schwytz. Thus the great fortress of Helvetic Catholicism has fallen in to the hands of the new reformers.

In the canton of Berne events have been still more serious. I stated in a former letter that the Catholic population of Jura, instigated by infatuated priests, had refused to accept the acts of the conference of Baden, and that the Bernese government had been forced to send soldiers into this part of the canton to restore the authority of the laws. The rebels were reduced to order and the affair seemed at an end; but a Catholic journal of Paris announces an important fact, which may be followed by the most serious consequences.

Among the most fanatical priests of Jura, is one named *Cuttat*, curate of Porentruy, who exceeds all others in violent declamation and a spirit of revolt. For some weeks he published a journal in which he called upon the citizens of Jura to rise against the government and establish an independent canton. When the troops of Berne arrived in the country, Mr. *Cuttat* fled, to escape legal punishment. The bishop of Bale, whose diocese comprises the Catholics of Jura, felt it to be his duty to depose this rebellious priest and appoint a successor. But the pope's nuncio wrote to the bishop of Bale censuring him, calling upon him to revoke his decision. The pope himself interfered in the matter, and took the part of the priest who had kindled the fire of revolt against the government. The bishop of Bale refused to yield to the injunction of the holy see, and, we are assured, is about to resign his charge.

What will be the result of this contest, it is impossible precisely to determine. It is said that the question will be carried before the Helvetic diet. If, as is probable, the magistrates retain in the parish the successor to Mr. *Cuttat*, a new schism will be produced, and Rome will lose another considerable portion of Swiss Catholics.

In fact, every thing in this country tends to revolution. Roman catholicism cannot live quietly in a free and enlightened nation. When learning is diffused among all classes of the people, when education becomes general, when democracy is introduced into the manners, and the laws, and popery then tries to sap and overturn the edifice of reason and liberty, it excites the distrust and enmity of good citizens, and the people at length understand that, if they would be free and tranquil, they must be severe in imposing restrictions on the power of the Romish clergy. Let the opinion be once fixed in the minds of the mass of the people, that they may lawfully inquire whether the Romish church does not teach cunningly devised fables for the profit of the holy see, and the inquiry soon detects numerous impostures in catholicism. This is the course which the reformation is now taking in Switzerland, and it will not stop, to all appearance, till the last remains of popish domination are laid in the dust.

The friends of the gospel who have adopted the great principle of the separation of church and state, will regret perhaps that the government should interfere so often in the religious troubles of Switzerland, and will wish that the reformation would use only spiritual instruments.

These sentiments are laudable, and I adopt them wholly. Would God that in all christian countries the church were independent of the state and the state independent of the church! Religion and political liberty would both derive great advantages. But it must be recollected that this reciprocal independence does not yet exist in Switzerland, and the reformation needs, as in the time of Luther and Calvin, to be sustained and even directed by the civil magistrates, that it may overcome the obstacles which oppose its progress.

Let us not forget that this reformation is yet *negative* rather than *positive*. The Catholic Swiss, who reject the dominion of the pope, are far from being all pious, sincere christians. Most of them, it may be presumed, are simply *anti-papists*, but not faithful disciples of Christ. Yet this first step will certainly lead to others. They who have forsaken the holy see to enter the paths of reform will not long be contented to remain destitute and famished; they will seek for spiritual nourishment, and will find it, we trust, in the word of God. Christianity is flourishing in the Protestant part of Switzerland, and when the other

part shall become decisively *protestant*, it will possess the proper means of becoming *christian*.

CHINA—The annexed edict, which we copy from a late number of the Canton Register, is not only a curiosity in itself, but may interpose very serious obstacles in the dissemination of Christian truth among the millions of China. Although by the religion of the “lord of heaven” the edict is supposed by the editor of the Register (as we infer from an explanatory phrase in the first paragraph) to refer to the religion of the church of Rome, it is not at all probable that the Chinese Government discriminate between that and the religion of Protestants. Indeed it is evident from the allusion to an “English foreign ship” which “abruptly entered the waters of all the Provinces and distributed foreign books,” that no such discrimination is made. The distribution referred to was effected by Protestants, and the books were Protestant books including however, parts of the Bible, which is claimed by all denominations of Christians as the basis of their belief.—*Jour. of Com.*

EDICT AGAINST TEACHING THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION.

*Lew*, acting magistrate of the *Nahae* district, &c. &c. respecting an official document I have received from, by imperial appointment, the provincial treasurer, *Ah*, and the provincial judge, *Wang*, concerning the strict prohibition of the dissemination and practice of the religion (doctrines) of the lord of heaven (the religion of the church of Rome,) and to rectify the hearts of men: an affair of the most pressing urgency.

It is known from the records that the Portuguese have dwelt in the land teaching and practising the religion of the lord of heaven; and they have privately printed volumes of their sacred books, from which they discourse to the people and delude many; these spread the doctrines and practice, assume secret designations, and the delusion reaches to the multitude; of this there are certain proofs. The leaders, after being tried and found guilty, certainly should be strangled. Those who secretly disseminate this delusive doctrine, in number are not many; those without any designation, after trial should be imprisoned (before being strangled.) Those who have only, on hearing the doctrine, become disciples and do not know how to reform, should be banished and delivered over to the *Pihkih* officers or to the Moosoolmen (*Hwuy Hwuy*), who are able to keep them under, to be slaves. \* \* \* \*

After the publication of this proclamation, if all those who have received and retained foreign books of the religion of the lord of heaven, or practised and disseminated that religion, within the period of half a year deliver to the district officers [their books] and leave the religion, then their crimes will be forgiven. Now through this not-ancient path of vice and stupification those who try can retrace their steps; you should hasten to change your *face* and change your mind, and with the bitterest regret repent and reform. Do not on any account, “halting between two opinions,” delay returning. But if you exceed the allowed period, and again receive and retain any foreign books, and do not deliver them up, and persevere in practising and spreading the religion, for those who act thus, an examination shall be forthwith ordered; they shall be immediately seized and punished severely.

Now how in this world below, on which the splendid heaven sheds its transforming and vivifying light and heat, can depraved discourses be permitted to flow?—O ye fortunate people, you now live happily in a state of peace and quietness; you should adhere to the correct worship

and straight path, and reject and extirpate depraved and corrupt doctrines, without cabals and combinations, without selfish depravity.

Follow the ways of the ancient kings, then you will be able to *drink* harmony and *eat* virtue; and you will all be the virtuous people of an abundant and flourishing age. We, the *szu* officers, indeed most assuredly hope it. Do not oppose. A special edict.

Taoukwang, 16th year, 4th moon, 7th day. [21st May.]

#### ART. IX. *Miscellany.*

**STARTING CHILDREN IN THE WORLD.**—Many an unwise parent labors hard and lives sparingly all his life for the purpose of leaving enough to give his children a start in the world, as it is called. Setting a young man afloat with money left him by his relatives, is like tying bladders under the arm of one who cannot swim—ten chances to one he will loose his bladders and go to the bottom. Teach him to swim and then he will never need the bladders. Give your child a sound education, and you have done enough for him. See to it that his morals are pure, his mind cultivated, and his whole nature made subservient to the laws which govern man, and you have given him what will be of more value than the wealth of the Indies. You have given him a ‘start’ which no misfortune can deprive him of. The earlier you teach him to depend upon his own resources the better.

**THE BIBLE ABOVE ALL PRICE.**—The celebrated Patrick Henry, in his last will, bears the following testimony to the value of the Bible: “I have now disposed of all my property to my family; there is one thing more I wish I could give them, and that is the christian religion. If they had that and I had given them nothing, they would be rich, and without it, if I had given them all the world, they would be poor.”

#### ART. X. *Our Correspondents.*

We are happy in being able to present to our readers, in the present No., so much valuable original matter. The correspondents, who have furnished it, have our thanks. R. is a new correspondent, we hope to hear from him often. Such communications need not be *post paid*. As we had received nothing from A. since her *Observations on the Life of Abraham and Sarah*, her communication entitled, *Presbyterians in the 16th and 17th centuries*, was gratefully received by us, and will be perused, we trust, with interest by all our readers. We hope she will not be silent so long again. It would be desirable if our correspondents would endeavor to write as *legibly* as possible. The lines are often so crowded together that it is difficult to *decipher* the meaning. We would willingly pay *postage* on the additional *paper* that might be requisite to make *fair copy*. We have no complaint, however, to make in relation to the two correspondents named above, as some might be led to imagine from the *connection* in which we have given this hint.

THE  
RELIGIOUS MONITOR,

AND

EVANGELICAL REPOSITORY.

---

MARCH, 1837.

---

ART. I. *The Deceitfulness of Riches Choking the Word.*

(Concluded from page 398.)

We have considered the deceitfulness of riches, in a few of the many cases in which it is exemplified. Our second inquiry, is, How does it choke the word, and render it unfruitful?

This will more clearly appear, if we consider, first, What fruits the word is designed to produce, and which are therefore to be expected from it? In answer to this then I observe,

1. The word preached is designed to produce the conviction and conversion of them that hear it. It is the incorruptible seed of the word which liveth and abideth forever, of which true converts are the fruit and offspring, "being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible by the word." Our Lord says to the apostles, "I have chosen you, and ordained you, that ye should go and bring forth fruit, and that your fruit should remain." Their work, to which they were ordained, was to preach the gospel, but the end and design of all was the conversion of many, as the fruits of it. The apostle, (Rom. i. 13,) uses the same expression, "Now I would not have you ignorant brethren, that oftentimes I purposed to come unto you, (but was let hitherto,) that I might have some fruit among you also, even as among other gentiles." That is, that by his preaching he might be the means of converting some. The expression and the meaning are so frequent and so plain as to need no further illustration.

2. The spiritual comfort and growth of believers, is another fruit which the word is designed to produce. So the apostle speaks, (Phil. i. 21, 22,) "For to me to live is Christ, and to die is gain. But if I live in the flesh, this is the fruit of my labor." Verse 25, "And having this confidence, I know that I shall abide and continue with you all, for your furtherance and joy of faith." Whether the word be heard, read, or made matter of meditation, the universal experience of believers attests that its proper fruits and effects are the enlargement of spiritual comfort and growth. The fruit of the Spirit, (and they are by the word,) are love, joy, peace, &c., all of which are the believer's own

enjoyment in the first place. The more that the word abides and abounds in any, so much the more of this precious fruit they enjoy to their soul's comfort. Hear the Psalmist cxix. 97, 98, "O how love I thy law, it is my meditation all the day. Thou through thy commandments hast made me wiser than mine enemies"—This is its precious fruit in him. Verse 103, "How sweet unto my taste are thy words; yea sweeter than honey to my mouth," &c.

3. Good works are a farther and very important fruit which the word is designed to produce. By good works is meant the performance of the several duties we owe to God, and to our fellow men. An open and steadfast appearance for God in a profession of his name, a diligent observance of all the duties of that profession public and private, a constant watchfulness against all that is inconsistent with our holy profession. The same, therefore, that the apostle means by a conversation becoming the gospel, and, a conversation in heaven. Good works include also all acts of love to fellow men; so the apostle calls a charitable contribution made by the Gentile churches, in behalf of the poor Jews, a fruit. Rom. xv. 28. This fruit of good works is very important, it is inseparable from the inward fruits before spoken of, and an indispensable evidence of them. It is therefore the rule of judging—"By their fruits ye shall know them." It is important as respects the honor of religion in the world; therefore is it so much insisted on. The apostle prays for the Phil. i. 11. That they might be filled with all the fruits of righteousness, which are by Jesus Christ, unto the praise and glory of God. And for the Col. i. 10. That they might walk worthy of the Lord unto all pleasing, being fruitful in every good work.

4. The word in believers is designed through them to produce like fruits on the young under their care. Children are God's heritage; and where the word has its power, and fruit in the heart, and life as before spoken, it will also by instruction and example in training up the young, extend its fruits even to the following generation.

We may now easily understand how the deceitfulness of riches chokes the word, so as to hinder the production of these fruits.

1. It does so, when this love and pursuit of the world obtain first possession of the heart. This is the case supposed in the parable, the good seed fell among thorns. And where these thorns of worldly cares, are fairly rooted, the sower of the word may sow his seed in the morning, and in the evening not withhold his hand but he must sow in tears, for he will reap no fruit of his labors. Our Lord Jesus represents those who are in love with riches, whether possessing or only pursuing them, as among the most unlikely to be effectually wrought upon by the word; "How hardly shall they that have riches enter into the kingdom of God, and again I say unto you, that it is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle, than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of God." They who find in riches the means of gratifying all their carnal desires, are most unlikely to embrace the selfdenying doctrines of Christ. The very first lesson is too much for them. If any man will be his disciple, let him forsake all, and take up his cross and follow him. This was what tested the young man, concerning whom our Lord particularly made the remark. He had some desire to be instructed by the word, to partake of the spiritual and eternal blessings of the gospel, but upon a trial it appeared he had no room even for the seed of these things; the ground of his heart was so completely filled with thorns, that the seed of the word which Christ did cast at him, was in a manner lost and thrown

away, it was completely choked out. It cannot be enough lamented, that there are still so many young men like him—they greatly abound, and their number appears to be on the increase. Religion was not made the first business with them, I mean in its practical character, and with personal application to themselves; it has not been laid to their heart, while yet their hearts were young and tender, that must be deferred till they come to years of judging. But in the mean time they have been daily taught and trained to worldly business and management. Alas! what sad misconduct in parents or instructors, thus to cultivate the thorns, when they should have been sowing the good seed. Now they are so full of business, the farm and the merchandise, or affairs of the common-wealth, that they have little time or taste for religion, it seems like a business that does not lie to their hand, and of course it is not strange that they are very backward in making profession of religion, the word preached, is heard with almost no interest, and the introduction of a spiritual subject in private conversation would be positively irksome.

2. It does so by destroying the seed where it was sown. I do not intend to say that where the word, as the incorruptible seed, has indeed come into the heart, in its regenerating power, through the influence of the Holy Spirit, that any thing shall be permitted to root it out, or wholly destroy it; we are expressly taught that when that is the case "it liveth and abideth forever." But I refer to those cases in which the knowledge of divine truth has been treasured up in the memory and understanding by early instruction, this is a sowing of the good seed, which when watched and watered will produce good fruit; according to the tendency of means, it may issue in the saving change of the heart. This is therefore the fruit to be looked for; it is due, and whatever prevents it may be considered as chargeable with destroying it. But how common is it, for those whose minds have been well stored with scripture, and scripture doctrine, as taught in the catechism, in their childhood, when they come to enter upon worldly business, lay all aside, and by the time they ought to be able to teach others, they have need that some one teach them again the first principles. They have actually forgotten and lost, amidst worldly cares and business, what they once knew; and are very apt to look on the learning of such things, as an exercise out of season for them, as unfitting as the clothes of their childhood, would be. The word has been choked in them and rendered unfruitful. How often also when persons are about making a public profession, they are stirred up to examine or at least to read with some care the form of doctrine, and to attend with more seriousness to the hearing of the word and other duties; all which is a good beginning, and if cherished would produce much good fruit; but very often they are no sooner admitted to the fellowship of the church, than they consider the business of learning as over, become negligent in it, and more diligent in the world, lose what they had attained, become more incapable of being benefitted by the preaching of the word; they go backward instead of forward.

Whatever knowledge or skill is acquired, may again be lost, and without the constant exercise will slip from us; this applies with singular force to religion. Both the letter and spirit of it, are plants that flourish not naturally in us, if not cherished by daily use of the means, it will wither and decay, and still more rapidly when the attention is given to the cultivation of the most noxious weeds and thorns.



3. It does so in real believers, when they allow themselves in discontent with a low condition in the world; anxiety, and desires after more, schemes and contrivances for improving their circumstances, &c. For thus their attention is occupied; and in the same measure as their thoughts run on such subjects as these, are they taken off from meditating on the word, it is choked out, there is literally no time for it, and moreover the two subjects are so immensely different, that as the mind familiarizes itself with the one, so must it lose fitness and relish for the other. In such a case a believer will certainly become lean from day to day, he will continue unskillful in the word of righteousness, and scanty in the experience of its comforts; instead of advancing a step in knowledge and holiness by every day's lesson, he must still have but very limited, obscure and confused views of divine things. Do we not see it so with the great majority of professors? If any would really profit by the word and enjoy its fruits, let them consider the directions and examples of the word itself on the subject. "Let the word of Christ dwell in you richly says the apostle, speaking to yourselves in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, singing and making melody in your hearts to the Lord." It must *dwell*, be habitually the subject of reflection, and not merely by set portions at set times as a task, but *richly*, the mind must run on it freely and with pleasure, and the affections also be engaged to singing and making melody in the heart. Truly if the lonely hours of the most humble christian were thus employed, however poor in the world, he would find his spiritual riches and comforts rapidly increase. He who delights in God's law, and meditates in it day and night, he shall be like a tree planted by the rivers of water, that bringeth forth his fruit in his season; his leaf also shall not wither.—Ps. i. 2, 3. Is this a general case? No, we fear that this spiritual meditation has become so rare as to be almost out of knowledge, it is choked and excluded by the deceitfulness of worldly things.

By this same means also the word is farther choked among real christians on being excluded from conversation. This must necessarily follow from its being shut out from the meditations; in the same measure as it has place in the one, so will it have also in the other—out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh. Now when we consider how much of the influence of men over one another is by conversation it will appear how great this evil is. Spiritual conversation is one of the most precious means of quickening and strengthening believers, as iron sharpeneth iron. It is also of excellent use to the young, the ignorant and the careless; hence it was enjoined on Israel of old to speak of the things of God's word when they should sit in their house, walk by the way, lie down and rise up. And wherever this means is neglected, there will speedily appear a corresponding deficiency in spiritual knowledge and growth; but where its place is filled by worldly things, as it will be in the case supposed, and as we see it actually the case, it must have a most withering influence. It is the deceitful things of the world, that are the general and main subject of conversation in the family when sitting in the house, lying down, and rising up; in all the ordinary intercourse between professors from day to day; yes, even on God's holy day, and at the place of his public worship, scarcely has the assembly been dismissed from hearing the word, till some worldly topic is introduced. Is it any wonder that the word preached, or read in the family produces no fruit when that is the case? It is impossible it should, it is completely choked.

4. When christians act on mere worldly principles, or depend on mere natural means in their temporal circumstances, it chokes many precious promises of the word in a particular manner; as that in Ps. xxxiv 9, 10, "O fear the Lord ye his saints, for there is no want to them that fear him. The young lions do lack and suffer hunger, but they that seek the Lord shall not want any good thing." Again, Ps. xxxvii. 3. "Trust in the Lord and do good, so thou shalt dwell in the land and verily thou shalt be fed." Again that admirable lesson by our Lord himself, Math. vi. 19, "Lay not up for yourselves treasures upon earth, where moth and rust doth corrupt, and where thieves break through and steal, but lay up for yourselves treasures in heaven," &c. to verse 33rd. "But seek ye first the kingdom of God and his righteousness; and all other things shall be added unto you. Take therefore no thought for to-morrow," &c.—and many others. Now consider what are the proper fruits of such promises in particular. They ought to produce faith in God even with respect to temporal things; as he takes into his own care all the concerns of his people in a peculiar manner, so he will have them exercise faith on him in them all, in the way of seeing his hand in the ordering of their outward lot, (as we now speak of it only,) humbly submitting to his will, and patiently waiting on his counsel. Then where this fruit is produced others will be connected with it; the humble believer will possess an inward peace and confidence as to the security even of his temporal interests; so says Paul, (Phil. iv. 6,) "Be careful for nothing, but in every thing by prayer and supplications, with thanksgiving let your request be made known to God; and the peace of God which passeth all understanding, shall keep your hearts and minds through Christ Jesus."—They who take upon themselves the care of their worldly interests, have an anxious vexing charge, but the humble believer is thus at once relieved of that burden. Another fruit is an experience of the truth and excellency of these promises, and of the condescension and fatherly care of God to them by these. This is a treasure that all worldly possessions are not once worthy to be named in comparison. So that they who have been most exercised upon this lesson in the book of God, have recorded the days of their greatest poverty, as the days of their most happy walking in communion with God. The promises are best understood, only when we come into the condition to which they more directly point; and we realize the promised blessing only when we heartily rely on the promise in such condition. But in the case remarked, all these promises are choked, there is no place for them, and so all these their precious fruits are prevented. Who is there that makes his worldly affairs matter of earnest prayer, with humble dependence and patient waiting on God? It is to be feared that such are very few. Who is it that would contentedly abide in poverty, for the sake of enjoying the word and ordinances to their edification, or the society of those with whom they might take sweet counsel and walk to the house of God? Who is there that habitually studies to look on his poverty as the holy and wise ordering of his Father; and to rest on such promises as have been named for his support? Such characters are unknown in our days. What time a man imagines himself in narrow circumstances, or turns his thought to some new country, said to be fertile, well watered, and where there is no lack of any thing that is in the earth, there is but one law for him, that is, he is determined to go there, and there make rich by his industry. And commonly his affection to those with whom he was in immediate fellowship; or the voice of providence, the one way or the other, has no

more binding force, than a thread of tow that is touched with the fire. And as for the promises they are not believed at all. Yes, severe as this charge may seem to be, brought against professing christians, its truth is demonstrated by the fact, that they cannot and will not adventure any thing upon them; though the God of truth has said it, though he has sworn it, "verily thou shalt be fed," he who would urge this as sufficient security for temporal support, and press men to prove it by an experiment, would undoubtedly be thought fanatical. So that these words of promise, are so choked, that their first fruits of faith and obedience can never appear, and of course all sweet fruits of peace and the like are utterly prevented.

It needs no argumentation to show how the word is choked and rendered unfruitful in those, who under a profession of religion are pursuing worldly riches with all their might, as if they supposed that gain were godliness, whether they keep themselves to the place of ordinances or not.

5. The word is choked and rendered unfruitful in the lives of professors and through them in the rising generation, when they are decoyed, by the dream of ease and wealth in new regions, to leave a place of settled ordinances and christian society. I do not say that the emigration of families is always unwarrantable; or that the exchange made by it is always unprofitable; there may be many instances the reverse; but I have in view the motives and ends by which men act in such cases, when they are drawn away by the love and desire of worldly possession. And that there are many evidently in this case is plain to be seen. And many more as really in it, and not so plain to be seen. They have some necessity of their family to plead on the one hand, and their purpose to settle only where they can attend upon ordinances of their own communion, as an excuse on the other, and no doubt there may be much truth and weight in both of them. But with many there is a third thing in the case, and which is properly the first thing of all, though not mentioned at all, a secret love and desire for more of the world, so deceitful perhaps, that the man himself can scarcely believe it. If it be really so, it will produce the same kind of effect in choking the word and rendering it unfruitful, in one place or another, though not to the same extent. But the case now more particularly remarked is where mitigations such as are just named do not appear, and they are not a few;—Professing christians removing to parts where they cannot pretend to any other advantages but such as are of a worldly nature, must be allowed to be under the influence of the deceitfulness of riches. Now the word is choked in them by their depriving themselves of a dispensation of the word, and of course its fruits of every kind in them will be hindered; this may not precisely accord with the figure of seed being choked, but it is undoubtedly included in what is meant by it. In whatever way men render themselves inaccessible to the word, whether by filling their hearts with worldly cares so that they are fortified against it, while they continue to hear it, or by literally removing beyond the reach of it; it amounts to the same thing. And it is curious to observe how the deceitfulness of the snare works in such cases. There is scarcely any one but would be ashamed to say plainly, he had determined to exchange spiritual privileges for a morsel of meat, and therefore he supposes that his new situation may perhaps come within the circuit of some missionary, or in the course of a few years, preaching will no doubt be obtained there, and that is no worse than the first sei-

tlers were in the place he is leaving, &c. In this way he silences his own conscience, and keeps himself in countenance among professing christians, as not intending to give up with religion; but is it not most manifest that if his spiritual appetite bore any proportion to his natural hunger, he would look upon such scanty provision, such occasional meals, as nothing better than absolute starvation? and if his eagerness to obtain worldly possessions, were not incomparably greater than his desire after the true riches, he could never think a supposition, or peradventure, any ground to go upon?

But let us consider the emigrant as at his place of destination. Immediately he finds himself surrounded by innumerable new objects calling his attention; society if any, is generally most remote from that which might be for his spiritual profit, and he is overwhelmed with labour, so that on every hand the word is choked; he is forgetting what he formerly heard and knew; he has little or no time for meditation on the word, it is choked here also; and as little advantage or spiritual conversation, the word is choked there; and finally it is most sadly choked in the rising generation. Even if we might suppose the parents to retain the impression of what their eyes had seen and their ears heard, what can be expected of the young who grow up in such a situation? there are indeed exceptions, but the consequence generally is "they mingle with the heathen, and learn of them their ways."

I have been thus particular in the case of those who leave the place of ordinances, in pursuit of the world, because it is a very plausible scheme, yet a very deceitful way in which the love of the world prevails and is gratified; because also it is a very common and ruinous evil at the present day, not only hurtful to the individuals themselves, but exceedingly so to the church and cause of Christ in general, as might be shown in its proper place.

In conclusion, it is undeniable, that the spirit of the world has entered the church to a very great extent. What is its natural tendency? But to the utter ruin of religion. It is therefore important that every one should be aware of this, and labour to repress it not only by dissuading others, but first and chiefly in his own heart. Let no one, rich or poor, young or old imagine he is free, or not in danger; let him remember his love of riches is singularly deceitful; and the best, the only preservative from it is a diligent attendance to such exhortations as that of the apostle to Timothy. "But godliness with contentment is great gain, for we brought nothing into this world, and it is certain we can carry nothing out. And having food and raiment let us be therewith content."

D.

---

## ART II. *Our Religious Liberty in Danger.*

Were I set a watchman over the safety of this nation, I would at this present time sound an alarm in every State and every house in the Union. I would say "Stand fast in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made you free." Christ hath given us a liberty to which, or to its effects and consequences, no man can be indifferent. When it is fully and fairly understood, it must be admitted by all parties to be identified with

the best and dearest interests of man. I earnestly desire, if any thing I can say may contribute to so important a thing, to convince the public mind that this liberty is now in extreme danger of being lost. I crave the reader's attention First, to a few words describing this liberty, by which it may be perceived how much man in every relation has at stake; Second, I shall point out the danger of its being lost; and Third, I shall propose what ought to be done to prevent it, if that be yet possible.

The sum of this liberty doctrinally considered may be comprised in the following propositions,

1st., It is a liberty from the curse of God. "There is now no condemnation to them who are in Christ Jesus." "He was made a curse for us, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him." I know that there are many who do not believe this proposition, and that there are others, who though they profess to believe it, yet in their hearts attach little value to it; but it is not for their sakes that I state this, but for theirs who feel its worth, (and there are many of them) and who know full well, that if the doctrine of this proposition shall be overturned or sealed down in silence, the very foundation will be razed.

2nd. It is a liberty from the law of God *as a Covenant*. "Verily, if there had been a law given which could have given life, righteousness should have been by the Law." The inference is strong that no such law has been given, and therefore righteousness is not by the Law. The believer in Christ is as free from the law in its covenant form, as a woman is from the law of her husband when he is dead. He is bound to it only as it is a rule of life, and a law of love. This too will not pass for much with many, but there are others who know it to be a valuable part of our liberty.

3rd. It is a liberty from the ceremonial yoke. The words with which I set out, were particularly designed to warn the Galatians against a return to this law of commandments and carnal ordinances, which at that time was pressed upon them as necessary to salvation by the Judaizing Teachers, whom Paul charges with preaching another Gospel. To have yielded to them would have been to have surrendered gospel liberty, and to have made the death of Christ constructively to be a vain thing. It was a yoke. Peter says, which neither they, nor their fathers were able to bear. Paul calls it "beggarly elements" and "the ministration of death."

It may be safely inferred, that if Christ hath freed us from those ceremonies and rites which had divine appointment, and was in force till he came, much more has he freed us from the observance of such as man only has invented and set up, as meats, drinks, days, times, &c.

4th. It may be called the liberty of privilege; First, the privilege or the right of private judgment. We are to call no man Master, for one is our Master, even Christ. We are free from the doctrines and commandments of men. The great men among the Jews, subsequent to their return from Babylon, set up at sundry times their own opinions and glosses on the law, and also their own practices which were preserved and imitated among them, and by which they made void the Law of God.

But all such doctrines, and commandments, Christ expressly condemned. And from them, and from all of the same nature and origin, he set his followers forever free. Peter says, "For as much as ye know that ye were redeemed not with corruptible things, such as silver and gold, but with the precious blood of Christ, from your vain conversation received by tradition from the Elders."

5th. It is the liberty of attending upon the spiritual and simple ordinance of worship, which he has instituted in his church, at all times and in every place; as the preaching of all the doctrines of the gospel in a language which the people understand, prayer, praise, the administration of the sacraments, and of church government and discipline, and of maintaining, defending and propagating the same, by every means compatible with the equal rights, peace and good order of civil society.

6th. It is the liberty of reading the word of God, and of examining it for ourselves. This word is given to the whole church, and to every individual in particular. No licence or permission is necessary, from any man or order of men under heaven to read the Bible. To every human being to whom it comes, it is as free as the light which proceeds from the Sun, or as the water which issues from the earth.

7th. It is the liberty of trying all religious opinions and practices delivered by whomsoever, by this word of God, and of receiving or rejecting them as they agree or disagree with it in our judgment. Christ himself although the infallible Teacher sent from God, recognises this as the hearer's inestimable privilege, by appealing to the Scriptures. "Search the Scriptures," says he, "for in them ye think ye have eternal life, and they are they which testify of me." And his Apostles did the same thing. "I speak," says Paul, "unto wise men, judge ye what I say."

In exercising these great privileges we may and often do err. But for this Christ has not made us liable to any civil pains or penalties, or to any co-ercion. We are answerable only to him and to that spiritual ecclesiastical authority with which he has vested his servants. If they shall judge us to be in error, they may put us out of their society, and here they must stop.

It is only the true Christian, who has a proper discernment of the transcendent value of this freedom. He knows something of it by experience, he knows the bondage of the curse, and the yoke of sin; he has felt something of this freedom in his soul, by the power of the Holy Ghost. Yet it is so closely connected with the best interests of civil society in general, that it is believed few men, after a very moderate degree of candid consideration, can remain altogether insensible to its importance. Civil and political liberty may be greatly infringed, while religious liberty still remains entire, but such is their connection, that if the latter is taken away, the former *cannot* remain. Suppose for argument's sake, that our religious liberty is taken away, and that we must not preach publicly the doctrines which we believe to be taught in the Bible—must not print or publicly defend them—must not be found reading the Bible except by licence given—must not dare to express our own private opinion in any way under civil pains; much less must we presume to arraign the doctrines of those who claim to be our teachers, before the word of God. They who upon this hypothesis claim the authority to give the sense of the Bible to us, cannot separate their claim from infallibility. To call *them* in question would be no less a crime than to arraign Christ himself.

Now admitting this to be sound doctrine, it must follow that such as do any of these things are not only to be denounced as heretics by the church, but pointed out to the civil magistrate as dangerous to the state, and therefore ought not to be suffered to live. This doctrine wicked as it is, if it were to remain only in theory, would have but little influence upon our liberties, and might be called comparatively harmless. But it is its very nature to grasp at power, and aspire to the chair of

supreme authority. And let it only obtain that, and it will necessarily become an absolute despotism. For he that has authority to think and determine for me in all matters of eternal moment, is the keeper of my soul. And through the medium of that faith and practice which he claims to lay down to me with unfallible accuracy, it will be the easiest thing in the world to enslave my body also, and to obtain the absolute control of all things temporal, as well as spiritual, and then not a vestige of liberty remains. This frightful picture is not confined to this theory. It has been in full and perfect operation, and is so at this present time, in many places.

8th. It is the liberty of love, or that liberty which results to society in its social and civil transactions, from the influence of the doctrines of grace upon the conscience and the actions of them that cordially embrace it. Where the doctrine of this liberty rules the heart, society will be free from plots, insurrectionary movements, and assassinations. A man will be safe in his own house—safe on the highway. His property will be safe from spoliation and plunder. He will be allowed without any annoyance to go about his business. His reputation will be safe from secret spies. His religious faith will be no bar in his way to fair and honourable trade. He will be safe from treachery and deception. He will be safe in depending upon a promise, and in taking the oath of his fellow man. But let our religious liberty as above said, be overthrown, and then this practical liberty which is the very vital part, the heart's blood of all desirable society will also be destroyed with it. If the good faith of an oath be destroyed, if a man is not safe to turn himself about in society for fear of being informed against, betrayed or ruined, if he may not walk the high way without being assaulted, if he is in danger, sitting at his own fire-side, what is society to him but Hell upon Earth?

When we speak of the liberty wherewith Christ has made us free, we ought to remember that it cost him when he was rich to become poor—to be a man of sorrows—and to die the cursed death of the cross. In order to give it a footing in our world, nothing less was necessary than the mission of his Holy Spirit, whose gifts and graces were freely bestowed to qualify men for the purpose. He sent forth his apostles and other ministers into all the world to announce it and to dispense ministerially its blessings. He has transmitted it to us at the expense of the blood of his Martyrs, and he hath identified with it the dearest interests of unborn millions, the jubilee of the world. Where is the man, the patriot, the philanthropist, or the christian who will not under these considerations, feel himself bound for its preservation.

~ **BUT THIS LIBERTY IS AT THE PRESENT TIME IN EXTREME DANGER.**

No part of the community I think can be ignorant by this time, that the Pope of Rome is seeking to establish his religion in this country; but we fear there are many who are not sufficiently informed of the nature of his religion, and of the history of his measures by which he has uniformly sought to enforce it, to know that if he succeeds, it must be on the ruin of our dearest rights. Not that it is a new thing in the world, or that it hath not as yet sufficiently developed its nature by facts; no, its history comprises the chief facts of the history of the whole civilized world for more than a thousand years back. There is not a nation, kingdom, or state in Europe, which has not seen it in full form and operation to their hearts' content. It is to be seen also on this con-

inent in the South American States, in some of the West India Islands, and in Canada. And it has, for the time that it has been amongst ourselves, displayed itself even to a greater extent than could have been anticipated by the most jealous and timid, nor does it even here in this enlightened country, at all belie the history of it in past times. It is for other reasons than the want of means and opportunity to know it, that many do not know it, which I shall afterwards state. I cannot give here so much as an outline of its history. Even that would require several volumes. I must content myself with a few sentences.

Its doctrines are completely subversive of those which I have stated in the beginning of this paper—subversive of the whole gospel. Its worship is a system of senseless and degrading superstitions, having nothing else for their foundations than the doctrines of men, and the commandments of Popes and decrees of councils. Its services are performed in an unknown tongue. The means by which it has uniformly sought to be enforced are “deceit and violence,” lying wonders, intolerance and persecution. Where it has the power it suffers not the free exercise of any religion different from itself. It will not allow us to meet peaceably in our meeting houses for worship, if it once had the power to prevent us—nor to read the word of God in our families, nor form our own private opinion—nor publish or defend our own sentiments in any way, nor educate our own children—nor manage our civil or political concerns in any way which it deems not congenial, not subservient to its prosperity and unlimited and irresponsible sway. Such as will not acknowledge its authority and tamely submit to its iron sceptre, are denounced as heretics in relation to the church, and enemies to the state. If it is conveniently within its power they are to be proceeded against publicly as persons not fit to live, and their property, if they have any, is confiscated; and if this may not be done they are equally in danger from the treachery and plots of rank assassins; and he that spoils, ruins, or butchers them is deemed to have performed a meritorious act. He that keeps his promise to a heretic, or his oath to a government in a heretical country, when that oath would stand in the way of popish power, is declared to commit a mortal sin.—This much all the world knows to be the truth concerning popery, and this ought to be enough to convince any candid man not a papist, let his sentiments be otherwise what they may, that there is no interest safe to us, if popery shall succeed here.

And to show the great probability of its succeeding at no very remote period, I offer the following considerations. The influx of catholic emigrants into this country is immense, and yearly increasing, and as a natural consequence it will continue to encrease still, because the more that comes makes the inducements for others to follow them continually stronger. Their friends and relations are here before them. The places where they can be located to their mind and have the communion of their church, popish teachers, &c, are every year multiplying all over the country. Their facilities in coming over, and of travelling from post to post after they are over, are increasing also. The most flattering accounts of the country, and of the near prospect of its becoming their own is held out to them. They know that the country is open to them—That they can obtain the right of suffrage almost as soon as they land, and that so soon as they can with the help of their liberal, unsuspecting heretical friends, form the majority, the day is their own. Therefore they are pouring in like a flood from Ireland, France,



Switzerland, Germany, and Poland, where the redundant population is more than sufficient to overwhelm us. They come prepared with money and priests to sit down at once in full organization. They come able to purchase the most eligible sites in the country, and to establish themselves in those parts where their influence will be most directly felt. And were our fathers, dead but some twenty years, now to look up, they would be astonished to see already the cathedral, the chapel, and the nunnery, in every corner of the Union, and citizens, native citizens! as well as naturalized, attending the confessional box, and seeking absolution from a Priest! Twenty years ago this would have been ridiculed as an idle dream, but such is the startling fact this day. But how happens this? is it a mere contingency? Suppose it were, the danger would scarcely be any less, but there are marks of design in it; it has an organization, the Pope is knowing to it, is at the head of it, and if he knows it why does he say nothing against it? Does he, or his crafty leaders deeply skilled in human nature as they are, think that there is the least danger of any considerable number of his people becoming either protestants or republicans in good faith? no, this would be an absurdity in popery; but rather that a very considerable portion of "the unsuspecting Americans" will, very probably become Papists. His religion has nothing in it towards either the protestant religion, or republican government, but irreconcilable hatred, and if he and his wily Jesuits had not the settled design, and the fair prospects of destroying both by proselyting, revolutionizing, and finally by persecuting, it is inconceivable that this tide of emigration should not be arrested by his supreme fiat. Many circumstances are in their favor.

1st. Ignorance of the true principles of Popery, and of its history, prevails to a vast extent; and the number of those who are fully informed on the subject is very few. And because they do not perceive any danger, from their own personal knowledge, they will not believe that there is any—rather than admit their own ignorance, by believing the testimony of the few that are informed, they choose to impute all this cry of danger to superstitious fear, bigotry or political excitement. They will not believe particularly that a Catholic's oath gives no security to those whom they call heretics, a single moment longer than it makes for the interest of their mother church.

2d. Apathy with regard to all religion, is another circumstance, so far as it prevails, exceedingly favorable to their seizing on the country before any harm is dreaded from them. We may safely say there are many who feel perfectly indifferent to all questions of a religious nature—who care for none of these things, and, therefore, without troubling themselves with any particular inquiry, will dismiss this subject as mere difference of opinion between Catholics and Protestants, with perhaps a condemnation of the later as uncharitably jealous of the former. Nothing that can be said, or published, will be likely to excite the attention of this portion of community to the subject, so much as to ascertain before it be too late, whether Popery has not a bearing upon our civil and political institutions.

3d. Another circumstance greatly facilitating their unsuspected advances to power, is the very common notion that we of the United States are sufficiently fortified against all danger from such a quarter, by our improved state of society, our general intelligence, and the vigilance and promptitude of our citizens. It is called absurd to speak of the Roman Catholic religion succeeding in this enlightened country, to

the extent it has done in others; and so they fold their arms and with supreme self complacency look upon the myriads of papists landing every where upon our shores, as a thing as perfectly harmless, as the Trojans did the Wooden Horse. *It is a harmless superstition.* Let them build their Nunneries, their Seminaries, their Chapels and Cathedrals. Let them teach in our schools. Let them have our infants to their schools, and be taught by their pictures. Let our daughters enter their Nunneries, and our sons their Colleges—*there is no danger!* After all, the idea is not so absurd. Their system of measures is “all deceiveableness of unrighteousness,” “and cunning craftiness of men lying in wait to deceive.” They have a bait and a hook, for catching every kind of fish. They have a weight in the ballot-box to catch politicians. They have showy piety, and charity, to catch the charitably pious that are not over scrupulous, and seek not to look below the surface of things. They have learning to catch the scholar, and fine music, sculpture and paintings, to catch men of taste; pompous ceremonies, indulgences, absolutions, and something to suit every taste. And the fact that they *have succeeded so far already*, without general suspicion, proves them to be adepts in the business.

4th. There is a great portion of community so given over to themselves, so licentious, wicked and profane, and so ignorant of the scriptures and true religion, that they are in the fairest way possible, upon the first awakening of their conscience, to fly for shelter into such a religion as Popery, because it promises the very thing which suits them, absolution from the punishment and indulgence in the sin.

5th. The spurious, unscriptural charity, which has leavened the several religious denominations, will induce many to form favorable opinions respecting them. With all their superstitious ceremonies, it may be said they hold many of the essentials. They have intelligent men among them. They are sincere in their way. They have many pious, charitable and liberal people. They are reformed and mollified, &c. If we give them a friendly and charitable reception, we may be the means of bringing them over. This is music to their ears, and they are exceedingly desirous to cherish the delusion of such people, until their object is fairly within their reach.

6th. The doctrine of works, and man's ability to save himself is extensively taught and believed in the United States. This has always been the doctrine of Popery. It is the very soul and strength of their whole system. There may no doubt be a difference in the particulars in which they carry out the general principle of the doctrine and in the phraseology, but in principle and in practical influence on the heart and life of man, and in opposition to the doctrines of free grace, they are perfectly agreed. And these preachers of works and their followers will find if they ever come into close action with Roman Catholic adversaries, that their different way of applying the common principle will be a slender breast work.

7th. The friends of civil liberty, and also of the doctrines of grace and gospel worship, are greatly divided among themselves. Divided both in sentiment and practice. And they are in danger of forgetting their common interest, and through the intensity of their minds upon the questions of difference between themselves, of not observing the insidious advances of their common foe. And besides it affords crafty and disguised Jesuits as good an opportunity as they can desire of fanning the flames of discord and fomenting quarrels and jealousies. And in the smoke of

our fire, one at another, they will come up to our very lines unobserved before they commence theirs.

8th. God has a quarrel with all the protestant denominations, and with the United States. This one thing is more in favour of their success than all the rest. God who wrought the great and merciful deliverance for these churches at the Reformation, and for the United States at the Revolution, is grievously offended. "When our armies do go forth, he goes not with the same." He turns our sword's edge. It wounds not the enemy, our weapons fall harmless to the ground. We stand not in battle. We cry, but he shuts out our prayer; we fast but he takes no knowledge. He is offended and justly so at the way in which we have treated him. Which of the doctrines of grace have we not denied? which of his ordinances have we not corrupted? We have despised the glorious deliverance, and in our hearts turned back again to popish principles. Our civil and political privileges we have turned into licentiousness and made subservient to personal and party elevation. In the height of our power and prosperity we are cruel oppressors of our black population, perfidious to our Indians, selfish, corrupt, and treacherous among ourselves, and with regard to all christian institutions, we have said as a nation, "Who is the Lord that we should obey him." And while we continue thus to treat the God of all our mercies, how can we imagine him to be on our side? and how can we think to stand without him? I cannot view the Roman Catholic coming in here otherwise than as the rod of his anger, and the staff in their hand as his indignation—that he hath given them a charge against a sinful nation and hypocritical churches, although they mean not so, neither does their heart think so. The correctness of this view, and the ground which it lays for fearful apprehensions for our safety will appear yet stronger if we add to it a due consideration of the various means which God has already used to awaken us to a sense of our duty, and to reclaim us from our sins without effect.

Our sins as a church and a nation have been often pointed out to us, both from the pulpit and the press; our national sins have not wanted testimony by able and gifted men on the floor of Congress. We have been visited by the sword. The pestilence has gone through the length of the land. Sometimes the heavens have become as brass above us, and the earth beneath dust and powder, at other times a flood has come, carrying destruction and ruin to the end of its course. The fire has consumed our cities, and the insect has destroyed our crops, but we have refused all these calls. Yea we have despised them all. How then can we expect that God will be on our side? And if *he* is against us, who can be for us? What measure can prosper without him?

Putting all these circumstances together will not every considerate man allow that we have reason to be afraid for our liberty, and to tremble for the dreadful scourge that is preparing for us. I would now say a few things as to what we ought to do at the present crisis, if indeed it be not too late. But this must be for another sheet.

EGO.

ART. III. *The Unveiling of Theology.\**

The human mind is averse to think, in any case where thinking tends to shake its belief in formerly received maxims, and opinions. This natural aversion may be often mistaken for *soundness in the faith, and zeal for the truth*. The person who cherishes this aversion, by refusing a candid perusal of any thing suspected of not chiming with his established sentiments, is often deemed the only true catholic believer; the orthodox christian; the sound and orthodox divine. And upon the other hand, it may be remarked, that the man, whose affliction it is to discharge the office of undeceiving the candid part of his former friends and associates, and of exasperating the rest, by disturbing their repose in beloved prejudices, is one, most probably, that has been whipped and forced into his new discoveries, by some unexpected and painful dispensation of the Most High, which he was neither able to evade, resist, or control. The writer, therefore, of these remarks, is persuaded that no merit accrues from being the author of the following propositions, whether the sentiments expressed by them, be old or new, false or true.

PROPOSITION I. It is one of the most distinguishing tenets of this Associate Church, and one which we are bound by covenant to support and defend, that the attainments in truth and duty, made by our ancestors, in Britain and Ireland, in two successive periods of reformation from Popery, were imperfect in extent; and that further advances may, and ought to be made, by changes, both in the matter and form of our religious profession. It is one duty—to *hold fast that which we have received*; and it is another duty equally incumbent—that, *forgetting the things which are behind, we reach forth unto those which are before*.

PROP. II. There ought to be in every christian congregation, two or more ruling elders, who are chosen by the people, from among themselves, who *are apt to teach*, who will *feed the flock as shepherds*, and *overseers*, conducting in the absence of the evangelist, wise-man, or scribe, all the public and ordinary exercises of religious worship, according to the extent of their ability.

PROP. III. There ought to be in every christian congregation, a school, in which men could be taught, without abandoning their worldly calling, all that is essential in the present system of education, preparatory to the office of the gospel ministry. The languages taught, should be the Greek and Hebrew. The sciences should be grammar, logic, metaphysics, geography, astronomy, theology and church history. All of which may be studied by any man of respectable, but not extraordinary talents, and of mature powers of body and mind, not impaired by old age, *in the space of four years*, without quitting his home, or worldly calling, and without observing celibacy—as *thoroughly as* these things are now studied by the majority of persons, who become ministers in any one of the Presbyterian churches. And if the languages be omitted, and the English Grammar studied beforehand, the space of time required for the remaining sciences, including Theology, will only be—*two years*. Condensed systems, on some of the branches enumerated, will be requisite. Learned men will be found in the Isles of our ancestors, and in these United States, competent to the task of preparing them.

PROP. IV. It is time to *lift the veil of mystery* from the art of preach-

---

\* This article has been lying on hand for several months. We had supposed we were acting a friendly part towards the writer in withholding it from the public; but he seems to think otherwise, and insists on its publication. In this he shall be gratified, but with the understanding that we are not to be considered as endorsing his sentiments.—[ED. REL. MOV.]

ing, and to throw the secret of education for the gospel ministry under the eyes of the christian community, by giving them to read in the vulgar tongue, the things which studied, or looked at, in the Latin language, and in the Colleges and Seminaries, have made their ministers so wise.

How far it may be my lot to prove and illustrate all, or any of these propositions, the Most High and Sovereign Majesty, in whose hand our breath is, and whose are all our ways, alone can determine. The translation of Mark's Medulla into English, and the publication of the whole, or a part of it, in the RELIGIOUS MONITOR, or some other religious periodical, would, in my judgment, serve to illustrate, and contribute to prove, one or more of the above propositions. It might in other respects be doing the christian reader a favor. JOHN MARK was Professor of Theology, in conjunction with FREDERIC SHANHEIM and JACOB TRIGLANDIUS, the former of whom had been Mark's Preceptor, in the University of Leyden, in Holland, about A. D. 1690—'95, as appears from the preface to the work. Besides a larger work, styled "A Compend of Christian Theology," he compiled and published a more condensed system, the title of which, in English, would be, "The Marrow of Christian Theology." This MEDULLA, or MARROW, is the Text Book from which the Professors of Theology, in our Associate Church, have always lectured their students. It serves, in our Seminary, a purpose similar to that of Pike's Arithmetic, or Morse's Geography, in Common Schools. If this book is good for the priest; it is also good for the people. Let a chapter of it now, and another one then, be thrown into the MONITOR, by one and another of the editor's correspondents, until the whole is translated, each one selecting for himself. And when the translation shall have been completed, let all the parts of it be collected in order into one book, and published entire.\*

SECEDER.

---

#### ART. IV. *A Comparison of Creeds.*†

AN ADVANCE has been made by the SECESSION CHURCH in one article or two of CHRISTIAN FAITH, beyond the boundary attained by the best reformed of the Protestant Churches. In proof of this bold position we must, *first*, show from the Confessions of several of the Reformed Churches, what was the doctrine held by them on certain points; and, *second*, the doctrine of the Secession Church on those same points. The difference between the two being ascertained, we are next by the word of God to determine on what side lies the preference.

The ARGENTINE CONFESSIO was exhibited in a grand Convention of States, to Charles V. emperor of Germany, A. D. 1530, by the le-

---

\* The writer has sent us a translation of Chap. V., (De Trinitate,) of Mark's Medulla, to be inserted after the foregoing, but we have his permission for not publishing it at present. As it appears to be well executed, we may take the liberty of presenting it to our readers on some future occasion. We never heard it hinted before that any concealment was practised on the part of the ministry as to their sources of theological knowledge. Any imputation of that kind we cannot but regard as slanderous. So far as Seceder Ministers are concerned, we think that, in general, they are ready to say with Moses—"Would that all the Lord's people were prophets."—[ED. REL. MOR.]

† This article came to us as a continuation of the last, but as the connection between the two is not very obvious, we have taken the liberty to change the title as above. We hope SECEDER will approve of this.—[ED. REL. MOR.]

gates of the States of Argentine, Constance, Memminga and Lindauc. Under the chapter *Of human traditions*, the Argentine Confessors express themselves thus—"Whereas the present state of christians is such that they are benefitted even by injuries; the christian will not hesitate to obey even those laws which are unjust, provided they command nothing impious, according to that of Christ—"If any one compel thee to go one mile, go with him two." Thus the christian ought to become all things to all men, studying both to suffer and to do nothing which is not to the favor and benefit of mankind; but which is not to be opposed to the commands of God. Hence it follows that to those civil laws, which are not repugnant to piety, every one will yield obedience, the more prompt, the more deeply he is imbued with the faith of Christ."

The **BOHEMIC CONFESSION** was presented to the same emperor, at Vienna, by the Barons and Nobles of the kingdom of Bohemia, A. D. 1535. In an article *Concerning the power of the Church*, they teach—"But this they ought to do, not by their own power and will; but as stewards of the mysteries of God, ministers and servants of Christ by authority, in his word and sacraments. For the Lord committing to them their office and function says, (John xx.) 'As the Father hath sent me; so also do I send you; receive ye the Holy Spirit; and whosoever sins ye remit, to them they are remitted; and whosoever sins ye retain, to them they are retained. They admonish that they who are in the ministry of the church, use those keys only according to the ordination and will of Christ revealed in his word; but not as it may please themselves, from the impulse of their own spirit, lest that of the prophet be fulfilled in them—"And now O priests this commandment is for you," &c.

In an article *Concerning human traditions*, they teach—"Human traditions, rites and customs, which are no ways adverse to piety, are to be observed in the public assemblies. After which manner the apostle admonishes—"Let all things be done decently and in order." And elsewhere—"Stand fast and hold the institutions which ye have learned, whether by word, or by our epistle." But traditions, rites or ceremonies of that kind, that they obscure the glory and thereby the grace of Christ, lead off and withdraw the people from the truth and the faith, are equalled or preferred to the divine precepts; or that under covert of those traditions, if any one transgresses those precepts, he relinquishes the sincere use of God's word—are to be avoided and rejected. For the scribes and pharisees, observers of those traditions, our Lord severely rebukes, in Mark vii. 'Well prophesied Isaiah concerning you hypocrites,' &c. And Paul cautions us to beware of traditions of this sort. Col. ii, 'Beware lest any man make a spoil of you according to the constitution of men, according to the elements of the world, and not according to Christ.'—Wherefore our [divines] teach that those rites only, and traditions, which advance and cherish the faith and worship of God and other good ends among the faithful, conciliate peace and concord among the people, and constitute a certain polity and harmony, whoever be their authors, synod, pontiff, bishop, or any other, are to be kept and observed. For none ought to be so offended in the authors of these traditions, as not to observe them, if they have in them nothing inconvenient."

In the article *Of the secular powers*, after stating the duties of magistrates, and their subjects, they say—"But as it respects those matters which are proper to souls, to faith, and to salvation, obedience is due

to the word of God only, and to his ministers, as Christ himself says, render to Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's, and to God the things which are God's.'” Thus the Bohemian brethren.

The SAXON CONFESSION, exhibited to the council of TRENT, A. D. 1551, contains the following, *Concerning traditions, that is, rites in the Church instituted by human authority*: “Those errors being removed, against which it is necessary the church be admonished, these certain honorable rites, made for the sake of good order, we do both observe ourselves, and teach others to observe them: for without order men cannot live, and Paul says—‘Let all things be done decently and in order.’ And there is a saying of Athanasius—‘Ceremonies are useful, but only when used with knowledge of the truth, and in moderation.’ This sentence appears opposed to superstition, which at that time also was increasing the ceremonies, and obscuring the truth, and loading the consciences and the churches.” In the article *Of the political ruler*, they say—“God wills without any doubt that the Magistrate proclaim the voice of the moral law in the human race, as it respects discipline according to the decalogue, or natural law: That is, He wills that by the voice of the magistrate, *first*, be proposed [published] supreme and immutable laws, prohibiting the worship of idols, blasphemies, perjuries, unjust manslaughters, lewdness, the violation of conjugal faith, thefts, and frauds in covenants, contracts and treaties. The *second* duty is, Of those laws divine and immovable, which are testimonies concerning God, and the supreme standard of morals, let the magistrate be *the custos* [the warden] in punishing all who violate them.”

The AUGUSTAN, that is, the AUGSBURG CONFESSION was drawn up by Melancthon, in a convention of a number of Princes of Germany, at Augusta, which is Augsburg, in the year 1530, where it was exhibited to the emperor Charles V. In one of the principal articles of Faith the Augustans say: “Concerning rites ecclesiastic, which are instituted by human authority, they teach, that those rites are to be kept which can be kept without sin, and which conduce to tranquility and good order in the church; as certain holy days, certain pious singings, and other similar rites. But concerning this kind of rites they teach that consciences are not to be loaded with superstitious opinions; that is, that we are not to think those human ordinations to be righteousness before God, or to merit the remission of sins, or to be a worship necessary to the righteousness of the gospel. But we are to think of them as thinks indifferent, which can be omitted without incurring scandal. Yet they sin who do with scandal violate them, inasmuch as they do rashly disturb the tranquility of their own churches. The traditions therefore are rejected which cannot be observed without sin, as the tradition concerning celibacy. The impious opinion is also rejected, concerning traditions and vows, by which it is feigned that worship by human authority merits the remission of sins, is a satisfaction for sins, and the like. Of which sort are the false persuasions concerning vows, concerning certain fastings, and the like, scattered in the church by the unlearned.”

In the article following, we read;—“Concerning civil things, they teach that legitimate civil ordinations are good works and ordinations of God, as Paul testifies. ‘The powers which are ordained, are by God.’ They teach therefore that it is lawful for Christians to bear the office of magistrate, to try causes, to issue judgment according to the present imperial and other laws, to institute and execute punishments in right, to wage war in right, to do military service, to form legal con-

tracts, to hold property, to give an oath of fidelity to the magistrates requiring it, to contract legitimate wedlock, to exercise acts approved by the laws. They condemn the Anabaptists who interdict these civil offices to the Christians. Therefore Christians ought to obey the present magistrates and laws, except when they command one to sin; for then—'They ought rather to obey God than men,' Acts iv."

In the Augustan Confession, strictly so called, we have the views of those candid, but infant reformers further unfolded. "And the Apostle, 1 Tim. iv. calls 'the prohibition of meats, of marriage, and similar traditions, the doctrines of devils.' But why did he use so fierce a rebuke? He did not will that there be no ordinations absolutely; that no distinctions be kept of places, of times. But then he accounts them doctrines of devils, when to them is transferred the benefit of Christ, when they are held for righteousness, also for necessary worship, when an opinion of necessity is affixed to them, and when consciences are tortured and faith is shaken off by them. Against these inconveniences Christ and the Apostles will have us to be on our guard. And therefore so many times and so vehemently they preach against traditions. And it is wonderful that those are nothing moved by those thunders, who defend the superstitious opinions of traditions. But there are two classes of traditions, those which demand works that are openly repugnant to the divine law; such is the prohibition of marriage. But it is necessary this rule have place in the Church—'We ought to obey God rather than men.' So it appears that such human traditions are by no means to be obeyed. Others there are, which speak of things indifferent in their own nature; as of food, clothing, and similar things. These traditions become impious when they are proposed with the opinion that they merit the remission of sins, that they are things necessary, that they are divine worship, that is, duties, the immediate end of which is that God may be honored by them. These pestiferous opinions it is necessary in the Church to reprove. And upon account of these opinions, useless human rites are to be cast away; as the distinctions of meats, monastic vestments, and similar superstitious customs, as Hezekiah burnt up the brazen serpent, when he saw it to be worshipped by many. But because this society of men in this corporeal life have need of order, some rites that are useful for this political end, can be retained without superstitious opinions, that is, without judging them to be worship, or things necessary, that the people may know when the assemblies ought to convene in the temples for discourses, and for the use of the sacraments. For it behooves that this ministry be public. It is an advantage that set times be constituted. Thus with us are kept the holy day of Lord's day, and several others. The long used historic distinctions in the singings allotted to Christ's nativity, the paschal, the feast of ascension, pentecost and other set times. And the people love these ceremonies the more, after their consciences are freed from danger, and from those unjust burdens concerning which the monks and canonists used to vociferate, and after it has been shown on the contrary—the utility of those rites in serving the ministry of the gospel. Men are also admonished that the end of these ordinations is political. This dextrous interpretation of traditions renders them more grateful to moderate minds. And although the opinion of their necessity, and of their being worshipped be detracted from them; yet they remain sufficiently fortified; because we teach in the emended churches that ceremonies are useful to the service of the gospel. Wherefore we say that they who petulantly and with scandal so violate those ceremonies, that is,



they who impede the ministry of the gospel, do commit sin. It is certainly necessary that there be a measure set to traditions; it behoves that the consciences of men be consulted for, in order that men may understand that human rites are neither things necessary, nor a righteousness."

I knew not how to do justice to the memory of those venerable men, who first adopted this confession, nor to the name of those worthy and beloved brethren in Germany, and in the United States, who still adhere to it, as the confession of their faith, and at the same time to do justice to my subject—without offering the reader this long extract.

(To be Continued.)

---

ART V. *Strictures on some remarks of FINIS.*

MR. EDITOR.—The matter furnished by the Monitor to the reading public, has, I trust, been useful for bringing the doctrines of the Reformation to the knowledge of some who were comparatively ignorant of them before, and for stirring up others, who did know them, to greater confidence in the goodness of their cause and greater efforts for their promotion. For this usefulness (may it long continue) it is in no small degree indebted to this circumstance, that it has confined itself invariably to the object set forth in the title page—“*Devoted to the principles of the Reformation*” &c.

It has done this with the dignity of sound argument derived from the purest of all sources, the Bible, and without personality or abuse. It has stood at a due distance from its very commencement, from all questions purely political. Its editors and correspondents, no doubt, as well as other men, entertained their own views on the various political questions of the day. But so far as I can remember (and I have read it from the beginning) the reader could not certainly tell, from what he read in the Monitor, what these views were.

My anxiety that it should be conducted in the same manner still, is as great as my estimate of its usefulness; therefore, I am equally anxious to have your correspondent, *Finis*, continue to write. If he is a new correspondent let him know that his views are calculated, in the judgment at least of one reader, to edify. But there are perhaps two passages in his paper not altogether of this description, and for the purpose of pointing them out, through you, to him, I now write, which I trust will be received without offence.

The first is, p. 393 of the Feb. No. near the bottom, as follows, “The commendation then which some ministers have had for never mentioning it [money] in the pulpit, seems very doubtful praise, especially when it is known that in such a case avarice may be increasing among the flock; and at such a rate in one instance of this kind, that it is recorded that the chief manager of the salary claimed the legal allowance as a recompence for his service in the holy thing.”

The words in *italics*, I think, are somewhat exceptionable. If I might judge from these words, the said “chief manager” seemed to be governed more by ignorance and superstition, than avarice; but my chief dislike to it is, because it seems to be personal. The good sense

which *Finis* displays in his paper will enable him on the first reflection to see this to be an improper method of censuring offenders.

The second passage is on p. 394, near the end of his paper. I quote only the exceptionable clauses. "No such excuse remains now amidst the unexampled prosperity which the land enjoys, and the *wise provision* which our rulers have made of returning to the more common use of the precious metals *divinely sanctioned by scriptural example as the circulating medium of the world.*" This passage at the end of so good a paper is much to be regretted and is highly objectionable: *First*, because it is political in its bearing. What has the Monitor to do with Politics? They are not the sword of the spirit; neither are any of its weapons carnal. It is therefore in a wrong place. *Second*, because it advocates a party in politics. Some of the party if they read the Monitor may be pleased, and others on the same side will be displeased. And what effect can it be supposed to have on the opposite party? Most certainly not that of godly edifying. If they have used to come off from the heat and excitement of political war, to cool their spirits in the shade of Gospel truth, spread for them on the leaves of the Monitor, they will consider themselves cut off from this retreat, if it is henceforth to be open for such paragraphs. *Third*, because the example of scripture is brought in as sanctioning the party's measures. This is the worst feature of the passage. What! does the inspiration of God descend to the party measures of Jackson and Van-Buren! Does it determine by its example the circulating medium of the world! and of course what the Banking system shall be—the rate of exchange—and in a great measure the commerce! No: the Bible is no such a book. "It is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, and instruction in righteousness." But as for such things as the circulating medium, it speaks after this manner—"Who made me a judge or a divider over you." If it sanction and determine that the precious metals shall circulate through the world, does it not for the same reason sanction that it shall be *talents* and *shekels* and *pieces of silver*? and must we not also conform our weights and measures to the example of the *homer*, the *bath*, &c.

As this passage is irrelevant to his subject, so it is perfectly inconclusive. For suppose his ideal prosperity to be real, it will not prove that there is "*no excuse now* for those who do not lay by them some money every sabbath day," unless it were also universal. Mayhap that mercantile men, and great capitalists, and office-holders are realizing "*unexampled prosperity*," but *Finis*, should remember that it is but few of these that care about Christ or his ordinances. "Not many mighty, not many noble, are called—God hath chosen the poor of this world," &c. And the greatest part of seceders are of this description: many of whom, I presume are for months together without the precious metals, as well as *bank notes*.

One thing more, and I have done. *Finis* seems to take it for granted, that because nothing else is mentioned as circulating in the world, in the sacred volume, therefore it gave its sanction to that. This is not a safe rule of interpretation.

The scripture records customs and practices that are good, bad and indifferent; but it sanctions nothing but what comes within the scope of its general principles, clearly defined, and authoritatively enjoined. What is good or moral, mentioned in scripture, is to be viewed as a specification of what is sanctioned before, rather than a sanctioning of

that thing by itself; and what is immoral, as a specification of what is forbidden: but there is a class of things mentioned in scripture, which are neither moral, nor immoral; and the Bible neither approves, nor disapproves of them. Such was the currency in the countries to which the sacred writers have reference, the modes of communication, travelling, &c. Because there is not a word of *printing* in scripture, but of *writing* invariably, *Finis* will not surely set up *writing* as the mode sanctioned in scripture, and that our rulers would be wise to put down the *press*: nor will he affirm that we must not ride on horses, but asses and mules, even though for special reasons the multiplying of horses was forbidden.

EGO.

---

#### ART. VI. *Presbyterians in the seventeenth Century.*

1. Epistolary correspondence of Thomas Scott, D. D.
2. Memoirs of the Lives and writings of Divines convened in the Assembly at Westminster. By James Reid.
3. Life of Cheynet, by Dr. Johnson.

Professing as we do to adhere to the principles of the Reformation, as set forth in the formularies of the Westminster Divines; the history of the church in the period referred to, is one of peculiar interest and importance to us.

“The rise and progress of the Reformation, in the different countries of Europe, must ever be regarded as presenting one of the most important and striking objects that has occurred in the revolutions of the human mind, and in the history of the world.”\*

Both the periods of the first and second reformation are full of memorable events, which were accomplished by the agency of eminent men. The abolishing of the Pope's authority in Scotland, in the year 1560, the adoption of the *first* Confession of Faith, the placing of ministers throughout the kingdom, the establishment of the scriptural government of the church, the adoption of the First and Second Books of Discipline, the swearing and subscribing of the National Covenant by persons of all ranks, in the years 1581 and 1590, we view as great steps of national reformation, and they were greatly promoted by such men as Knox, Buchanan, the two Melvilles, Welsh, Davidson, Bruce, Black, and many other worthies whose *memories are blessed*.

In the second period, between 1638, and 1650, sound doctrine was more fully and clearly stated in the Confession of Faith, and in the Larger and Shorter Catechisms, compiled by the Westminster Assembly, and received by the church of Scotland, in opposition to popish, arminian and other errors. The Directory for worship agreed on by the Westminster assembly was received. The divine right of Presbyterian Church Government was asserted, and the intrinsic power of the church to meet and act by virtue of the authority granted to her by Jesus Christ her only Head. The national covenant was renewed in 1638, with a new Bond against Prelatical innovations. In 1643, the solemn league and covenant was entered into by the body of the people in Scotland in conjunction with their neighbors in England and Ireland. The League

---

\* Universal Mag. vol. lxxv. p. 293.

was also renewed in Scotland in 1648, with "An acknowledgement of sins and an engagement to duties." Many acts were passed against evils that are commonly overlooked or connived at. The work of reformation was carried on with deep humiliation. The parliament of England, and the Westminster Assembly had monthly fasts. The blessing of God was remarkable on those who engaged in the work. A great number of burning and shining lights were raised up in the church, not a few of whom yet speak to us by their writings.

No period of the church since the Apostle's days can, therefore, so strongly claim our attention as this. To the ecclesiastical Reformers of this period, under God, we owe much, may we not say *all* that is dear to the friends of religion and liberty. Rejecting arbitrary forms of worship, and idle ceremonies, they proposed the word of God as the only rule of faith and practice.

Viewing the Presbyterian Covenanters, and the principles of the Covenanted Reformation in the light in which we do, how can it but be matter of grief to us, that so many have reproached and defamed them? And it is not only the scoffing and irreligious who have cast unmerited reproaches on the Reformers of this period—they have done so "from Hudibras down to the lowest buffoon in the tavern"—but many others have done so, from whom better things might be expected: even to this day what member of the Established Church of England speaks of the reformers of this period without some degree of bitterness? High-churchmen, and Low-churchmen, Independents, and many professed Presbyterians, have agreed that these worthies contended for things not worth contending for; and that such men as Guthrie, Cameron, and Renwick, shed their blood in vain.

Highly however as we value these great and excellent men, yet we do not esteem them infallible; nor do we surrender our understandings into the hands of any set of men, however deserving; but shall endeavour to exercise our judgment according to the rule of scripture, in appreciating men and things.

To vindicate our venerated ancestors from the aspersions of the wicked or ignorant, would surely be a pleasing task. But it would require volumes to answer all the objections that have been brought against the Covenants, and the Covenanters; for, though they are so truly worthy, yet like every thing which strongly contradicts the corruptions of the human heart, they have been treated with the most virulent abuse. Our object therefore chiefly is, to direct the attention of the reader to the subject, being satisfied, if on a subject at once so difficult and important, we succeed in exciting a disposition to obtain correct information as to the character and principles of the Reformers.

A great deal has been written, well and ably written, in defence of the Reformers of this period; but it is to be lamented that the idea which is now generally entertained of this period, is derived from the caricature of it in Hume's history of England, Walter Scott's novels and other sources of equal veracity. According to Bailie, Stevenson, and others, who had the best opportunities of knowing, the Reformers were truly an illustrious band of patriots. But as one observes, "their noble sentiments, their wise and vigorous proceedings in defending the cause of true religion, and civil liberty, are seldom to be fully or fairly learned from the admired pages of the later historiographers, whose partial accounts, distorted pictures, and bad reflections, and insinuations exhibit vile libels, instead of histories of the characters and transactions of the times of reformation."

The historians last mentioned uniformly ascribe a *persecuting spirit* to the presbyterians of this period. So frequently and boldly has this been charged upon them, that it is now very generally believed.

We cannot now inquire into all the reasons why this unjust stigma, unsupported by facts, has been cast on the Presbyterians. Perhaps, however, the chief reason may be, because they suffered more severely from persecution than others, and have shown themselves decided opposers of tyranny. It is an old maxim that those who have injured you, will hate you. Romanists and Episcopalians have taken unwearied pains to fix the stigma of a persecuting spirit on those who suffered when under their power, the direst persecution.

In the seventeenth century the just and liberal principle of *negative toleration*, was probably not so well understood by any class of men, as it is in the present day. The toleration which allows every man to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience, without interruption, or loss of personal rights, while he holds no opinion and teaches no doctrine, which in its own nature and necessary tendency, is destructive of common order in society. This rational principle of toleration was understood by few in that age; but the few who did understand it, were almost without exception *Presbyterians*. This can be abundantly established by historical facts. Perhaps occasion has been taken to make this charge of persecution, from no one thing so much as from the Covenants which they took, and the manner in which they were administered. This charge against the Covenantants, is founded on the word *extirpate*. This word however does not necessarily infer persecution. Our Saviour himself says, "Every plant which my Father hath not planted shall be rooted up" or extirpated: and that no other than spiritual weapons for the extirpation of Popery, Prelacy, &c, was intended, is evident, for no others were used. The weapons to be used for this extirpation, were preaching, praying, and writing; for it was the heresy, not the heretics that were to be rooted out. What the covenanters had in view was the preservation of religion at home, and the reformation of it in England and Ireland. One of the historians of those times (Baillie) says, "We must take God to witness, in the midst of the flames of his wrath, that the public intentions of the godly in the land, have been, and are, for the glory of his name, for the advancement of piety, truth, and righteousness, without the hurt of any flesh, except so far as our necessary defence does compel." In a paper of information, sent to their friends in Paris, the Scottish Commissioners to the Westminster Assembly, speak in the clearest terms of extirpating the office, or system of Prelacy—not the prelates. "The covenant of Scotland," say they, "rejects all kinds of Episcopacy: the covenant of the three kingdoms, is expressly for rooting up of all Prelacy, not the tyranny alone of that office." "No episcopacy here is tolerable, as being a mere human invention, without the word of God, which wherever it lodged, has been a very unhappy [unwelcome] guest. The total extirpation of it would be applauded and congratulated."

But these were not the sentiments of individuals only, the Westminster Assembly, in their exhortation to the taking of the covenant, expressly declare—"Nor is any person hereby bound to offer any violence to their persons." But it may be objected that a principle can not be easily extirpated, without at the same time infringing on the liberty and rights of conscience of the person professing that principle.

Much may be done, however, to extirpate certain heresies and modes

of worship, without exercising a single act of persecution. Popery and Prelacy can scarcely exist without immense revenues and royal favour. To extirpate them the State has only to repeal the civil laws by which they are established, and withhold the revenues on which they fatten. Leave them to themselves and they are destroyed. It is not an infringement of the rights of any man to refuse your countenance and money to the support of his wickedness or absurdity.

The act, June 11th, 1640, enjoining the Covenant under "all civil pains," was far more limited in its operation, agreeable to reason, and the established practice of free States, than many are willing to believe. Those who refused to take this Covenant were never punished, by this act, with more than exclusion from places of power and trust. And this exclusion was perhaps the whole design of the act. That the phrase *all civil pains*, means no more than this, is evident from the act itself, which explains it by saying "the recusant shall have no place nor voice in parliament." Not a word of fines and imprisonments, or confiscation. And can our reformers be blamed for keeping power from the hands of those, who were well known to be eagerly waiting for the opportunity of turning it against them? Can they be blamed for taking effectual means for securing their dearest rights, for the sake of which they had suffered so much, and struggled so long? "What had they to expect from Papists after the bitter experience of more than a hundred years, and the recent instance of the Irish massacre, one of the most tragical scenes these enemies of God and man had ever exhibited? What had they to expect from Episcopalians who had joined the Papists in arms against their country, were murdering their relations, and committing every excess?"\*

While we do not assert that the reformers of this period were never actuated by narrow and intolerant principles, and never betrayed into acts of undue severity, this we will say, that making allowance for their long and accumulated distresses, their fearful dangers, their heavy losses, their immeasurable provocations, and for the unavoidable infirmities of human nature—the candid inquirer will find them better acquainted with the rights of conscience, and greater enemies to persecution, than any of their opponents.

The Presbyterians will suffer nothing by a comparison of their conduct with the proceedings of their opponents. The Papists and Episcopalians consigned, with remorseless barbarity, the conscientious dissenter to prison, to banishment, and to death: But when "the body of the Parliament, city and country, were for the Presbytery, and loved them;"† when they had the majority, and consequently had a right to exercise all national acts, no measure employed by them ever equalled the Bartholemew Bushel, the Corporation Act, or the Star-Chamber. When the Parliament of England, under the influence of Presbyterianism, abolished Prelacy, and the ceremonies, they provided for the support of such ministers as were removed from their places.

The lapse of time which has intervened, makes it now difficult properly to understand the measures of those times, or to obtain a correct knowledge of the character and spirit of those who engaged in those measures; and this difficulty is increased, by the ignorance and prejudice of many of those who have pretended to give a history of those times.

\* Baillie Lett. vol. ii. p. 116.

† Ib.

If, however, we examine the writings of the most eminent Presbyterians of this period, we shall find that their's was not a persecuting spirit, but the very reverse. Let any one read the sermons that were delivered on the several occasions when the Covenant was taken, and he will find they breathe the genuine spirit of Christianity. Who after reading the works of Rutherford, Henderson, Gillespie, can but admire the unaffected piety, and Christian patriotism which they evince?

We think these facts and considerations, evidently shew the great injustice done to the Presbyterians of this period by those who reproach them as having persecuted wherever they had the power to do so. Should not this single fact set the matter at rest, and also refute the opinion that every religious party will persecute whenever they predominate, that, while a deluge of blood has been shed by the churches of Rome, and of England, not a single person lost his life by the sword of the Covenanters, for his religious profession?

But it may seem a difficult thing to vindicate the character of men from this aspersion, who lived more than a hundred and fifty years ago, when the same aspersion is cast on the whole religious community *in cumulo*, by high authority in literary, if not in theological matters. In closing the review of Mc Crie's "History of the Reformation in Italy," the Reviewer thus apostrophises, "Terrible period! when the powers of the human mind seem to have acquired a greater development, only in order to open a broader field of suffering; and the convictions which should inspire sentiments of calm and beneficent philanthropy, served as stronger stimulants to ferocious persecution. Bitter, and even more humiliating than bitter, are the scenes that we have traced; but bitterer still is the reflection, that the spirit which distinguished them is still alive, and that in our own, as in every other age, the persecuted but awaits a moment of success, to serve for his own use, the arms of the persecutor. Happy are we, not that our passions are milder, but that our laws are better; and that persecution from being a moral, has become also a political crime."\*

This sentiment of the Reviewer, we think to be as just and as liberal, as one of Archbishop Laud's: Says his Grace in a letter to the Marquis of Hamilton, "Truly, my Lord, never did I see any man of that humour, (the Presbyterian) but he was deeply dyed in some violence or other, and it would have been a wonder to me, if *Henderson* had held free."†

We have hitherto noticed the objections of those who were indifferent or opposed to religion. Such persons cannot, of course, appreciate the value of the *Reformation* of religion, nor can they desire the prosperity of the Church. From such, all that *will live godly in Christ Jesus shall suffer persecution*. From such, our Presbyterian fathers suffered reproach, contumely, and even death itself in defending the truths of Christ—and shall we fear to follow their footsteps, because we shall assuredly suffer reproach also? In the present day we see the Presbyterians stigmatized, as were the Jews of old by their enemies, as seditious and tyrannical.‡ So fearful are our politicians of their influence in the State, that they do not even wish their prayers for its prosperity. But let not this make us ashamed of our profession, but rather let it stir

\* North American Review, No. 94, p. 178.

† Burnet's Memoirs of the D. of Hamilton, p. 109.

‡ Ezra iv. 16.

us up to more diligence in endeavouring "to adorn the doctrine of God our Saviour in all things:" for, "if any man suffer as a Christian, let him not be ashamed."

But though we might endure to be hated of all men, for Christ's sake, yet to become strangers to our brethren, and aliens to our mother's children, is a trial not so easily borne. But true believers in every age have been often called to endure this trial. It should teach us to cease from men, and to commit our character to the keeper of Israel—who will "bring to light the hidden things of darkness, and make manifest the counsel of all hearts."

We were led to make these remarks from having lately read the "Life and Letters" of the excellent and judicious Thomas Scott—a book which contains much that is useful and pleasing to the pious mind—and a good deal that we might denominate *trashy*, or at least indifferent.

An impression highly favorable of Mr. Scott's character is received from reading his Life and Letters. We cannot but admire the patient and indefatigable industry, which enabled him to accomplish so much, when his circumstances were so unpropitious to writing and composing. But we especially admire the pious and devout feeling which distinguishes his works.

In view of all that is presented of his character however, we think we can discover the great disadvantage under which he labored, from the want of a correct religious education; and from his having so early imbibed prejudices against all but the Established Church of England. These circumstances seem to have given a bias to his sentiments and feelings, which he was never able fully to overcome. On the doctrine of *Faith* particularly, we think his ideas confused, and that upon the whole he leaned too much towards Arminianism.

But it is not his opinion on these matters we proposed to notice. Though there are many things in which we do not agree with him, yet we think his works may be very useful—especially as in all these things he so earnestly inculcates the duty of searching the Scriptures, and of praying for the direction of the Holy Spirit to lead us into all truth.

We think Mr. Scott evidently under the influence of prejudice, when he speaks of the covenanting Presbyterians of the seventeenth century. Some allowance must be made for him, however—as he wrote on this subject only in a familiar epistolary correspondence, which he probably did not expect would be published—and therefore he might not so carefully weigh what he said as he would otherwise have done. Still what he wrote was his deliberate opinion, and which he frequently expressed; respecting him as we do, we are sorry that he wrote at all on a subject, of which he was so ignorant.

Many of the objections he brings against our reformers, are such as we have before noticed.

He objects to the covenant, that "It reserves to the church or assemblies the right of determining what princes are tyrannical, and what measures oppressive; and of sanctioning, or even exciting, resistance by arms to such measures and princes: which is too much like popery in respect of dethroning heretical Kings, &c. The primitive church, however governed, made no resistance when persecuted, and when her assemblies were scattered; nay, made no protests: and I cannot reconcile the covenant with the scriptural rules of obeying the powers that be." "It seems to me, that what I should call sedition, made a nest in



which to deposite her eggs and hatch them, in the foundation of the Scotch Church, as laid more or less in opposition, direct, or indirect, to governors, by the first reformers; and therefore as human nature is, perpetual contests with civil rulers—contests favorable perhaps, to liberty, but often both disgraceful and ruinous to vital religion—must prevail so long as that system is pertinaciously adhered to. For these and other reasons I deem the oath itself to have been unlawful; and that the national sin of Scotland originally consisted in taking and imposing it; and that they who urged this as a reason why it was null and void were so far right, though wrong in almost every thing else." p. 416—17.

We have noticed these objections of Scott, not because they are so weighty and singular, but because he was a moderate Episcopalian—and therefore might be supposed to reason with less prejudice on this subject than many others. His language, however, is in effect, the same that has been employed by all tyrants, and the friends of non-resistance and passive obedience. Some of his assertions too, are wholly gratuitous. If the covenanters are *now* thought to have been rebellious, they could not be proved to be so in the reign of Charles I. "In the year 1638, his Majesty gave orders to his Council to consult the most eminent and *least suspected* of the Scott's Lawyers concerning the legality of the covenanters' proceedings, in assembling without his authority, protesting against the proclamation of his Royal will and pleasure, and entering into covenant without his command and concurrence. Sir Thomas Hope, the Kings advocate, with Nicolson and Sir Lewis Stewart of Blackhall, being accordingly consulted, gave their opinion, 'That the most part of the covenanters' proceedings were warranted by law: and that, though in some things they seemed to have exceeded, yet there was no express law against them.\*"

[To be continued.]

---

#### ART. VI. *The Christian World Unmasked.*

(Continued from page 558.)

The doctrine of perseverance affords a stable prop to upright minds, yet lends no wanton cloak to corrupt hearts. It brings a cordial to revive the faint and keeps a guard to check the forward. The *guard*, attending on this doctrine, is sergeant *If*; low in stature, but lofty in significance; a very valiant guard, though a monosyllable. Kind notice has been taken of the sergeant by Jesus Christ and his apostles; and much respect is due unto him, from all the Lord's recruiting officers, and every soldier in his army.

Pray listen to the sergiant's speech; *If ye continue in my word, then are ye my disciples indeed.* John viii. 31. *If ye do these things, ye shall never fall.* 2 Pet. i. 10. *If what ye have heard, shall abide in you, ye shall continue in the Son and in the Father.* 1 John ii. 24. *We are made partakers of Christ, if we hold stedfast unto the end.* Heb. iii. 14. *Whoso looketh and continueth* (that is, if he that looketh does continue)

---

\*Stev. Hist.

*in the perfect law of liberty, that man shall be blessed in his deed.* James i. 25.

Yet, take notice, Sir, that sergeant *If*, is not of Jewish but of Christian parentage; not sprung from Levi, though a son of Abraham; no centinel of Moses, but a watchman for the camp of Jesus. He wears no dripping beard, like the circumcised race; and is no legal blustering *condition* to purchase man's salvation, but a modest gospel *evidence* to prove the truth of grace. He tells no idle tales, that the sheep of Christ may perish; and a child of God mistake his way, while his guide is fast asleep, and ramble down to hell: but knowing there are various works, which are but mimics of a work of grace, he kindly standeth on the king's highway of faith, producing peace and holiness; and telling passengers, *if* you continue walking in this way, your perseverance proves your faith is true: for faith, which comes from God, endures, and brings men safe to God.

Perseverance *makes* us not in Christ, but *shews* we are so; unites no branch unto the vine, but proves it is united; merits not the crown of heaven, but shews our walk is heaven-ward. A persevering walk, is an *evidence* that we are blest with persevering grace; and *are not of them, who draw back unto destruction, but of them who believe to the saving of the soul.* Heb. x. 39.

When this little sergeant is neglected, and appeareth to be scouted, bad effects ensue. Chaffy hearers, resting on a shallow work, are dancing after all new doctrines, and stirring up confusion: Upright people often grow remiss, and through a sauntering foot are apt to trip, and lose their evidences: preaching too becomes a sore travail; a needful rod for the preacher's back, to make him friendly with the sergeant; and occasion may be taken, by them who seek occasion, to revile the doctrine.

When Jesus says, *I give unto my sheep eternal life, and they shall never perish*; this secures the perseverance of the saints. And when he further says, *If ye continue in my word, then are ye my disciples indeed*; this shews that actual perseverance in the way of faith and holiness, must be my *evidence* to prove that I am one of his sheep. A belief of the doctrine of perseverance cannot save me, without the grace of perseverance.

In the Old Testament, the saint's perseverance is thus expressed. *They that are planted in the house of the Lord, shall flourish in the courts of our God; they shall still bring forth fruit in old age; they shall be fat and flourishing; to shew that the Lord is upright; that is, faithful to his word, and does not forsake his people.* Psal. xcii. 13, 14, 15.

In the New Testament, perseverance is described by the *good ground, which hears the word, and keeps it, and brings forth fruit with patience.* Luke viii. 15.

This doctrine yields no real shelter to licentiousness or laziness. If perseverance is promised to the saints; then I must be found persevering in the path of duty and the means of grace, else the doctrine does condemn me, and destroy my evidence.

St. Peter exhorts all Christians, *to make their calling and election sure*; not taking up this matter on light grounds, but using all diligence to be *assured* of it, *by adding unto faith, courage, knowledge, temperance, patience, godliness, brotherly-kindness, and charity.* His meaning is, prove your grace by a growth in grace: where heavenly seed is sown, it brings a harvest. And there is need of such an exhortation. Appear-

ances of grace and faith are often found, which flash and sparkle for a while, like meteors in the sky, and then vanish quite away.

Some, like the foolish virgins, bear a lighted lamp, and keep up Christian fellowship, yet have no oil in their vessels, no grace in their hearts: some, like Judas, preach the gospel word, and cast out devils from the hearts of others, but remain themselves the devil's bond-slaves: some, like stony ground, receive the word with eagerness, and find refreshment from it; yet having got no root, they take offence at persecution, and take their leave of Jesus: to some God gives *another* heart, as he gave to Saul, 1 Sam. x. 9, but not a *new* heart; and such may prophesy, as Saul did for a season; and taste the joy which prophets taste; yet be rejected from the kingdom, as Saul was. The sower's parable instructs us, that many are awakened, enlightened, and reformed in a measure, who seem hopeful for a time, yet having not a rooted faith in Christ, they dwindle quite away. These are awful evidences of that solemn and repeated word, *Many are called, but few are chosen.* Matt. xx. 16.—xxii. 14.

No dependence can be placed upon a present reformation, nor on short-lived impressions from the word of joy or sorrow: but a *growth in grace, and in the knowledge of Christ Jesus*, must be sought, as the crowning evidence of all the rest. The vineyard, which the Lord planteth, *will be kept and watered by him every moment*; Isa. xxvii. 3, *kept* by him, that none may hurt it; *watered* by him that it may thrive, and bear fruit. The thriving and fruit-bearing of a vine, discovers it to be of God's planting.

But you ask, Are none recovered after sad and heinous backslidings? Yes, Sir; but not without the grace afforded of a bitter sad repentance. When backsliders live and die in a course of sin, without repentance, they are lost undoubtedly. This case is determined in both the Testaments. Jesus says, *Except ye repent, ye shall all perish*, Luke xiii. 3, 5. And Ezekiel saith, *When a righteous man turneth away from his righteousness, and committeth iniquities, and dieth in them; for his iniquity that he hath done, he shall die.* Ezek. xviii. 26. Such final backsliding, is the case of all the stony and thorny ground hearers, and shews the heart was never truly brought to God. Men may seem to be religious, walk in *righteous* paths for a season, and be called *righteous* men, to difference them from the openly profane, and yet be unconverted men. By a sober education they may walk a while decently, as Jehoshaphat did, though not devoutly; be civilized, though not evangelized; or they might hear the word from a Samuel's mouth, as Saul heard; and become *another* man, as Saul became, but not a *new* man. 1 Sam. x. 6.—2 Cor. v. 17. If backsliders had been real children, God would have scourged them well with scorpions, and broken all their bones, as David's were, and fetched them home with streaming eyes and bleeding heart. Psalm lxxxix. 31, 32, 33.

When repentance is afforded after heinous backsliding, a few examples are recorded in the scripture, to encourage such to call on God, and hope for mercy. And when Jesus breaks an heart for sin, his blood will heal it. But if backsliders fancy, they must all be restored by repentance, because David was restored, and Peter was; they might as well suppose, they must be all translated into heaven without dying, because Enoch and Elijah were.

To sin, presuming on repentance, and a future call, is such a devilish motive, and carries such a cloven foot, as shews a case is horrid bad

indeed: this was not Peter's case, nor David's. The most alarming thunder in the book of God is levelled at such horrible presumption. *If any bless himself in his heart, saying, I shall have peace, though I walk after the imaginations of my heart, to add drunkenness to thirst.* (that is, sin, to sin,) *the Lord will not spare that man; but the anger of the Lord and his jealousy shall smoke against that man; and all the curses which are written in this book shall lie upon him.* Deut. xxix. 19, 20.

Indeed, Doctor, I can see no reason to object against the doctrine of perseverance, when attended by the sergeant's guard. While they walk hand in hand together, the doctrine is a spur to diligence, and the sergeant is a check to wantonness or laziness. But how comes it, that the world takes such high offence at these doctrines, and loathes the preachers and professors of them? Nay, we are told, that some very honest folks, who are cast in a gospel-foundry, often ring a fire-bell, to quench these very doctrines. And you may think it makes us titter when we hear a cry of fire, and see some engines from the Foundry playing on the Tabernacle-pulpit. It is pretty sport for us, when the gospel-men pull noses, and the gospel dames pull caps. Such frays make us laugh delightfully, and yield a venison feast for the squire and the vicar. "Now these rogues begin to quarrel, we shall hear of all their tricks," they cry. When the dean of Tottenham died, his chapels, we supposed, would tumble down of course; but they keep upon their legs, we hear; and the pulpits are becrouded most amazingly. Our schoolmaster is reputed a very topping scholar; he can write Italian hand, read a Latin dictionary, manage vulgar fractions, and give you twenty nimble reasons for every thing; and he says, the doctrines of grace will never be abandoned by those, who are tintured with them. For every one, who slips into them, drops into a quagmire, and is swallowed up directly. He compares the doctrines to Polyphemus's den, where many went in, but none came out; all were eaten up alive in the cave by the monster.

Sir, I perceive your schoolmaster is an arch fellow; and, li'e his neighbors, useth wanton tricks, to put modest truth out of countenance. A fool's cap, thrust upon the head of a serious truth, or a grave judge, will make them both appear ridiculous, when nothing else could. However, truth will not be thrust out of doors, though often put to the blush. She may change her countenance, but cannot change her nature, nor will desert her post. Yet, if religious truth meets with lewd opposers, I must confess, she sometimes meets with wanton advocates, who hang upon her skirts and claim acquaintance with her, and bring disgrace upon her, though she disclaims them utterly.

Scandalous professors are found in every age, who warp the doctrines of grace to sanctify their wickedness. Like the spider or the toad, every thing, such lewd men feed upon, is turned into poison. Paul speaks of these, and says, *Their belly is their God, and they glory in their shame.* Phil. iii. 19. Peter calls them, *Spots in their love-feasts; sporting themselves with their own deceivings; cursed children; having eyes full of adultery, and hearts exercised with covetous practices.* 2 Pet. ii. 13, 14. And Jude can scarcely keep his temper, while he brands them, as *brute beasts; filthy dreamers; walking after their own lusts; raging waves of the sea, foaming out their own shame; clouds without water, carried about with every wind; wandering stars, for whom is reserved the blackness of darkness for ever.* Jude, 10, 12, 13.

Such professors, you see, were found in the apostles' days; and will

arise at all times, and give a just offence to serious minds; and because these *brute beasts* are always babbling about faith and grace, this sets the world of course against the doctrines. They are condemned as poisonous, because abused by hypocrites; and every preacher of the doctrines, is supposed to be an open or a secret advocate for vice. Even Satan seems a much more harmless creature than a Calvinist. If he has got one cloven foot, a Calvinist, besure, has two.

But, Sir, the abuse of doctrines is no argument to prove the doctrines themselves are hurtful; the blessings of providence are full as much abused, as the doctrine of grace: yet none reject the providential blessings, because of their abuse. If all my countrymen were drunkards and gluttons, this would be no argument for my rejecting food and liquor, but a good caution to use them temperately. And if my brethren, who profess the doctrines of grace, should all agree to wear them as a cloak for wickedness, this would be no reason for my rejecting the doctrines, but a strong caution not to wear the cloak myself. The apostles did not reject the doctrines of grace, because a wicked use was made of them: no more should you or I.

The common run of Christians do not regard the doctrines of grace; yet thousands live in open sin, and cheer their hearts in sin, by saying, God is *merciful*. The doctrines of grace cannot be more abused, than the mercy of God is; nor afford a sweeter handle for licentiousness: yet no horrid outcry is raised at this abuse. Many mind it not; and others pass it softly over, without saying, it is wrong. But sure God's honour is as much concerned in this abuse, as in the other. And since men can bear to have the *mercy* of God abused, but take a violent offence when the doctrines of grace are perverted, this sheweth that the mere abuse of these doctrines is not the *chief* ground of the world's outcry. The doctrines themselves are hateful, because they batter human pride, undermine all human merit, lay the human worm in the dust, and give the glory of salvation wholly unto God. Nature cannot bear this: she would not have salvation as a *lost*, but as a *decent* sinner: nor become an heir of glory by a mere election of God and faith in Jesus, but by some noble plea of merit; nor would she walk in duty's path, through the Holy Spirit's aid, but by her own gouty ankles. With some reluctance she endureth to go snacks with Jesus, but will never bear to be wholly saved by grace, it is so pitiful a way, so much beneath her dignity! What? If she is become a captive, and the devil's captive, she was once an empress, and will never wear a crown, through another's generous purchase, but by her own exploits, and decent share of merit.

It is not possible to preach the doctrines of grace, nor even to profess them, without the world's indignation and censure. If every preacher was a Timothy, and all professors were Nathaniels, still the world would hold them in abhorrence, think them satan's troops, and call them wolves in sheep's clothing. Paul affirms that himself and his fellow-labourers were slandered as licentious men, who said, *Let us do evil, that good may come*. Rom. iii. 8. And Peter intimates, that all the Christians were *spoken against as evil doers*. 1 Pet. ii. 12. Now, Sir, if the preachers, in the purest age of the church, were slandered as licentious men; and professors were reviled as a race of evil-doers; it is no marvel, that the slander rolls along through all succeeding ages.

And what could give occasion to this slander? Not the evil conduct of the first preachers and professors, but their *nauseous doctrines*, which

made old nature sick. Preachers said, and converts did profess that *men are justified by faith, without the deeds of the law; chosen of God before the foundation of the world; called by grace; kept by the power of God through faith unto salvation; and saved not according to their own works but according to God's purpose and grace.* Rom. iii. 28.—Ephes. i. 4.—Heb. ix. 15.—1 Pet. i. 5.—2 Tim. i. 9.

Such preaching, though attended with much practical instruction, smelt so horrid nauseous, and appeared so licentious, that a heathen stomach puked at it. Loose as the gentiles were, they could lothe a Christian for his supposed evil principles; and did condemn them all, apostles and their flocks, as the *filth of the world, and the offscouring of all things.*

And if this was the case in the purest age; what else can be expected in succeeding ages? But you say, we sojourn in a baptized country. True: the country swarmeth with baptized rakes, baptized worldlings, and baptized infidels. A watery profession, without the Spirit's baptism, will never wash the heart from pride, and subdue it to the gospel doctrines; and legal righteousness will set the heart still more against them. No one can truly bear the doctrines, till he cannot bear himself.

Jesus Christ inviteth them, that are weary of themselves, and laden with their guilt and sinful nature. Only such received him in Judæa, and only such receive him in Great Britain. These are prepared for his gospel, know what poverty of spirit means, and feel that brokenness of heart, which God delighteth in, and where he only dwells.

These are the gospel subjects; but alas! how few! And where must we find them, in leather or prunello, in camblet or in sarcenet? They are a *little flock* indeed, who have been taught to say with Job, and say with deep compunction, *We abhor ourselves.* Job xliii. 6. Yet Job was called a *perfect* man, by one who knew what is in man: but Job wanted breaking down, before he could truly say, *Behold, I am vile.* xl. 4. And when the furnace had well melted him, disclosed his dross and filthy scum, and made him *lothesome* to himself, then the work was done. The furnace cooled presently; his sorrows fled away; and peace and plenty smiled on him.

The doctrines of grace, are utterly repugnant to the pride of our arminian nature; yet none forsake the doctrines, who have gained a clear sight of them. They are abused by some, as every good thing is, but are abandoned by none. Arminians, who have received a ray of gospel-light, desert their ranks frequently: but a Calvinist will never leave his standard; he dies at the foot of his colours. A clear sight of grace is so exceeding glorious, it keeps the heart steady to the doctrines.

Perhaps you think, a Calvinist maintains his ground, because it is bestrewed with roses, and suits licentious purposes. But, Sir, this calumny is grown exceeding stale, it was broached first in Paul's day, and poured on him liberally; and sprinkled on his hearers; and has begrimed his followers in all succeeding ages. If the slander sticks on us, it cleaves to Paul abundantly; because he tapped this nauseous vessel, which turns the human stomach, and makes it rave with indignation.

These doctrines suit a contrite spirit; and are drank, not as a Circe's-bowl, to intoxicate the mind; but as a grace-cup, to cheer the heart, and keep it steady under trials. They do not prove a *monster's den*, as you suppose, where all are eaten up, who enter in; but a *banquet house*, where pilgrims find such sweet repast, they have no will to leave it.

If I seemed tedious on this article, the misguided zeal of some, I hope, well-minded people, has constrained me; who have taken most outrageous pains to blacken Calvinism. Whatever ridicule a sparkling fancy could suggest, whatever filth or ordure could be raked together, has been cast upon it. The looseness of a few, is charged on all the rest; and a devil's coat is put upon a Calvinist, like some condemned heretic; and in this flaming raiment he is held aloft, as a horrid bug-bear, to frighten simple hearted people.

Well, but Doctor, one thing somewhat gravels me, that these doctrines will not relish with the present age, though they are *established*. The law, the homilies, the articles, the prayer-book, all afford protection to them, and yet they cannot stand upon their legs: pray, what makes them prove so rickety?

Sir, your question may be answered by another. Can any good thing keep its head above water in the present age? If the doctrines of grace are rejected; is not the word of God despised too, and the house of God deserted, and the name of God blasphemed every where? The Bible, like an old almanac, is either cast out of doors, or cast upon a solitary shelf, to be buried there in dust, and covered with a winding sheet, weaved by a spider. How should the doctrines keep upon their legs, when the Bible, which contains them, is fallen upon the ground?

Unless a *spirit of grace* is poured out upon a land, the *doctrines of grace* cannot be heartily received; because they fight with every dictate of depraved nature. The first lesson to be learnt in Christ's school, is, *deny thyself*, every thing that belongs to *self*; not *self-pleasing* only, and *self-interest*, but all *self-sufficiency*; *self-will*, *self-potence* and *self-righteousness*; and these are heavy crosses to be taken up.

The law was *established* with divine solemnity among the Israelites: yet they were evermore deserting this establishment, and warping to idolatry. And how were they reclaimed? By a prophet's mouth, you say. True; but a prophet's mere preaching could no more reclaim the people, than a prophet's dancing. God gave a promise to his prophet, *I will pour upon the inhabitants of Jerusalem the Spirit of grace and supplication*, and so the work was done. Where the *Spirit of grace* fell, a change was wrought.

Even so it fares with the gospel, which can no more be kept on foot, than the law was without a supernatural power. Men will desert the doctrines and the precepts of the gospel, for these go hand in hand; nor can human establishments prevent it. Establishments may keep up forms, but Christ alone can give the power. A fanciful alliance may be framed between church and state; but the church's whole support is from the church's head. *The government is laid upon his shoulder*; and he will never prosper doctrines, who oppose his grace: such preaching will be chaff and stubble, and the preachers grow contemptible.

When a Christian church becomes exceedingly depraved; when *its nobles are as ravening wolves*; and *its prophets daub them with untempered mortar*: when *its watchmen are grown blind, love to slumber, and are looking every one for his gain*; and *the people, great and small given unto covetousness*; then, unless the Lord revises his work, *by pouring out his Spirit from on high*, the church's candlestick is quite removed, and she becomes a sister to the African and Asiatic churches.

Mahometism is the gulph provided by the Lord, for his abandoned churches to be drowned in. They first deny the God, who made and

bought them ; which drives them to the synagogue of Arius ; another gentle step leads them to the chapel of Socinus ; and a half pace more brings them briskly to the mosk of Mahomet.

(To be Continued.)

### ART. VII. Psalmody.

*An Address to the students of the Theological Seminary of the Associate Reformed Synod of the West, at the opening of the session, Dec. 5th, 1856; by John Pressly, D. D.*

In this "Address" Professor Pressly discusses the question—"Shall we, in singing God's praise, make use of the songs contained in the book of Psalms, or, shall we adopt, in their stead, hymns composed by uninspired men?" The subject of the "Address" was probably suggested by a notice which the editors of the Biblical Repertory took of Professor Pressly's Lecture on the subject of "Catholic Communion." They say, (vol. viii. no. iv.) "We now turn to the Lecture of Dr. Pressly, which will be found a rare example of exclusiveness, 'after the strictest sect.' One would think, at this period of the world's age and experience, that two bodies of Presbyterians, having precisely the same Confession of Faith, precisely the same form of government and discipline, and a form of worship exactly agreeing in all respects, save only a difference in the *version* of Psalms which they employ, might freely commune together without any unhallowed mixture or any criminal abandonment of principle on either side. But to this Dr. Pressly can by no means accede.—We are not prepared, indeed, to subscribe to every "part and parcel" of Dr. Mason's eloquent and able work on 'Catholic Communion.' To some of the principles which he lays down we are constrained to demur, as too indefinite, and of questionable safety: but we hardly expected to find a pupil of that great man, and especially one of so much intelligence and information as Dr. Pressly evidently is, consenting to stand on ground quite so narrow as that which this Lecture discloses.—Are we to consider the members of his communion as *unanimous* in maintaining the doctrine of this Lecture? Unless we are deceived, we could name venerable men belonging to the Associate Reformed Church, who would be unwilling, even *now*, to concur with Dr. Pressly in some of his views in relation to this subject. For ourselves we regret the publication of the doctrine of the Lecture before us, at this time of day, on a variety of accounts. Primarily, because we think it unsupported by Scripture or reason: and also, because its tendency we think, is to discredit the cause of truth, and thus ultimately to promote error. Human nature is prone to vibrate from one extreme to its opposite. And we cannot doubt that the extreme rigor of the doctrine of sect, is adapted to drive its advocates ultimately to the extreme of latitudinarianism. We have seen this principle exemplified in the history of several gentlemen once connected with Dr. Pressly's own communion, but now remarkable for nothing so much as for their reckless rejection of all creeds and venerated ecclesiastical landmarks. May no future metamorphosis exemplify the same principle!"



These remarks of the Repertory, were calculated to wound the feelings of Professor Pressly. He takes, however, no express notice of them, in his late Address to his pupils, but as we have said, they were probably the occasion of suggesting the subject-matter of that Address. The Repertory would have its readers believe, that on the subject of Psalmody, the difference between the General Assembly Presbyterian, and those Presbyterians, who, in praising God, sing the Bible Psalms, consists only in the use of a different *version* of the same Psalms. This assertion of the editors we are compelled to characterize as highly dishonest. It would be offering an insult to their intelligence to say that they did not know better. Dr. Pressly in his Address points out the fallacy of this assertion and presents the subject in its true light.

In the above remarks of the Repertory we find several other statements, which we can only view in the light of unfounded assertions. The editors should have attempted to show, that the "doctrine of Professor Pressly's Lecture was unsupported by scripture and reason." Or did they think that their *ipse dixit* was of itself sufficient to overthrow the arguments of the Professor? We cannot say, what may be the tendency of the "extreme rigor of the doctrine of sect," but we do not believe that a firm adherence to the whole truth of God's word has any tendency to "latitudinarianism," and consequently we do not believe that *this principle* was exemplified in the case of the Associate Reformed ministers alluded to by the editors. It was not their former *strict* profession that drove them into the ranks of the General Assembly; no, it was *popularity*, the same thing that afterwards made them so "remarkable for their reckless rejection of all creeds and venerated ecclesiastical landmarks." It is not often that ministers forsake a more sound profession for one that is less sound, from a solemn conviction of duty: such changes are generally effected by a desire of *popularity* or some other equally detestible motive.

The Repertory, however, is right in charging upon certain ministers of the Associate Reformed Church, a disagreement from Professor Pressly on the subject of Catholic communion. We alluded to the same fact, in the brief notice which we took of the "Lecture" in an early number of the present volume of the Monitor. We spoke, however, only in relation to the Associate Reformed Synod of New York; and we have lately understood that some of the most intelligent people of that connection, consider the chief difference between their church and ours to lie in this, that while we are for *close*, they are for *open* communion. But as many, both ministers and people, belonging to said Synod, also differ from us on the subject of Psalmody, at least in practice, we would, as was done in the case of the "Lecture," recommend to them the careful perusal of Dr. Pressly's "Address."

This "Address," though containing nothing original, is nevertheless highly creditable to the author; the question in controversy is fairly stated; the truth triumphantly established; objections judiciously answered, and, in short, the sentiments of the "Address" are both correct and happily expressed. We present to the reader the following extract as a fair specimen of the whole performance.

"The great superiority of the songs of inspiration is a sufficient reason why they should be used in preference to all others. The book of Psalms is admitted by all Christians to be the word of God. In these

divine compositions, the character, and perfections, and will of God, are exhibited by himself. Here, that praise is ascribed unto God, which is due unto his name. Here, the exercises of the renewed soul are described by Him whose prerogative it is to change the heart. And with regard to every thing contained in this book, whether it may be an exhibition of the divine perfections, a delineation of the character of the true believer, or a declaration of what God has done for his church in past ages, or a promise with regard to what the objects of his love may expect from him, we know assuredly that it is the truth, without any alloy; and on it we can rely with unshaken confidence. *The words of the Lord are pure words, as silver tried in a furnace of earth, purified seven times.* But with regard to any other collections of songs, it must be admitted, that they are the productions of men, and partake, in a greater or less degree, of that imperfection which characterizes all the works of man. They may be recommended by the elegancies of language, and the charms of poetry; and, in addition to these things, they may possess no inconsiderable portion of evangelical truth; but still, after all that can be said in their favor, they are the productions of erring man. On the contrary, the songs contained in the book of Psalms are the word of Him whose work is perfect. And shall we substitute in the place of the word of God itself, that which at best is only a human exposition of it? Can this be done without offering an indignity to the Author of the Bible, and practically preferring the productions of men before his word? But perhaps some one will say, the point in dispute is not whether the productions of men are to be placed upon a level with the word of God, but simply, whether one version of the psalms, or another version, shall be preferred. You may prefer the old version, but I prefer the improved version of Watts.

To this I reply, that the mere preference of one version over another, can have no application to the hymns in common use. It will not be pretended that these are a version of the scripture psalms. All that can be said of them is, that they are founded on different portions of scripture. In so far, therefore, as the use of evangelical hymns is concerned, it is perfectly plain, that the point in dispute has respect not to any particular version, but to an important principle, and that is, the propriety of introducing into the worship of God the compositions of uninspired men. But it may be alleged, that whatever may be the point in dispute, in relation to the use of hymns, the question with regard to the psalms is, simply, which shall be preferred, the version of Rouse, or the version of Watts? To this I reply, that Watts' psalms are not, in any proper sense of the word, a version of the scripture psalms; nor was it the intention of their author that they should be. But let this distinguished writer speak for himself. In his preface he says, 'I have entirely omitted several whole psalms, and large pieces of many others, and have chosen out of all of them such parts only as might easily and naturally be accommodated to the various occasions of the Christian life; or at least might afford us some beautiful allusions to Christian affairs. These I have copied and explained in the general style of the gospel; nor have I confined my expressions to any particular party or opinion, that, in words prepared for public worship, and for the lips of multitudes, there might not be a syllable offensive to sincere Christians, whose judgments may differ in the lesser matters of religion.' After this honest and candid declaration of the author himself, how preposterous is it to represent his performance as a version of

the psalms! 'Several whole psalms are entirely omitted, and large pieces of many others;' and yet will it be called a version of the scripture psalms! Nay—'out of all of them,' he says he has 'chosen such parts only as might easily and naturally be accommodated to the various occasions of the Christian life;' and yet, after all, will it be pretended that it is a version of the psalms? Nor is this all that he has done. He states further—'Where the Psalmist uses sharp invectives against his personal enemies, I have endeavored to turn the edge of them against our spiritual adversaries. Where the flights of his faith and love are sublime, I have often sunk the expressions within the reach of an ordinary Christian.' Not only then has he, according to his own declaration, omitted much that is contained in the psalms, but he has greatly altered that which he has retained. In some instances, the Psalmist, it seems, has evidenced an unchristian spirit, and has used '*sharp invectives against his personal enemies*;' and, in his improvement, our author turns the edge of these invectives against our spiritual adversaries. In other instances, the spirit of the Psalmist is rather too heavenly; the flights of his faith and love are so sublime, that, in his improvement, Watts sinks the expressions within the reach of an ordinary Christian. And after many of the psalms have been entirely omitted, parts culled out of others, and the spirit of the remainder changed, will it still be pretended, that this is a version of the scripture psalms? I repeat it, then, it neither is, nor was it, the design of its author, that it should be a version of the psalms, properly so called. His professed design was to imitate the psalms of David in the language of the New Testament, and as he expresses it, to make David speak 'the common sense and language of a Christian.' The point in dispute, then, is not which shall be preferred, this version of the psalms, or that version of the psalms; but it is simply this—Shall we confine ourselves to the use of the songs of inspiration, or shall we exercise our liberty in using the evangelical hymns of uninspired men? And our argument in favor of the exclusive use of the songs of inspiration, is drawn from their entire superiority.

I have stated already, and I wish you to keep it distinctly in view, that the controversy on this subject does not relate to what particular version of the psalms shall be used. It is true, however, that in those branches of the Christian church, which plead for the exclusive use of the scripture psalms, what is termed 'Rouse's version,' is now used; and it may be worth while to notice briefly the history of the introduction of this version.

During the sitting of the Assembly of divines at Westminster, in the year 1643, this version was brought before that venerable body. Being carefully examined and amended by the Assembly, the use of it was authorized in the year 1645. It was afterwards laid before the General Assembly of the church of Scotland. By the General Assembly it was referred to the consideration of the Presbyteries, who reported such corrections and amendments as they thought proper. These amendments were reconsidered by the Assembly, and after the version had been improved by the combined wisdom of the Presbyteries and the General Assembly of the church of Scotland, the use of it was authorized in the year 1649, as being found to be, when compared with the original, more agreeable to the text than any version heretofore prepared. This version is now used, for the simple reason, that it is decidedly the best we have. It is framed upon the principle, of a trans-

lation of the original as literal as the laws of versification will allow. The version we do not suppose to be perfect; but admit, in relation to it, what all admit in relation to the received translation of the Bible, that in some particulars, it might be improved. All expositors of the Bible occasionally suggest amendments of the common translation, by which they suppose it might be improved; and yet, the commonly received translation of the scriptures, we regard as substantially the word of God. And if the prose translation of the psalms deserves to be regarded as the word of God, the mere English reader may satisfy himself that the metrical version possesses substantially the same character. Not only is there generally between the metrical version, and the prose translation, an exact coincidence in sentiment, but, to an extent truly remarkable, the metrical version retains the very words of the prose, only a little transposed, for the sake of rhyme. But if, in any case, it can be made appear that our metrical version does not fully and literally exhibit the idea of the original text, we then admit, in relation to it, what all are free to grant in reference to the prose translation, that it may be amended. It is, then, ungenerous and unfair, to represent us as contending for the use of Rouse's psalms. As well might the Romanists represent Protestants as contending for king James' Bible, because they use the translation of the scriptures which was prepared under the reign, and in conformity with the order of that prince. No—our principle is, that it is the will of God, that the songs contained in the book of Psalms be sung in his worship, both public and private, to the end of the world. Among Presbyterians it is a received principle, that the scriptures are to be translated into the language of every nation unto which they come. We use a particular metrical version of the psalms; because it is believed to be the best, most faithful and correct, which has yet been prepared: and we cannot use Watts' psalms; because these are not, in any proper sense of the word, a version of the songs of inspiration.

But perhaps some one will inquire, what impropriety can there be in using, in the praise of God, the hymns of uninspired men, provided the sentiments they contain be strictly in accordance with the gospel? My answer is short—they lack the divine appointment. Evangelical hymns may be read for our improvement, just as we read evangelical sermons, or any other human writings, which are founded upon the scriptures: but, in offering religious worship unto God, we must be governed by his word: and, therefore, unless it can be made appear that God has appointed the use of uninspired hymns in his worship, their introduction is unauthorized, and consequently improper. The manner in which God is to be worshipped, is not to be determined by human wisdom, but must be learned from the divine appointment. If men were left to determine, in the exercise of their own discretion, what is proper to be introduced into the worship of God, what could be excluded? One considers that a band of musical instruments, as an accompaniment of our public praise, adds much to the solemnity and impressiveness of this part of divine worship: and thus our churches may be rendered centres of attraction to the fashionable and gay, who are delighted with 'concord of sweet sounds.' And as it is important to bring all men under the influence of the preaching of the gospel—if we were left to determine this matter by our own sense of propriety—we might argue, that to accommodate the fastidious taste of the giddy multitude, it would be perfectly proper to relieve the dullness of

preaching by a musical entertainment. Another might plead, that his devotion is materially assisted by a picture, or visible representation, of the cross, of God, or of Christ. These pictures, he might plead, serve to bring to his remembrance the objects they represent, and thus assist his thoughts in soaring from earth to heaven. And thus the walls of our churches might be decorated with splendid images. And while these images might serve to help the devotional feelings of some, our churches might be rendered more attractive to those who have a taste for the fine arts. And where should we stop? There is such an endless diversity in the tastes of men, that one would like to have this, and another would choose to have that, introduced into the worship of God, until the simplicity of scriptural worship would entirely disappear in the midst of the fertility of human invention. But let us pause, and ask, who hath required these things at your hand? These things may seem to men to be improvements in the worship of God; but how do we know that they will be acceptable to Him who is the object of all religious worship? Have they the sanction of God's appointment?

That you may appreciate the importance of attending to the divine appointment, in every thing connected with the worship of God, let me direct your attention to a particular case in the history of divine worship, under the law, as an example for illustration. In the directions given to Moses, relative to the making of an altar, it is said, '*If thou wilt make me an altar of stone, thou shalt not build it of hewn stone; for if thou lift up thy tool upon it, thou hast polluted it.*'\* Now, if we for a moment keep the divine appointment out of view, it would be very easy to assign a variety of plausible reasons, why a different kind of altar should have been made. It might be said, that an altar of rough unpolished stone would not be respectful to the Deity: to make such an altar, would be to offer an indignity to God. A due respect to the glory of the divine character, would require that the altar should be constructed of stone, handsomely polished. If the matter were left to the judgment of men, such would certainly be our decision. But the divine declaration is, '*If thou lift up thy tool upon it, thou hast polluted it.*' To apply this example to the subject before us, it may be argued, in favor of the hymns of uninspired men, that they are evangelical, that they contain gospel truth, presented in elegant language, and adorned with the beauties of poetry: and it may be said, that they are much better adapted to the gospel dispensation than the old, antiquated psalms of the Bible. But the question meets us, who hath required this at your hand? Has God directed us to praise him in the use of uninspired hymns? We know that he has furnished a book of songs of praise, the use of which in his worship he appointed; but where has he appointed the use of hymns of human composition? We know that the praises of God are uttered in an appropriate manner, in the songs of inspiration; for they are the productions of his own Spirit. And we are assured, that if we use these with suitable affections, our worship will be acceptable unto him; because it is regulated by his own appointment. But shall we leave these fountains of living water, for cisterns which we ourselves have hewn out? Before we take a step of such importance, let us be very sure that we have the divine authority.

---

\* Exodus 20 : 25.

ART. VIII. *The A. R. Synod and Rev. Mr. Stark.*

We should not have referred to this transaction again, had it not been that we were lately informed that some of our readers were unwilling to credit our former statement respecting it—thinking that our informants had imposed upon us, as no respectable Synod could have been guilty of the conduct specified. To let such readers know that we were not misinformed in the statement we made, we will present to them the two following Letters addressed to the Editor of the Christian Magazine, and which have been given to the public in the January number of that Periodical.

*“ To the Editor of the Christian Magazine:*

In the [November number of the Religious Monitor, I observed an article, in which there are some severe remarks on the conduct of our Synod, in tendering an invitation to the Rev. Mr. Stark, of the Associate Church, New-York, to sit as a corresponding member. The severity by which the remarks are characterised ought, in justice, to have been spared, until the Editor was fully informed of the circumstances of the case. Mr. Stark was suspended from the ministry, by the Associate Synod, in May 1836. The Editor of the Monitor, therefore, looks upon the invitation given to Mr. Stark by our Synod, as a direct and unparalleled insult to the body by which this act of suspension was passed. That no such insult was intended by the Synod of New-York, I am certain, and equally so, that if the fact of Mr. Stark's suspension had been generally known, the invitation would not have been tendered. If that fact had been known by the members, the Editor of the Monitor would have had just reason to complain. Whatever might be the opinion of individual members respecting the justice of that sentence, it would be worse than indecorous for the Synod, either directly or indirectly, to declare the acts of the supreme judicatory of a sister church, null and void, without a full and careful investigation of all the circumstances which led to them.

I am authorised by one of the members of Synod, who was present when the invitation was given, to say to you that he never heard of Mr. Stark's suspension, until it was announced by Mr. Stark himself, when he gave it as a reason for declining to accept of a seat. Eight other members, were to my certain knowledge, equally ignorant of it until they learned it from Mr. Stark, and I have no doubt that such was the case with by far the greater number of the members who were present at the time.

A MEMBER OF SYNOD.

*To the Editor of the Christian Magazine.*

You will do me a favor, by permitting me to state in your Magazine, that I would not have voted for the motion in our late meeting of Synod, to invite the Rev. Mr. Stark to sit as a correspondent, had I known the relation then existing between him and the Associate Synod. Two reasons would have led me to oppose the motion:

1st. Respect to the ordinance of government in the church of Christ. The Associate Synod is a church of Christ, and therefore, had I felt prepared to dissent from their decision, still through respect for the ordinance of Christ committed to them, I should have felt constrained to oppose the motion.

2d. Respect for the Associate Synod—a Synod, in my opinion, highly respectable for learning, talent and piety.

Yours fraternally,

H. CONNELLY.”

Our readers will readily perceive that the above Letters show, not only, that the *fact* stated by us was true, but also, that we were justifiable in the remarks which we then made. We never, indeed, intended that those remarks should apply to such of the brethren as our respected friend Mr. Connelly, who were ignorant of Mr. Starks' ecclesiastical standing. We believed then, and we believe still that a majority of the *ministers* in the Synod knew his standing. The Correspondent of the Magazine who subscribes himself "A member of Synod," would have his readers believe differently, but at the same time tacitly admits that himself and some others knew the facts in the case. Why then did not *he*, or the *Editor* of the Magazine, or some of the other members, who knew the true state of the case, object to the motion respecting Mr. Stark's reception, and state to the uninformed members the grounds of their objection? But we do not wish to occupy any more room with this disgraceful affair. We, however, sympathize with those members of the Synod, who, on the occasion referred to, were imposed upon by the improper silence of their brethren.

---

ART. IX. *Miscellany.*

POPISH BAPTISM.—The Rev. Robert J. Breckinridge thus describes a *Popish Baptism* which he saw performed at Paris in the church of St. Eustache.

"At the door I met a small party bearing a very young child. They are going to have it baptised perhaps, a ceremony I had long desired to witness, and I turned back with them. They were soon shown into the chapel, on the left side of the church, in the centre of which stood a font apparently of silver, on a pedestal about four feet high. The priest entered, apparelled nearly like him I had seen at Notre-Dame, marshalled by an official, dressed in a military costume, and followed by another in deep black, of a peculiar cut, like a sort of clerical undress. Besides these three, the nurse with the infant in her arms, the father of the child, a girl about thirteen, and a boy of perhaps ten, formed the company in the chapel. The priest took his stand by the font, and commenced whispering out of a little book as if speaking to himself. The infant was held in the arms opposite, and on either side of it stood the little girl and boy to act as sponsors for the babe; the male sponsor was obliged to stand upon a high stool, upon which the father held him, and thus fulfilled his entire part in the scene. As the door of the chapelle still stood ajar, I pointed to it, and catching the eye of the attendant, made a slight bow. He returned the salutation, and I entered and took my stand by his side, within arm's reach of all the party.

I will briefly describe what I saw. But when the multitude of the absurdities is considered, and when it is remembered that the words of the ceremony were in a language (Latin) which few can speak, and which was now uttered in a foreign accent, I shall be easily excused if I be found in error, as to points more material than the exact order of occurrence, about which indeed I cannot be positive. During much of the ceremony the priest extended his right hand over the child; occasionally the little sponsors did the same, the assistant gazed about, and at intervals said amen; while the official handed about the various uten-

sils, cotton, little spoons, &c. &c. used on the occasion. The priest made the sign of the cross on the forehead and breast of the child, saying at the same time, it was "to secure to it eternal life." He breathed several times in its face, saying "receive the good spirit," with much beside, for I only give a few words of what he muttered without ceasing. Just before or just after that, he went through a process of exorcism, which was directed against an unclean spirit supposed to reside in the infant. He put his own saliva on his fingers, and transferred it into the nostrils and ears of the little sleeping subject, using at the operation on the latter, the solemn *Ephphatha*, once pronounced by our Saviour, with the power of God, and which I shuddered to hear profaned to such mummery. He took a pinch of salt, from a silver shell, and put it into the child's mouth. He took a little gold spoonful of oil out of a very small silver cabinet, and touched the breast and back of the neck with it, the attendant immediately wiping it off with a bit of cotten, with which he also carefully wiped the cabinet. At this moment, if my memory is accurate, he took up a second silver utensil, very small, and formed like a shell, and poured out a small portion of water upon the right side of the crown of the head. Two things however distracted the fixed and painful attention with which I had regarded his proceedings. The first was the multitudes of caps, being no less than four, which were removed from the head of the infant, to expose it for the performance of this part of the ceremony. The second was, that the priest, in his first attempt, missed the head and poured the water into the font, at which he uttered several ejaculations of surprise, that greatly tried the gravity of the spectators. A second attempt was more successful. After which he gave the unction with chrisam, taken from a second compartment of the little silver cabinet. Then followed a dumb show with a candle, which he held so as to appear as if grasped by the child, while he uttered a few sentences, in the midst of which they gathered closer around, and concealed it for a moment from my view. Towards the end of the affair, he took up one end of the collar which depended from his neck, and held it for a moment over the person of the infant, with the side that had a cross on it upwards. He had several times before pressed the side with the cross, on its face and person, and once took the collar off, reverently kissed the part that rested on the back of his neck, turned it inside out and put it on again. And this is Baptism? This is that simple, significant, divine right, wherein by the pouring of water on the person, we signify the outpouring of the Eternal Spirit for the cleansing of the soul of man; in which we manifest our wish to perform, on our part, the conditions and to secure the fulfilment on the part of God, of the sacred promises, of that covenant of which it is so plain a seal? No: it is a gross and degrading mummery, compounded of impiety, superstition and folly; no more like Christian baptism than the Pope of Rome is like that blessed Lord, in whose name and stead he claims to rule, or the apostacy in the midst of which he sits as God, is like that universal church of the redeemed in earth and heaven, of which Christ Jesus is the only and the adorable head!"

---

\*We had supposed that Mr. Breckinridge was a better Theologian than to give utterance to such a sentiment. It grieves us to see the Covenant of Grace converted into a Covenant of Works and clogged with conditions which must be performed, on our part, in order to secure the fulfilment, on God's part, of its sacred promises!—[ED. REL. MOV.]



**MODE OF WORSHIP IN THE CHURCH OF HOLLAND.**—Public worship in the forenoon of the Sabbath is conducted in the following manner in the churches in Holland.

“The reader enters his desk at half past nine precisely, habited with cloak and band similar to those of the minister. He raises a psalm, in which all unite. After that, he reads with slow and solemn tone a section out of the Scripture, ordinarily one relating to the subject of the sermon. As he reads, the eyes of all are following him in the Bibles with which every one is furnished. Ten o'clock strikes. He immediately closes the book, and leads the psalm announced on the board, of which one verse only is then sung. The minister ascends the pulpit, having first offered a short, silent prayer on the lowest stair, and hangs his hat upon the pillar against which it stands. The psalm ceases. The minister then commences a short introductory prayer, usually an ascription of praise to God, or, it may be, a brief supplication for help and a blessing upon the preacher and the hearers. Then follow the introduction of the sermon and a prayer, ending frequently, but not always, with the Lord's Prayer. Another verse is now sung. After this the text is read, and a short benediction pronounced. Then follows the sermon itself, consisting usually of three parts; the exposition of the text, in its terms and connection with the foregoing and following context; then the statement and development of the subject or proposition; last of all, the application to the hearers. \* \* \* This never lasts less than an hour, commonly an hour and a half, frequently two hours; but the attention of the hearers is wonderfully sustained till the close. The minister often has a glass of milk, or water, beside him, with which he occasionally moistens his dry mouth. If the sermon be unusually long, a verse is sung between the heads. At its close, the sexton brings him the notices, which he then gives out. After these, he offers the concluding prayers, which usually last half an hour, including supplications for the sick and for travellers, and thanksgivings on recovery, return home, and almost every conceivable occasion. When this is over, he gives out another hymn, sits down and draws too the green curtains which enclose the pulpit on both sides. This, however, is not always done. After the singing of the hymn, the congregation is dismissed with a blessing, sometimes the Mosaic, but usually the Apostolic benediction.”

**INFLUENCE OF WOMAN.**—One of the happiest results of Christianity, may be perceived in its influence on the condition of females. With but few exceptions, where the Bible is unknown, woman is ignorant, debased and unhappy. Instead of making her the partner of his joys, the object to which his tenderest sympathies are directed, and on which his warmest affections are fixed, her tyrant lord has employed her to gratify his lust, and administer to the indulgencies of his appetites. The benevolent design of her Creator has been wholly disregarded. But wherever the Gospel comes, it tames the savage passions of man, and brings them into subjection to the divine will. Encouragement is given to the cultivation of intellect, and all the powers of the soul undergo a purifying process. He is then prepared to allow the other sex her rightful elevation in society. He rejoices to see the fetters which bound her mental powers, broken to pieces, and to afford opportunity to develop all the soft sensibilities of her nature. She is now no longer the servile suppliant, but the affectionate, confiding, beloved com-

panion. In the relations of mother, sister, and wife, she may move with unobtrusive dignity, and exert a most commanding influence.

The elevation which in Christian lands, woman has thus reached, affords her the power to sway the minds, mould the dispositions, and direct the habits of the other sex. This power she necessarily possesses, and whether she wishes it or not, this power will be exercised. Woman loves ardently, she cannot but be loved, and to her guidance, the husband, the brother, the friend, and the child submit. She may be the instrument of making all around her amiable, pious and happy, or petulant, unbelieving and miserable. In this view of the subject, she sustains a fearful responsibility. She should beware lest a creation or nourishment be given to passions which involve their possessor in ruin here and hereafter.

It is our deliberate conviction that females have much to do in improving the morals and manners of society, and in hastening the arrival of that day so devoutly to be desired, when the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord. On them, then, we urgently call, and invite them to appreciate justly, the influence which God has placed in their hands. In ascertaining what that may accomplish with God's blessing, let them become wise and prompt in the execution of their duty. If asked, what can we do? the reply is at hand. In all your intercourse with the other sex, and especially in the presence of children, be examples of prudence, moderation, faith, love to God and benevolence to man. Let your tempers, speech, and conduct, be living epistles to the praise of God's grace, to be seen and read of all men. And beside this indirect influence, exercise a holy ingenuity in works of faith and labors of love. You may find many suitable opportunities of defending the Divine character and service in the social circle. In the sick chamber you may do good. You may mould the plastic dispositions of children—and give instructions to servants. In epistolary correspondence with friends, in the Sabbath-school, in all benevolent plans, in a thousand numberless methods, you may bless your race. Who will try? What female will aim to make her influence beneficially felt?—*Morning Star*.

---

**THE GREAT QUESTION.**—We were recently asked by a ministerial brother "why so fierce for a division of the Church?" We answer briefly: we are *firm* but not *fierce* for a division.

1. Because, we have unquestionable and daily accumulating evidence that the two parties in the Church are alienated from each other beyond the hope of reconciliation. We do not mean that there is a bitter personal hatred, for this we do not believe prevails to any great extent, nay we hope it has not a place in a single bosom. But we mean that the two parties are wholly distinct in their views, sympathies, plans, operations, and that they profess nothing in common which might justly be regarded as a bond of union. While therefore they are kept together, it is by a kind of force; they feel as if it would be more natural to stand apart; their union being only nominal, is fruitful in perpetual and ruinous strifes; and as both parties fortify themselves in their positions, and feel no disposition to conciliate or recede, they should be formally separated.

2. The preceding state of feeling, results from the fact that the two parties maintain different systems of religion, and we are free to say that if one of them holds the true Gospel, the other denies it. It is a

difference about the most essential things, and not about words merely. This being the case they should stand apart.

3. One party by a gradual and constant accession to their number, now constitute at least one half of the Church; and they possess the powerful means of still further increasing their strength; this party is the one which we believe holds fundamental error, and therefore, we feel the necessity, in order that a remnant of the true faith should be saved, for an immediate separation.

4. Peace will be promoted by a separation.

5. The orthodox in the present state of things, are prevented by the opposing party, from enlisting their energies in the prosecution of missions; a separation would remove these obstacles.

6. Many are now necessarily forced to occupy themselves much with controversy, who by a separation, would be permitted to return to the delightful duty of exhorting the impenitent and edifying the faithful.

7. A separation must take place, or the ultimate oppression of the orthodox party will be the result.

In every point of view then, whether of personal comfort; increase of usefulness; or security for the truth, a division should take place. May the Lord in answer to the prayers of his people, direct the mode in which this can be most consistently effected.—*Presbyterian*.

---

PROTESTANTISM AND POPYERY CONTRASTED—Is the question settled Catholicus? Perhaps you yet doubt. Come then, sir, let me cite the *circumstances of this controversy* as proof of the native inherent liberty of Protestantism. You have had some experience here in this Protestant land, the head quarters of Protestantism, and I too have had some experience in Rome, the head quarters of Popery. Come let us compare notes. You are a Papist, you live in a Protestant community.—The overwhelming majority of the millions of this nation are Protestant. You dwell in their midst unmolested, you go in and out at your pleasure, you may proselyte whom you can to your political or religious faith, (provided you touch not their civil rights,) you may establish without licence your journals and publish what you will: you even find Protestant journals freely open for you to discuss and spread your own opinions; you write and debate what you please, (save only, be it remarked, what your own Bishop forbids,) you may even denounce the system which gives you this freedom, and throws the shield of its protection over you; yes, you may attempt to extinguish this Protestant torch of liberty, the *very light by which you write*, and no one even inquires who you are, or opposes to you any other force than the force of argument.

Now, sir, come with me to Rome. At the court of the Pope we shall be likely to know what Popery is. Let a *Protestant* attempt to do any one of these acts *there*, which *you* may freely do *here*, and he would have leave to cross the frontier in 24 hours; if he resides there, he dwells in the midst of spies; all his words, all his actions are watched, and faithfully reported; he feels the government all about him; false keys and domiciliary visits give the police access to his papers; examiners at the post office, to his letters; his least attempt to change the faith of a Roman, is known, reported and rebuked; and think you he could publicly or privately discuss in Rome, whether the Roman faith be favorable to liberty? Liberty! The word uttered loud in the streets would startle the passers-by as if it were a cry from the sepulchre of Brutus beneath their feet; and the dungeons of St. Angelo would pre-

vent the indiscreet utterer of a word so antiquated, from again disturbing the nerves of his Holiness. And if he would write, how shall his opinions be made public? Through what newspaper? Two miserable censor-chained journals, starved spectres from the tomb of the Press, the *Diario di Roma*, and the *Notizie del Giorno*, each the size of a sheet of letter paper, filled with the thousand times repeated details of prosing ceremonies, the movements of his Holiness, and the Cardinals, and meagre gleanings of safe intelligence, are all that Rome can boast; and for public discussion, Rome knows not the words, in politics or religion. True, he may discuss, but it must be a subject of such paramount importance as the rival merits of two opera dancers, or the comparative excellence of last Sunday's bull fight, and that of the Sunday before.—*N. Y. Journal of Commerce.*

**"MAKE OR BREAK."**—*Mr. Editor.*—In reference to the spirit of adventure which is becoming every day more and more rife, it may not be improper to offer an admonitory remark to Christians—as by their profession they are expected to keep a conscience void of offence. Can Christians, then, enter into contracts for the specific performance of certain duties, when they are aware that a thousand contingencies may prevent them from complying with their obligations, and yet be innocent! Can they, for instance, purchase houses, and lands, and stocks, far beyond the amount of their means, and calculate to raise from the sale of this property, at a subsequent day a sum sufficient to cancel their obligations, and leave a surplus for future adventures? But what if, in the meantime, the market value of this property purchased on speculation, and not in the ordinary course of business, should decline—and such cases not unfrequently occur—who is to suffer? Or what if some other contingency should arise, by fire, or by flood, or by the failure of others engaged in similar speculations, who then is the loser when they become bankrupt! The Bank, or the endorser, or the creditor, in such cases, is compelled to receive their assignments, for what they are worth, and, in common parlance, to "pocket the loss."

And upon the supposition that their transactions are perfectly fair, and that they render the creditors, without favor or partiality, a full schedule of their effects, the question arises whether their Christian character does not suffer in consequence of their failure? And another question still more important, whether it does not justly suffer? For was it right for them to tempt Providence as they seem to have done? Was it right for them to keep up the appearance of wealth which was merely fictitious?—to ask for credit when it was to them at all doubtful whether they would be able to meet their contracts, or to impose upon friendship the obligation of paying their debts? There is still another question, whether such adventures do not indicate a worldly spirit—a haste to be rich—which is contrary both to the spirit and precepts of the Gospel? If they succeed in their reckless speculations, it seldom, if ever, renders them more pious, more benevolent and more useful. And if they fail, it almost invariably brings a reproach upon the cause of Christ. True Christian morals point to a steady occupation—an honest calling, even though it yield but little of this world's wealth, and forbid rash speculations, or adventures which may involve others in loss or ruin.—*Charleston Observer.*

ARISTIDES.

**A PRECEDENT.**—In the days of the Apostles, when certain men had crept into the Church unawares, and had begun to propagate their er-

rors, Jude wrote a general Epistle to the Church, in which he said:—"Beloved, when I gave all diligence to write unto you of the common salvation, it was *needful* for me to write unto you and *exhort* you that you should *earnestly contend for the faith*, which was once delivered unto the saints." If Jude had lived in the present age and written thus to the Churches, he would probably have been told, "that contention had better be let alone before it was meddled with."—*Presbyterian*.

---

ART. X. A Query.

To the Editor of the Religious Monitor.

SIR,—I have been raised in the Secession Church and am now not a young member of it; and until very recently, I have never seen the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper administered, without some minister of the word, first, solemnly warning profane, erroneous and hypocritical persons, of the sin and danger of *eating and drinking judgment to themselves*, and formally and authoritatively debarring all such from taking a seat at the communion table. The practice, I see, is enjoined in the Directory of the Westminster Assembly, and so far as I can learn the same practice was observed by most if not all the Reformed churches, before the time of the Westminster Assembly, and for a considerable time since. Willison, Henry and Craighead, in their sacramental treatises, seem to take the propriety of the practice for granted.

But as intimated above, I have observed, on some late occasions of the celebration of that ordinance, that this practice is growing into disuse by *some* ministers, at least, in the Secession church. And instead of the solemn, searching debarrance to which we have been so long accustomed, we have a kind of general address, in which the speaker seems carefully to avoid both the *form* and the *substance* of a debarrance. Now Mr. Editor, I would request either from yourself or some of your correspondents, an answer to the following question.

"Has the practice of the Reformed churches, of debarring the profane and wicked and hypocritical from the Lord's Table, any warrant or authority from the word of God?"

If it has not, those ministers who have discontinued the practice, are not to be censured; but if it has, they should be warned to return to their duty. To my knowledge the omission has grieved some, respecting whom I have no reason to doubt, that their names are written in the Lamb's Book of Life.

A SECEDER.

---

Until a more full answer be furnished to the foregoing Query, we would refer our readers to an article, involving in some respects the same subject, which appeared in the Monitor for *February, 1835*.

Our readers are particularly invited to a careful perusal of the article in the present number, from the *Christian World Unmasked*. Another number will complete our republication of that work.

---

ART. XI. Ecclesiastical.

INSTALLATION.—The Rev. Peter Bullions, was, by authority of the Associate Presbytery of Albany, installed pastor of the Associate congregation in Troy, on the 28th of Dec. ult. Sermon by the Rev. James Martin: Charges by the Rev. John G. Smart.

THE  
RELIGIOUS MONITOR,

AND  
EVANGELICAL REPOSITORY.

---

APRIL, 1837.

---

ART. I. *Wresting the Scriptures.*

MR. EDITOR—I observed in one of your late numbers. an article under the above title; in which the writer, after laying down a method in several heads, touched briefly upon one point only, viz., How ministers wrest the scriptures in the choice of texts, by pretending to draw doctrines out of passages, that do not contain them; in order to show their own acuteness. Now, if it would not be improper, I would take the liberty of using that writer's method as he left it, and adding a few remarks on the same subject.

I would observe then, that there is another way in which ministers sometimes wrest the scriptures in the choice of texts,—selecting those which in some of the words may sound like an allusion to some private circumstance, or sentiment, or other such matter, as they intend to make the subject of discourse, instead of the marrow of the gospel. That the reader may understand me, I give the following instances. In a case where a congregation had built a new house of worship, and in order to stir up delinquents to pay the builder, a meeting was called, which was opened with sermon from Luke vii. 5.—“For he loveth our nation, and he hath built us a synagogue.” From these words the preacher took occasion to speak of the beauty, convenience, &c. of the house in which they were then met. Another, on marrying a lady whose name was Mary, called the attention of his hearers, to what we find recorded in Luke x. 42.—“Mary hath chosen that good part, which shall not be taken away from her.” On another occasion when the female part of a congregation, would show their regard for their pastor by presenting him with a splendid cloak; he on his part discoursed for their edification from these words in Phil. iv. 3.—“Help those women which labored with me in the gospel.”

Now if it be condemnable to hold forth even sound doctrines, from texts where they are not contained, surely this method of punning upon the divine word, is seventy and sevenfold more so. I can scarcely imagine a more shocking profanation of all that is sacred. We can find many instances of such distortions of scripture language in the scoffing ri-

baldry of the avowed infidel; but for a professed servant of Jesus Christ gravely to present himself before a worshipping assembly, on the holy sabbath, and as leading the solemn services of God, for the edification and salvation of souls; and thus to make a burlesque of the divine ordinance of preaching, and a mock of God's word, has in it something of profanity, or hypocrisy, even still more shocking. It is also common for such preachers to be led by their texts, to allude to their own private affairs, to vent their personal animosities, and point out the persons they intend, in language sufficiently plain to be understood, and in a manner calculated to beget in their hearers, their own feelings and sentiments towards them. This has always been a noted practice of the Church of Rome; only, that the priest is generally more open and express in giving names, &c. So we are informed, that Pope Innocent IV. opened the first general council of Lyons, 1245, in person, with a sermon from Lam. i. 12, "Behold and see of there be any sorrow like unto my sorrow." He said, he had five sorrows, the chief one of which was the conduct of the emperor Frederick, whom he accused by name. When John Sobieski, king of Poland, raised the siege of Vienna, 1672, every mouth was filled with his praise, and the preacher in the cathedral gave a discourse from John i. 6, "There was a man sent from God whose name was *John*." In the days of Henry III. of France, one Lincestre, a preacher, told his audience plainly, "That he meant not to preach the gospel to them on that occasion, because it was common, and every one knew it; but he would preach the life, the acts, and the abominable deeds of that perfidious tyrant, Henry de Valois." This is the same kind of preaching, that we now reprobate in protestant ministers, only much more honest; and if such ministers would be equally plain, they would do far less mischief than by their allusions, and equivocal language. But truly a people are to be pitied, who sit under such ministers; and still more, they who can relish such discourses are in a state not to be envied even by papists. They are like persons, who, in the extremities of want, can think a piece of a putrid carcase, the sweetest morsel they ever ate, and that its putrescence is even a real improvement. Let any one for a moment consider what is the nature of that sincere milk of the word which is the nourishment of believers, and he will need no argument to convince him, how miserable such provision is to hungry souls. *Such Preachers* ought to study the apostolical pattern of preaching, 1 Cor. II. 17. "For we are not as many which corrupt the word of God; but as of sincerity, but as of God, in the sight of God speak we in Christ." Again, ch. iv. 2.—"But have renounced the hidden things of dishonesty, not walking in craftiness, nor handling the word of God deceitfully; but by manifestation of the truth commending ourselves to every man's conscience in the sight of God." They ought also to consider the heavy condemnation here implied, against their own practice, of which we now speak. But while it is their practice they cannot be in such a state of mind, as to feel the weight of any such matters.

I would observe another case of wresting the scriptures, viz. by using words or phrases of scripture, in speaking of common matters, under the idea of its being wit, and producing a laugh. Wit is at least, but a sorry gift, and when it is the result of study, it is both contemptible and dangerous to the possessor, and most of all, when it draws its supplies of material from the word of God. He who allows his mind

to be habitually in search of mirth, will readily become incapable of all seriousness, and he who can thus act towards the divine word, we say confidently, is not in the way of receiving any saving benefit from it, either read or heard; because such abuse is utterly incompatible with that reverence that is due to the word, and necessary to the exercise of faith and love, by which it is received into the heart. There are few practices that have a greater tendency to harden the heart. Many who have ventured on it, only occasionally at first, and that not without some checks of conscience for the impiety, have come by the repetition to sit down at last in the seat of the scornful. Let us contrast such a practice, with that of the truly godly, on this point. "I will delight myself in thy commandments which I loved; my hands also will I lift up unto thy commandments which I loved; and I will meditate on thy statutes—O how love I thy law, it is my meditation all the day.—How sweet are thy words to my taste, yea sweeter than honey to my mouth &c." Ps. cxix. Could he who so values the word, make sport with it? It seems impossible. And on the other hand, whatever profession is made, or whatever standing occupied among men by the jester, it is very questionable whether he has ever experienced the divine power of the word, quickening, enlightening, sanctifying, and comforting his soul. "Trembling at the word," is a distinguishing mark of the true worshipper, and it is characteristic of swine to trample the pearl under their feet. Let those therefore who allow themselves in this iniquity, seriously ponder these things. It is a taking of God's name in vain, and "the Lord will not hold him guiltless that taketh his name in vain."

The *second* branch of the subject, was to show how hypocrites wrest the scriptures, by interpreting them so as to speak peace to themselves.

We might here observe, that something of this practice is to be found occasionally with those, who are not to be judged as altogether hypocrites. The charge of wresting the scriptures is incurred, by a gross misapplication of them, though no false meaning be given to the words themselves. The Devil was certainly guilty of this crime, when he quoted that promise to our Lord, (Ps. xci. 11, 12,) "He shall give his angels charge over thee," &c. For though no false meaning was put on the words themselves, nor was he mistaken in applying them to our Lord Jesus, yet, the circumstances under which he quoted them, and the end intended thereby, showed that his quotation was utterly unwarrantable—it was a perversion. Therefore, when passages are applied to cases opposite to their true intent, or for an end inconsistent with the design of all scripture, it is without doubt a wresting of them. So by a like misapplication of scripture example, there is a real wresting of scripture itself.

A man who was a member of a praying society, but in private, frequently guilty of intoxication, was sure at the next meeting, to sing, for the quieting of conscience,

"A good man's footsteps by the Lord are ordered aright,  
And in the way wherein he walks, he greatly doth delight.  
*Altho' he fall yet shall he not be cast down utterly, &c."*

Or these lines,

"The troubles that afflict the just, in number many be,  
But yet at length, out of them all, the Lord doth set him free, &c."

His discourse on such occasions, would be on the imperfections of the saints; that the very best had their falls, and failings. Noah fell, and



Lot fell, and these were two choice examples. David fell also, and Solomon fell, and Peter fell. All which was true, and very instructive, but the design of the remarks was very perverse, viz: to silence fears and remonstrances of conscience, with the secret inference, that notwithstanding his many falls, he was still a saint; and so in fact he fortified himself against being brought to true repentance. For he took to himself a word of comfort when the sharpest reproof belonged to him. Another, who was often complained of, for not adhering to truth, and conscious the complaint was just, had much satisfaction in that prayer of the Psalmist, "Remove from me the way of lying," not as a prayer however, (which would have been very proper,) but as teaching, that the man according to God's own heart, was much addicted to lying, which seemed to be confirmed by the several instances of his equivocating, recorded in the history. This was both wresting the scriptures by putting a false meaning on them, and applying the word to a wrong end, and at the same time slandering the saints, in order to countenance a sinful practice; instead of imitating them in their godly sorrow for sin, confession and forsaking of it.

It is a very common thing for those who are disciplined by the church as scandalous in their lives or doctrine, and obstinately resist the correction, to raise the cry of "persecution," and so claim to themselves the promises and consolations of the word, directed to those, who suffer for righteousness sake. "Blessed are ye when men shall revile you, and persecute you, and say all manner of evil against you, falsely, for my sake; rejoice and be exceeding glad, for great is your reward in heaven, &c." This has been a favorite trick with all the most noted heretics and troublers of the church, from the beginning, as serving the twofold purpose of attracting sympathy, and also searing their own consciences against the force of conviction. And though it is a very ancient practice, it is perhaps as fashionable at this day, as ever; as any one may observe, who is at all acquainted with the existing difficulties in the churches. In such a case the individual with great apparent devotion, and self-approbation, quotes and sings, "Plead, Lord, with those that plead, and fight, with those that fight with me," &c. (Ps. xxxv;) and confidently attributing all proceedings against him to envy and malice, he frequently applies to his own case these words, "How long will ye imagine mischief against a man, ye shall be slain all of you; as a bowing wall shall ye be, and as a tottering fence. They only consult to cast him down from his excellency, they delight in lies," &c. The most prominent subject of discourse also is, that eminent men have always been envied, and suffered from the shafts of malice; so it was with Joseph, so it was with Paul, and above all, so it was with our Lord himself. It is difficult to say which is the leading feature in such conduct, or which is most inimical, the gross self-flattery, to the blinding of conscience, by claiming rank with those undoubtedly righteous; or, the slanderous reproaches on the discipline of Christ's house and those who administer it; or the violent perversion of scripture?

Again, it is a very common thing for loose and careless people, to lay hold on some of the promises of the word, or some doctrine, that seems to include them in a favorable judgment. As, that God is merciful; that "the blood of Jesus, God's son, cleanseth from all sin;" "I, even I, am he that blotteth out your transgressions," &c. All which are certainly most precious grounds of faith, and matter of strong con-

solation to believers; but when men select such passages to themselves; without any concern to find in themselves the evidences that such are really theirs; or any concern to walk suitably to such a character, they are guilty of wresting the scriptures and deceiving their own souls.

Here a question may arise, How may a person know that he is rightly applying to himself a word of scripture, and not wresting it? The answer I shall reserve till a future number. X.

---

## ART. II. *Presbyterians in the seventeenth Century.*

(Concluded from page 462.)

1. Epistolary correspondence of Thomas Scott, D. D.
2. Memoirs of the Lives and writings of Divines convened in the Assembly at Westminster. By James Reid.
3. Life of Cheynel, by Dr. Johnson.

In the present day, when the rights and liberties of man are so well understood, and so generally prized, it might seem superfluous to vindicate the defending of these rights, when they are assailed by arbitrary power. But though many will allow that we may defend our property, our honour, or our civil liberty, yet they do not deem it lawful to defend our religious liberty, though civil liberty cannot be perfect without it. The notion seems to have obtained very generally, that it is wrong to defend ourselves by the sword from religious persecution, in any case. Says the Rev. Andrew Fuller, "I believe it will be found, that when Christians have resorted to the sword, in order to resist persecution for the gospel's sake, as did the Albigenses, the Bohemians, the French Protestants, and some others within the last 600 years, the issue has commonly been, that they have perished by it, that is they have been overcome by their enemies, and exterminated; whereas, in cases where their only weapons have been the blood of the Lamb, and the word of his testimony, loving not their lives unto the death, they have overcome."\*

In noticing these words of Fuller, and this commonly received opinion, Dr. McCrie says—"The facts which have been laid before the reader, [a detail of the circumstances which led to the suppression of the Reformation in Spain] will enable him to judge of the truth of the last part of this assertion. Nor is the first part of this assertion less incorrect and objectionable. The truth is, that the Albigenses, &c. who resisted were not exterminated; while the Italian and Spanish protestants who did not resist, met with that fate. If the defensive wars of the Albigenses were not successful, it ought to be remembered that those of the Protestants in Germany, Switzerland, Scotland, and the low countries were crowned with success. The French Protestants were suppressed, not when they had arms in their hands, but when they were living peaceably under the protection of the public faith pledged to them in edicts which had been repeatedly and solemnly ratified. It is to be hoped that the public mind, much as has been done to mislead it, is not yet prepared for adopting principles which lead to the condemnation of the famous Waldenses and Bohemians, for standing to the de-

---

\* Christian Patriotism, by Andrew Fuller.

fence of their lives when proscribed and violently attacked on account of their religion. They lived during the period of Antichrist's power; and according to the adorable plan of Providence, were allowed to fall a sacrifice to his rage; but while the scriptures foretell this, they mention it to their honour, and not in the way of fixing blame on them: 'It was given unto the breast to make war with the saints, and to overcome them.' Instead of being ranked with those who perished in consequence of their having taken the sword without a just reason, these *Christian Patriots* deserve rather to be numbered with those who 'through faith waxed valiant in fight; turned to flight the armies of the aliens, and others were slain with the sword,' all of whom having obtained a good report through faith, received not the promises, God having provided some better thing for us.'\*

The biographer and son of Dr. Scott, when speaking of seceders exclaims in surprize; "It appears to be a question to these good people, how far the vows of the forefathers are even now binding upon their posterity of the present generation!" And in speaking of the Covenants the Dr. says; "But supposing the oath originally lawful, and that those who actually took it did right under the existing circumstances, and were bound by it: what authority had they to bind it on the consciences of their posterity to the remotest generations, who might be placed in very different circumstances, and perhaps be of very different judgment?" And again, "I am not very partial to oaths at all, except when absolutely necessary. I cannot see how the oaths of our forefathers can bind us; or that we have any right to swear in the name of our posterity." p. 414.

These objections may be very well answered by Mr. Scott himself, in his notes on Deut. xxix, 11, 12. "Ye stand this day all of you before the Lord your God," &c.

"This transaction" says Mr. Scott "might in many ways, in the time and afterwards, benefit both the parents and their offspring, as it had a direct tendency to stir up their parents to pray for their children, and to instruct them as they grew up: and if they came to years of understanding, they were reminded, how solemnly *they* as well as their parents, had entered the covenant with God, it would tend to restrain their passions, awaken their conscience, and excite them personally to seek the covenant blessings, which could only be forfeited by their own wilful sins. Such as were absent, and the unborn children of the whole company to the latest posterity, were included in the covenant: since nothing but apostacy, idolatry, or rejection of the promised Saviour, could cut off the entail of the *national* advantages; and nothing but personal unbelief and disobedience could prevent individuals from sharing in the spiritual blessings."

So clearly could this excellent man see the truth, and so justly did he reason, when not under the influence of prejudice!

But we have dwelt longer on this part of the subject—the defence of the covenants, than we at first intended. Our thoughts recur to the covenanting Presbyterians in the 17th century.

The *Memoirs of the Westminster Divines*, seems to have been undertaken by Mr. Reid, with a very good design, and from worthy motives. His labors have been useful in collecting and embodying so many historical facts, which would otherwise have been less accessible to the generality of readers. He speaks very humbly of his abilities

---

\* *History of the Reformation in Spain*, by Thomas McCrie. D. D.

and talents, and is so very modest that he completely disarms criticism.

"The compiler of these Memoirs, pretends not to rank among such as are conspicuous, and have a respectable place, in the roll of the writers of biographical history; but submits himself and the work to the opinion of the public; requesting only equity in their censure, and impartiality in their judging. The talents of a Plutarch are not implanted in every capacity." p. 29.

With a great deal of labor and industry, some account has been given of the lives and writings of every member who attended the Westminster Assembly. The materials for biography, were often obtained with difficulty—and what is more to be regretted, were frequently very scanty. Biographers have generally, in such cases endeavored to supply the lack of historical facts—by giving their own suppositions, or by treating the reader with a few moral reflections. If we are sometimes disposed to skip over Mr. Reid's reflections and illustrations—yet on the whole we cannot but respect him for his honesty and zeal, in a good cause.

From the nature of this work, it is difficult to make extracts from it; and we have but little space left for giving any. The following passage illustrates the character of an eminent Presbyterian.

"In Cromwell's time Mr. Calamy lived as privately and quietly as he could: but he sometimes opposed the Protector's measures. It is said, in the Life of Oliver Cromwell, as with Dr. Calamy, that Harry Nevill, who was one of the council of State, used to tell the following anecdote upon his own knowledge. 'Cromwell, having a design to set up for himself, and bring the crown upon his own head, sent for some of the chief of the Divines in the city, as if he accounted it a matter of conscience to be determined by their advice. Among these was the leading Mr. Calamy, who very boldly opposed the project of Cromwell's single government, and offered to prove that it was both *unlawful and impracticable*, that one man should assume the government of the country. Cromwell answered readily upon the first head of *unlawful*, and appealed to the safety of the nation being the supreme law. But says he, pray, Mr. Calamy, why is it *impracticable*? He replied; telling him, O 'tis against the voice of the nation; there will be nine in ten against you. Very well replied Cromwell; but what if I should disarm the nine, and put the sword in the tenth man's hand, would not that do the business?' Mr. Calamy readily concurred with the Presbyterian party, in opposing the sectaries in Cromwell's time." p. 175.

Perhaps, next to having received the invaluable treasure of the Westminster standards from the Reformers of this period, posterity are most indebted to them for the care with which they guarded the institutions of learning from vice and profligacy. "The university of Oxford was in the most deplorable condition when it fell into the hands of the Parliament. The two houses appointed seven of their most popular Divines to go to Oxford, with authority to preach in any pulpit in the University for six months, in order to soften the spirits of the people and to give them a better opinion of their cause." p. 230. "While the Reformation was advancing, several improvements were requisite, highly deserving the attention of our reformers, to render the English Universities more capable of answering the noble end of their institution. Disgraceful charges were brought against these Seminaries of learning: and our zealous ancestors consulted both the honor and inter-

est of these venerable foundations, by endeavoring to amend what was amiss in them. Laudable attempts were made to restore the credit of their *Alma Mater*. Learning and piety were now the chief recommendations for offices. Accordingly the utmost exertions were made, that all departments, might be supplied with learned and pious men. The famous Earl of Manchester was appointed to visit the University of Cambridge, in order that he might correct what was wrong in it. Among other things he ejected some heads of Colleges, and made choice of some divines who were then sitting in the Assembly at Westminster, to be masters in their places." P. 107. Mr. Baillie who was then at Westminster says, "When we were going to the rest of the propositions concerning the Presbytery, my Lord Manchester wrote to us from Cambridge, what he had done in the University, how he had ejected for gross scandals, the heads of five Colleges;—and that he had made choice of five of our number, to be masters in their places, Mr. Palmer, Vines, Seaman, Arrowsmith, and our countryman Young, requiring the Assembly's approbation of his choice; which was unanimously given; for they are all very good and able divines."\*

This reformation of the Colleges though a blessing to them and to the public, has yet been severely censured by those who have been opposed to the reformers. The learning, and piety, of the great men who were concerned in this affair, has not saved them from having the most malevolent aspersions cast on them. This however they might well bear, after having been the means of benefitting their country so signally.—"The Lord's day" says Neal, "was observed with uncommon rigor, there were sermons and prayers in all the churches and chapels, both morning and afternoon, vice and profaneness were banished, insomuch that an oath was not to be heard within the walls of the University; and if it may be said without offence, the Colleges never appeared more like nurseries of religion and virtue than at this time." He adds, "I have before me the names of fifty-five persons, who after they had been examined by the Assembly, were put into vacant fellowships in the compass of the year 1644, and within six months more, all the vacancies were in a manner supplied, with men of approved piety and learning. From this time, the University of Cambridge enjoyed a happy tranquility, learning revived, religion and good morals were improved, at a time when the rest of the nation was in blood and confusion. And though this alteration was effected by a mixture of the civil and military power, yet in a little time things reverted to their former channel, and the Statutes of the University were as regularly observed as ever."†

The Westminster divines seem to have been not only the most pious, but the most learned men of the age—and the names of Lightfoot, Arrowsmith, Gataker, Selden [a lay member] and many others, may be compared as equal to the learned of any other age.

We cannot find room to extract but a short passage from these Memoirs, respecting the life of Gataker—It may shew that the reformers were divested of the superstition so common in their days.

"In the evening of his days, when he earnestly desired that repose to which he was very justly entitled, by his unwearied labours, he was most warmly attacked by an active and angry adversary, Mr.

\* Baillie's Letters, Vol. 1. P. 439.

† Neal's Hist. Purit. Vol. iii. chap iii.

William Lilly, the famous astrologer. But Mr. Gataker who possessed all the sacred and profane literature respecting astrology, not only defended himself with great strength of argument, but also very clearly detected all the plausible sophisms which could be urged in support of that pretended science. The ground of this controversy was Mr. Gataker's Annotations upon Jer. x. 2. in which he had with solid sense and sound learning, completely destroyed the credit of that delusive art, by which, in all ages and countries, weak and unstable minds have been much misled. These Annotations roused the whole tribe of astrologers against him, from the highest to the lowest. They were greatly offended and wrote against him without mercy. Mr. Gataker was thus induced to publish, in vindication, both of his Annotations and of himself; which he did in a very satisfactory manner." P. 305.

The following pious little epigram supposed to be his, will be read as a curiosity. It resembles the popular poetry which Mr. Ralph Erskine afterwards composed :

" I thirst for thiriness ; I weep for tears ;  
Well pleased am I to be displeas'd thus :  
The only thing I fear is want of fears ;  
Suspecting I am not suspicious.  
I cannot chuse but live because I die ;  
And when I am not dead how glad am I !  
Yet when I am thus glad for sense of pain,  
And careful am lest I should careless be ;  
Then do I grieve for being glad again,  
And fear lest carelessness take care from me.  
Amid these restless thoughts this rest I find,  
For those who rest not here, there's rest behind." P. 306.

Among those who actively promoted the reformation of religion and learning, Francis Cheynel took a conspicuous part. He was appointed by Parliament, one of the visitors of the University of Oxford—and President of St. John's College. In his life by Dr. Johnson, it is not a little amusing to see the struggle which the Dr. has, between his natural love of truth and his extreme hatred of the Presbyterians. Does he relate any incident in his life? he will not fail to seek some unworthy motive for it, and when he is obliged to praise—he seems to do it most grudgingly. The following is not the best nor the worst that he says of him.

" When the war broke out, Mr. Cheynel, in consequence of his principles declared for the Parliament; and as he appears to have held it as a first principle that all great and noble spirits abhor neutrality, there is no doubt but that he exerted himself to gain proselytes, and to promote the interests of that party which he had thought it his duty to espouse. These endeavors were so much regarded by the Parliament, that having taken the covenant, he was nominated one of the Assembly of Divines, who were to meet at Westminster, for the settlement of the new discipline.

This distinction drew necessarily upon him the hatred of the cavaliers; and his living being not far distant from the King's head quarters, he received a visit from some of the troops, who, as he affirms, plundered his house, and drove him from it. His living, which was I suppose, considered as forfeited by his absence, (though he was not suffered to continue upon it) was given to a clergyman, of whom he says, that he would become a stage, better than a pulpit; a censure which I can neither confute nor admit, because I have not discovered who was his successor. He then retired into Sussex, to exercise his ministry

among his friends, in a place where, as he observes there had been little of the power of religion either known or practised. As no reason can be given why the inhabitants of Sussex should have less knowledge or virtue than those of other places, it may be suspected that he means nothing more than a place where the Presbyterian discipline, or principles had never been received. We now observe that the Methodists, where they scatter their opinions, represent themselves as preaching the gospel to unconverted nations: and enthusiasts of all kinds have been inclined to disguise their particular tenets with pompous appellations, and to imagine themselves the great instruments of salvation; yet it must be confessed that all places are not equally enlightened; that in the most civilized nations there are many corners which may be called barbarous, where neither politeness, nor religion nor the common arts of life, have been yet cultivated; and it is likewise certain that the inhabitants of Sussex have been mentioned as remarkable for brutality.

From Sussex he went often to London, where in 1643, he preached three times before the Parliament; and returning in November to Colchester to keep the monthly fast there, as was his custom, he obtained a convoy of sixteen soldiers whose bravery or good fortune, was such that they faced and put to flight more than two hundred of the King's forces." p. 166.

From the facts reluctantly given by Dr. Johnson, we can easily see that Cheynel, though a thorough Calvinistic Presbyterian, was a great and good man. Indeed we feel little inclination to adopt the Dr's. opinion of any character—since he shews a far more kindly feeling to the author of *Hudibras*, than he does to the author of *Paradise Lost*: and since he could say of such a man as Milton, "such is his malignity, that hell grows darker at his frown." \*

In concluding our remarks on Presbyterians in this part of the 17th century, many reflections crowd upon us which we have not space to indulge in at present. Were we to describe their character in a summary manner, we would say, they were distinguished for one thing—love to *Christ*. They loved his ordinances—were actuated by zeal in an eminent manner for the welfare of his kingdom—and they kept the word of his patience.

Let us endeavor to follow them who through *faith and patience inherit the promises.*

A.

---

### ART. III. *A Comparison of Creeds*

(Continued from page 454.)

The WIRTEMBERG CONFSSION, which in the name of the illustrious D. CHRISTOPHOR, Duke of Wirtemberg, and Count of Montbeliard, was by his legates on the 24th day of January, A. D. 1552, offered the congregation of the council of Trent, has the following—  
 "We confess also this, that it is lawful for the Bishops, with the consent of their own church, to institute the ordination of festival days, and of lectures or discourses for the edification and erudition of

---

\* *Life of Milton*, p. 94, N. Y. edit.

the true faith in Christ. But it is not lawful to obtrude upon the church rites of the ancient law for sacred and divine, by which God may singularly and of itself be worshipped. Nor is it lawful either to renew the ancient rites of the law, or to devise new ones for shadowing forth the truth now revealed and illustrated in the gospel. Such are the lighting up of candles in day light, to signify the light of the gospel, or the using of crucifixes for standards, to signify the victory of Christ upon the cross; of which kind is the universal panoply of the vestments of the mass, which they say do shadow forth the whole passion of Christ. And many others there are of this kind. Much less is it lawful to institute ceremonies or sacred things, by the merits of which sins shall be expiated, and the kingdom of heaven obtained. For concerning that former kind of ceremonies and sacred things, Christ in Isaiah proclaims—'In vain do ye worship me, teaching for doctrines the precepts of men.' And Paul—'Let no one judge you, in food, or in drink, or in respect of a holy day, or of a new moon, and the like.' To these are added the testimony of Augustine, and others, concerning the free observation of such ceremonies. But concerning the latter kind of ceremonies, it is manifest that they are impious observances, and are reproachful to the death and resurrection of Christ, by the merits of which alone, we have the expiation of sins, and the inheritance of eternal life through faith."

The GALLIC CONFESSION of faith was exhibited to Charles IX. king of France, A. D. 1561. We extract what follows:—"We believe it is expedient that those who are elected prefects of any church, should consider among themselves by what method the whole body can most conveniently be governed. In such a manner however that they never decline from that which our Lord Jesus Christ has instituted. Yet this is no impediment but that their may be instituted in each particular place, some things peculiar, according as may appear convenient. Act. xiv. 23. xv. 6, 7, 15, 28. 1 Cor. xiv. 40. 1 Pet. v. But we exclude all human comments, and all laws, which under the pretext of God's worship, are brought in to bind the conscience; and we admit only those which are subservient to the cherishing of concord, and the retaining of every one in due obedience; in which thing we think is to be followed by us, the rule which our Lord Jesus Christ set concerning excommunication, a thing that we approve, and together with its appendages judge to be necessary. Rom. xvi. 17. We believe that to the word are adjoined the sacraments for the cause of more ample confirmation, that is, to be pledges and *tessarar* of the grace of God, by which, aid is afforded ~~our~~ infirm and unpractised faith."

The Gallic churches on the subject of civil government express themselves thus—"We believe that God wills the world to be governed by laws and polity, that there be reins whereby the immoderate lusts of the world may be restrained. And thus he hath constituted, kingdoms, republics, and other species of principality, whether they be obtained by hereditary right, or otherwise. Nor did he constitute this only, but also whatever has relation to the *state of justice*, as it is called, the Author of which demands to be acknowledged. So in like manner he has delivered the sword into the hands of the magistrate, for the purpose of repressing crimes which are committed, not only against the second table, but also against the first. It behoves us therefore, on account of him who is Author of that order, not only to permit them



to bear rule whom he hath set over us, but also finally to render them all honor and reverence, as his legates and ministers, designated by himself to the legitimate and holy office to be by them sustained. Ex. xviii. 20. Mat. xvii. 24. Rom. xiii. 1. 1 Pet. ii. 13. 1 Tim. ii. 2. We affirm therefore that obedience is to be yielded the laws and statutes, tribute is to be paid, and other burdens are to be borne, the yoke of subjection finally is to be submitted to and borne with, even if the magistrates be infidels, provided the supreme empire of God remain entire and unimpaired. Mat. xvii. 24. Act. iv. 17 v. 20. Jude, 8. We do therefore detest all those who cast off governments [repudiate dominations] who bring in a community and confusion of goods, finally who plot to overturn the whole ratio [relation and method] of right."

In a French subscription, which we find to this creed in the Body of Confessions in Latin, it is noted—"This confession of faith of the Reformed churches of the Realm of France drawn up at the first national Synod held at Paris, the 19th May, 1569 [which I take to be a typographical error, it should be 1549] in the reign of Henry II. and afterwards presented to Charles IX, king of France, by the grace of God, d'Paissi the year 1561." This is that Charles, of whom it is noted in the cold style of Chronologers—"His mother Catherine instigating, he sacrifices thirty thousand of the Evangelic, A. D. 1572." See *Megerlinu's Index*.

At a national Synod held at Rochelle, it had been declared by this Synod as representing all the French churches "that they approve and ratify the above written confession in all its chiefs and articles, as being entirely founded on the pure and express word of God. And in testimony of this agreement, it is signed by the *ministers and ancients* deputed from the provinces of the Realm, in the name of the said churches. And there were present at said Synod, held at Rochelle, Jean, by the grace of God, Queen of Navarre, the high and powerful Princes, Henry, Prince, of Navarre, Henry de Bourbon, Prince of Conde, the thrice illustrious Prince Louis, Count of Nassau, &c." This was done the 13th April, "in the year of grace" 1561.

The ENGLISH CONFESSION of faith, which appears in the *Apology for the Church of England* among the works of the great Divine, John Juellius, Bishop of Salisbury, published A. D. 1562, in relation to the Holy scriptures, speaks thus—"Against these neither law nor tradition, nor custom, is to be regarded; not even if Paul himself, or an angel from heaven should come and teach otherwise." But it is afterwards added—"Concerning a multitude of idle ceremonies, we know that Augustine complained heavily in his time. Therefore we have lopped off a great number of them; because we knew men's consciences to be afflicted by them, and the church of God to be burdened. We retain however and cherish, not only those which we know to have been delivered by the Apostles, but also some others, which appear to us possible to be observed without inconvenience to the church. Because we would desire that in the sacred Assembly, as Paul commands, all things be administered decently and in order. But all those [ceremonies] we saw to be either quite superstitious or frigid, or corrupt, or ridiculous, or repugnant to the sacred letters, or even unworthy the character of sober men, we do repudiate without exception. For we were unwilling that the worship of God be any longer contaminated by fooleries of this kind.'

THE THIRTY-NINE ARTICLES were first agreed upon by the Archbishops

and Bishops of both provinces, and the whole clergy in the Synod of London, in the year of our Lord 1562, for removing differences of opinion, and for strengthening the agreement in the true religion.

The VI. Article runs thus—"Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation : so that whatever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man, that it should be believed, as an article of the faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation. In the name of the Holy Scriptures we do understand these canonical books of the Old and New Testaments, of whose authority was never any doubt in the church &c.."

Article xxxiv. "It is not necessary that traditions and ceremonies be, in all places, one, or utterly like; for at all times they have been diverse, and may be changed according to the diversity of countries, times, and men's manners; so that nothing be ordained against God's word. Whosoever, through his private judgment, willingly and purposely doth openly break the traditions and ceremonies of the church, approved by common authority, ought to be rebuked openly (that others may fear to do the like) as he that offendeth against the common order of the Church, and hurteth the authority of the magistrate, and woundeth the consciences of the weak brethren. Every particular or national church hath authority to ordain, change, and abolish ceremonies or rites of the church ordained only by man's authority; so that all things be done to edifying."

The xxxvii. Article, as it appears in the Latin copies of Confessions, may be Anglicized thus—"The royal majesty in this kingdom of England and his other dominions, has the supreme power to which belongs the supreme government of all the estates of this kingdom, whether they be Ecclesiastic or civil, in all causes; and neither is, nor ought to be, subject to any foreign jurisdiction. When we attribute supreme government to his royal majesty, by which titles we understand that the minds of some calumniators are offended, we do not give to our kings, either the administration of the word or sacraments, as the injunctions lately published by our queen Elizabeth, do most openly testify. But that prerogative only, which in the sacred scriptures we see to, have been always by God himself attributed to all pious princes: that is, that they should hold within the bounds of duty, all estates and orders committed to their trust by God, whether they be Ecclesiastic, or civil; and should coerce the contumacious and delinquent with the civil sword. The Roman Pontiff has no jurisdiction in this kingdom of England." In the American version of the English Liturgy, the above Article reads thus—"The power of the civil magistrate extendeth to all men, as well clergy as laity, in all things temporal, but hath no authority in things purely spiritual. And we hold it to be the duty of all men, who are professors of the gospel, to pay respectful obedience to the civil authority, regularly and legitimately constituted."

In the year of our Lord 1536, the HELVETIC CONFESSIO was composed at BASIL in view of an Oecumenical council being shortly to be held for the settling of all disputes in religion. By order of the consuls and senate of Basil, an assembly was held, in which were present "legates of the senatorial order, very grave men, and doctors of theology, and ministers of the churches of Tifusine and Berne. Bullinger, Oswald Myer, and Simon Grynaeus were appointed to draw up a form. The divines of various other churches were present and aided. It was approved by Luther and the churches of Wirtemberg. It was revis-

ed and republished A. D. 1566. It was now sanctioned by the churches of Geneva, of England, Scotland, France, Holland, Poland, Hungary, and many of the churches of Germany. The Helvetic Confession in the Article of the holy scriptures has these words—'Wherefore faith is by hearing and hearing by the word of God. We acknowledge in the mean time that God can illuminate men, even without the external ministry, when and whom he will: this much belongs to his power. But we are speaking of the usual method of instructing men, and of the precept and example delivered us by God.'

Of the ministers of the church the Helvetians say—"Except the minister shall have performed every thing in the manner ordered by the Lord, but shall have over-leaped the boundaries of faith, what he hath done, is certainly by the Lord to be null and void."

In relation to traditions they say—"We repudiate human traditions which, although inscribed with specious titles, as if they were divine and apostolic, delivered *viva voce* by the Apostles, and as it were through the hands of apostolic men to the succeeding bishops of the church, yet compared with the scriptures are discrepant with them, and by this their discrepancy show themselves to be far from being apostolic—The Jews too had anciently their traditions of the elders; but they are heavily rebuked by the Lord, showing that the observation of them is opposed to the law of God, and that God is by them worshipped in vain."

Of holy days, fasts, and distinction of meats, it is said—"Although religion is not tied to any set time, yet it cannot be planted and exercised without a just distinction and ordination of time. Every church therefore chooses for itself a certain time for public prayers, and preaching of the gospel, as well as for the celebration of the sacraments. Yet it is not lawful for any one to tear to pieces this ordination of the church, of his own arbitrary will. And unless just leisure be conceded to the external exercise of religion, men will certainly be drawn off from it by their own businesses. Wherefore we see in the ancient churches, not only that there were certain hours in the week set for assemblies, but also a day itself, the Lord's day, was, from the times of the apostles, consecrated to these [assemblies] and to sacred leisure: which leisure [rest] is also now properly kept for the purpose of worship and charity by our churches. We here give no sanction to the Jewish observations and superstitions. For neither do we believe one day to be more holy than another, nor do we see how that rest, of itself, is approved by God, but even the Lord's day, not a sabbath, we celebrate by a free observation. Besides if the churches according to christian liberty, do religiously celebrate the memory of the Lord's nativity, circumcision, passion and resurrection, His ascension also into heaven, and the mission of the Holy Spirit upon the disciples—we highly approve. But festivals to men or saints instituted, we do not approve. And certainly holy days pertain to the first table of the law and are proper to God only; finally holy days instituted to saints and by us abrogated, have several things absurd, useless, and by no means to be tolerated. In the mean time we confess that not without use, the memory of the saints in its own place and time may be commended to the people in public sacred discourses, and the holy example of the saints be set forth to be imitated by all."

Of rites and ceremonies it is said—"For if the apostles were unwilling to impose on the christian people ceremonies or rites divinely de-

livered; who, pray, of a sound intellect, will obtrude upon them, the new inventions newly invented by men. The more that is added to the heap of rites in the church, the more is there detracted not only from christian liberty, but also from Christ and his faith, whilst most men seek that in those rites, which they ought to seek by faith in Jesus Christ the Son of God only. To the pious therefore a few rites will suffice, moderate simple, and not foreign from the word of God. But if in the churches be found discrepant rites, let no one suppose from this they dissent one from another. Socrates [the historian] says—It would be impossible to number up all the rites of the churches which exist in the several states and regions. No religion keeps the same rites, although it embraces the same doctrine concerning them. For they who hold the same faith dissent among themselves in reference to rites. Thus Socrates. And we at this day having in our churches diverse rites in the celebration of the Lord's supper and in some other things, yet in doctrine and faith do not dissent, nor is the unity and fellowship [society] of our churches cut asunder by this affair. But the churches have always, in rites of this kind, as being means, used a liberty. This we at this day also do."

In reference to the civil magistrate the Confession saith—"Let him therefore hold in his hands the word of God, and let him provide [procure] lest any thing contrary to this be taught, by good laws also composed according to God's word let him rule the people entrusted him by God and hold them within the bounds of discipline, duty, and obedience; let him exercise judgment in judging justly; let him not respect persons or receive rewards; let him defend the widows, the orphans, and the afflicted; the unjust, impostors, and violent men let him coerce and so also cut off. For neither hath he received the sword in vain. Let him therefore draw the sword of God against all evil-doers, seditious persons, robbers and homicides, oppressors, blasphemers, persons perjured, and against all those whom God has commanded to punish and even to slay. Let him coerce also heretics (who are truly heretics) incorrigible, not ceasing to blaspheme the majesty of God, and to disturb, and so to destroy the church of God."

(To be Continued.)

---

#### ART IV. *A Dialogue between two Evil Spirits respecting Popery.*

This is the first of a series of Dialogues by the Rev. John McGowan, one of the London Ministers, designed to exhibit the concern which fallen angels have in the actions of men. The Introduction is of course adapted to the whole of the series, which is not necessary to enable the reader to understand the subject of this, and I shall therefore pass it over. Although this first dialogue is not entirely respecting Popery, it is chiefly so, and the other matters hinted at are not unsuitable for general reading. I shall therefore give it entire. None will suppose that the author really overheard this conversation by the Devils. Yet I am disposed to think that few who understand the nature of Popery will have any doubt of its being perfectly congenial with their views and designs.

By the name *Avaro* he means the Devil who influences to Covetousness, and by *Fastosus*, the one who fosters Pride. EGO.

*Avaro.* So ho: *Fastosus*, whither so fast at this time of the morning, be not in such a hurry, but let a kindred Devil exchange a few words with you. Pray how do you do Uncle? *Fastosus.* Hah! my nephew *Avaro*.—I little thought of finding you in the vale at present. But I am glad to see you. Pray how do you do? *Avaro.* I thank you sir, I am pretty well, only tired with much exercise.—But pray where were you going in such a hurry? When I called to you, you seemed to outfly the wind! *Fast.* Indeed *Avaro* I should not be willing to discover my concerns to every inquirer; but I condescend to make free with you on account of our near kindred; and knowing you to be a true son of Beelzebub, I can trust you with any secret. As for my present hurry, the occasion of it is this. *The Right honourable Madame de la Coquette* having an inclination to a suit of some fashion never before invented, was thrown into a violent fever through the dullness of the mantua-makers who could devise no *cut* suitable to her lady-ship's desire. Finding her life to be in danger unless she was gratified, I was last night despatched to Hell to procure a new pattern from the best artists there; and having got it I am going post to France to assist my Lady's mantua-maker in cutting and finishing it; which done, I suppose I shall have a trip to London, to accommodate the Countess of Prude! and with a suit against the next court day.—*Avaro.* What! The courtly *Fastosus* become mantua-maker! I should never have thought of such an employment for my part. You have now descended low indeed Uncle! *Fast.* Indeed your ignorance *Avaro* almost provokes me to be angry with you; but you need not be so much surprised at my concerns with the mantua-makers; for I assure you that I am so much admired for my skill in dress by both sexes of the human race, that there is scarcely a suit of clothes made either for man or woman without my direction. Nor shall you find a *Peruke* maker hardy enough to venture a wig on the block ere he has had my opinion of it. In short, Cousin, there is very little done, and in dress there is nothing done in high life or low, but I have a hand in it. *Avaro.* If I have offended my honoured Uncle, I humbly beg your pardon; I assure you I said nothing out of disrespect to you. We all know that your spirit is princely, your monarchy great, and your dominion extensive; but indeed I never thought of your being conversant with taylor, barbers, and mantua-makers. *Fast.* Nay, my nephew I am not angry, nevertheless, you ought to revere me as your elder and better, and not take upon you to call in question the truth of what I say. As for the barbers, they are a set of transformists established wholly by my dexterity. And but for my sovereignty over man, these transformations had never been introduced. Now the transforming trade goes on so successfully, that there is reason to hope very many will be at last transformed into the likeness and nature of our sable fraternity. *Avaro.* Pray, Uncle, be not angry with me if I speak not altogether as you would have me, for you know I never had any inclination to learning and politeness; and I cannot help expressing my wonder at some things. Besides I am amazed to see you look so thin; why you look like a skeleton? What have you been doing, or where have you been? By your looks you might have travelled bare-footed to the holy land, or crept on your hands and feet to *Medina*, and

wept forty days by the Tomb of our dear friend Mahomet. You have not been on Pilgrimage sure! *Fast.* I thought from what I said you might have known that I have not been on Pilgrimage very lately: though I assure you I have often travelled to Jerusalem and to Mecca as a guide to those holy Pilgrims. There is not one of all the bare legged travellers who will stir a foot from home, till their good friend Fastosus is equiped in Palmerian habiliments to press forward in the van as their Protector. Nor are these Pilgrims my only vassals; for the superstitious of all denominations have with one consent devoted themselves to me. *Avaro.* Well but, Uncle, I am sure they worship me with as sincere regard as they do you. And I either attend them in person, or pour my influences upon every one of them in all their religious journeys to Jerusalem, Mecca, or elsewhere. *Fast.* It may be so, *Avaro*, but their prostitution to Covetousness, hinders not their devotion to Pride; for I have conducted many of this fraternity to the supposed sepulchre of Jesus of Nazareth who in their own opinion were made so holy thereby that when they returned to their native country, they thought the earth itself unworthy to bear the pressure of a foot which had trod the threshold of the adored sepulchre. These religious adventurers, (especially if they obtain some precious relics, of which there are great store in Palestine) generally lift them so far above their fellow creatures that thence forward they can hold no intercourse with the common people, lest their supposed fair garments should be polluted with worldly filthiness. Nor is it uncommon for these fantastical Devotees to imagine that by their journey to Judea they have gained considerable above the price of Heaven. So that when they come to die they have holiness sufficient for themselves, and a handsome legacy to bequeath as an help out to some poor brother who loves home better than the holy Land. *Avaro.* Ay, *Fastosus*, but then you may thank my brother Falax and me for your Jerusalem journeys. None of them would have been instituted but through falsehood, deceit, and covetousness. And I really think we did excellent service to the great Beelzebub, and the sublime Porte of Hell in imposing that cheat upon mankind. Though by the way one should wonder that the reasonable mind should be so easily deceived, seeing there is nothing in any of these pilgrimages that has so much as the appearance of Religion. Often have I laughed in my sleeve, to see the foolish pilgrims with holy awe and reverence approach a log of rotten wood, fully believing it to be part of the cross on which Immanuel was crucified. Oh! how have I seen them congratulate themselves on their supposed happiness, if by any means they had obtained a diminutive chip of an old gate post from the hand of a venerable Priest with his holy word upon it, that it was part of the cross! And to speak the truth which you know I am not very fond of, these reverend gentlemen have words and wood equally plenty, for when one log is sold off, they immediately replace it with another, so that this market will not stop for want of merchandize, while there is a tree left in the forest of Lebanon. I would not on any account that the world should know that the traffic in relics is all a cheat, by the help whereof my dear children the Jerusalem Priests get more money for chips of rotten wood, than the greatest merchant in Norway gets for his masts and yards. *Fast.* By what you say, and I own it to be right, cousin, you and I must share the persons and divide the spoil betwixt us on the day of reckoning. You and cousin Falax have laid the snare very craftily, and I by my

haughty influences drive the fools to it. Good Avaro, your game would not go well without my assistance; and while you and I continue to play into each other's hand, we can readily bring the two fools to meet, each deceiving and being deceived.—I mean we can bring the covetous fool and the credulous fool together. The credulous deceives the covetous fool with his money, and the covetous deceives the credulous fool with his rotten wood. Dear Avaro, our whole work goes forward apace, and we shall have them both at last. *Avaro.* No doubt of it, *Fastosus*; for both the covetous and over credulous are ours by common consent. Our game could not well go better than it does at present, for all ranks and degrees of people are subjected to our potent sway. No doubt but you have heard of that noble piece of architecture called the tripple crown, which I and my brother Falax made for our very worthy friend and stedfast ally the Pope of Rome. *Fast.* Heard of it! surely I have; was not I the principal person concerned in the work? But, Avaro, you have an ugly way of denying people the due honours of their labour. But for me his holiness would never have thought of such an invention. And as I had the principal hand in it, I aver that the best mathematician in Hell could not have invented a more excellent piece. I have thought ever since that the artful Falax acted his part with as much dexterity in the formation of that capital ornament, as when he and we assisted our venerable friend Mahomet in composing his Alcoran. But the chief beauty of it was to see our hoary friend the Pope with greater confidence than if he had been one of ourselves, exalt his papal chair above all that is called God. So that now in the sense of the Romish Impostor, saving and damning depend no longer on the justice and mercy of the Eternal, but upon the will of him who fills the infallible chair. Were we any thing but devils, whose hatred to truth is implacable, it would have grieved us to see how she sighed and sobbed, as if her heart would break, when the Impostor assumed the character of Infallibility. She knocked with violence at the gate of the Bishop's palace, but there was no admission for her there, she begged and prayed that the inferior ranks of the reverend clergy would receive her; but not one of them would suffer her to come under their roof. So that the poor heaven born Lady swooned in the streets, and there was none to assist her. Her eyes become as fountains of briny tears, trickling down her radiant cheeks. Her locks was dishevelled, and her apparel hung dangling around her. In this mournful plight she went through all the streets of the mystic Babylon, uttering her lamentation in every public place, and every concourse of the people. But as in former times she had piped to them, and none of the worshippers of the beast would dance; so now she mourned to them but none of them would lament. She stretched forth her hands all the day long, but none of them would attend to her; the venerable pope, father of the world, having published a decree, that none of them should suffer her under their roof, nor administer the least comfort to her in her calamity, under pain of the rack, the gibbet, the wheel, the fire, and saggot. Yea more, when his Holiness saw the importunity of divine truth and perceived that she would be a perpetual thorn in his side, if not timely and wisely prevented by forcing her out of the world, he clad himself in Vulcanian armour, sought for her in every corner of Babylon, when he met with her, he launched his fatal spear with papal force against her, that wounding her so deeply she fainted and fell to the ground, and no doubt had died had she not been immortal. When

the most holy bishop had thus deprest her, he cried out in devilish triumph, "*I am the Successor of Peter—the Vicar of Christ—the Pillar of Truth—the Porter of Heaven—and the Supreme Head of the Church.*", At which truth entirely disappeared, and to this day has not been suffered to set one foot within the limits of the Papacy. *Avaro.* It was a noble enterprise: nothing could exceed it. I am persuaded that the man who was in-dwelt by our brother Legion, and resided among the tombs, was never capable of coming so near to us devils in cruelty, deceit, and falsehood as that same venerable man, his infallible Holiness, hath upon every occasion. *Fast.* Indeed, *Avaro*, Legion though a many viced devil, is but a fool when compared to his Holiness; but it is highly necessary that he should be well qualified in devilism, seeing he is appointed Beelzebub's great vicegerent in the christian world. *Avaro.* Great are the abilities requisite for such a station, and his Holiness possesseth them liberally. Did you ever hear, *Fastosus*, the manner in which our Italian success was received by Beelzebub the great, and his infernal nobility? *Fast.* I suppose I have, but I have so many things to think of, that at present it has escaped my memory, therefore if you remember it, I shall be obliged to you for the recital. *Avaro.* With all my heart. I assure you it is well worth your hearing, for thereby it appeared that his Infernal majesty had the deepest sense of our services, and conceived the strongest hope of the increase of his kingdom from the alliance formed between the Sublime Port of Hell, and the apostolic chair at Rome. As soon as swift-winged Fame arrived at the gate, known by the name of earth-gate, she knocked violently, as you know is customary with her upon any emergent occasion. Our friend Cerberus, the Porter, no sooner saw that it was fame, but he immediately sent a messenger to court to inform his majesty and peers that the embassadress fame, had arrived. In shorter time than a Lawyer could frame a lie, Hell was all in an uproar, every inhabitant big with expectation of some important news from our friends on earth, fifty of the nobility were despatched from Court to congratulate fame on her arrival, and to conduct her in state to the court end of the city. The mighty Beelzebub ascended the flaming throne to receive the embassadress with imperial grandeur, and as soon as arrived, she was introduced to his sublime presence by Lucifer, prime minister of State, and in full court related all that had passed concerning the change at Rome in the system of religion, which desirable news was received with all the demonstrations of joy, damned spirits are capable of. Fame, having finished her relation, the mighty Prince who sat on the stupendous throne arrayed in all the majesty becoming his high station, lifted his warlike arm, waved the imperial sceptre for audience, and thus addressed his courtiers, his eyes blazing as burning furnaces while he spake.

"My Lords, my brethren in sovereignty and sharers of my glory; from the just sense I have of your steady attachment to my interest and government, as hath always appeared from your unwearied study, as far as possible, to destroy the creatures of our arch-enemy, whom, constrained, we call the Almighty, and promoting to the utmost our interest among mankind. From such considerations, I cannot forbear congratulating your highnesses, on the happy turn our affairs on earth have taken by the indefatigable pains and vigilant endeavors of our worthy friends and genuine descendants, *Fastosus*, *Avaro*, *Falax*, &c, &c, as appears by the report you have just now heard. from the mouth



of our swift winged embassadress, fame. By the industry of those worthy spirits, worms of the Earth are wrought up to such a degree of pride and self conceit as to undertake enterprises, that we, who are of angelic race could not accomplish, yea, and even to assume prerogatives which never came into our minds. My noble lords, there is reason to believe that this revolution will prove a leading step to a very plentiful harvest. I signify it therefore as my will and pleasure, that your highnesses take special care that the lodgings at the court end of the city are kept in due repair, as henceforth we may expect at every term numerous shoals of Popish priests of all ranks, to take up their residence with us; and you may be sure they will take it very ill if they are not accommodated according to their quality. I think my lords it is worthy of observation that all the missionaries we ever despatched among the heathen, could not prevail upon poor pagan priests to aspire to that degree of impiety which the pope hath now assumed. I hope my lords, that truth and holiness are in a fair way of being banished from the earth; for I am persuaded, that universal Father, his Cardinals Legates and Bishops, will exert all their influence to promote our interest in the suppression of our enemies." Having said this, a flaming billow rolled over the imperial seat, and so stunned the good old prince that he could speak no more for a season. *Fust.* All those things I well remember now you have mentioned them. But I want to know what you have got in that leather bag. You are not become nailer sure? *Avaro.* This bag Sir, contains a thousand pounds which a certain lawyer, a dear child of mine, wants to have deposited in some place of security, as he has not at present an opportunity of putting it out to generate, an increasing faculty with which all his other cash is endowed. This same gentleman is a person of great worth, ready to assist the rich and great, provided always that his good deeds are handsomely rewarded. But so cautious and prudent is he, that he utterly abhors parting with even so small a pittance as a guinea to relieve a poor distressed tradesman; and indeed for this very sufficient reason, that he cannot in such a case obtain land security for his money, so that if the poor man is ever so honest and industrious, he must even reconcile his thoughts to a dungeon, or seek relief from another quarter, for our worthy lawyer would part with no money to relieve him from it. His present fear is lest any of his poor neighbors knowing that he has plenty of money by him, should by their pressing solicitations over persuade him to part with a little of it to help them in their distresses; for he like many other honest men is determined to keep what he has got, if one half of the parish should die for want of bread. *Fust.* By your description of the worthy lawyer, I may expect his children as my pupils after his decease. I warrant me, *Avaro*, before their father is half consumed by the worms, I shall have them bowing and cringing to me as their God. I have remarked for some thousands of years, that when the parents have worshipped the God, *Avaro*, by giving themselves up to covetousness, for the most part after their decease, the children have made choice of me, and our cousin Profanity as their patrons. Sure if covetous parents knew what course their children would follow when their heads are laid low in the grave, and their souls still lower in Hell, they would quarrel with their God, *Avaro*, or die with grief on the prospect. *Avaro.* Ay, Uncle, but there is not one of all my numerous disciples who knows me by my proper name, and I am by far too subtle for them to find out the cheat. My English vassals for instance,

commonly worship me under the false names, Industry, Frugality, Prudence, Laudible care, but there is not one of them who can be prevailed on to believe himself a worshipper of the Devil, Avaro, which is you know my true and proper name. *Fast.* Nothing equals our success, for you damn the parents by covetousness, and we damn the children by pride and profanity. Good Avaro, we have them hip and thigh. It is but few of all the mundane race that we lose, and those also we should have if they were not forcibly taken away from us; but this is one comfort, that if we must have the mortification of seeing any of the human race get safe to heaven, we have also the pleasure of disturbing and distracting their minds on their journey, and many of them we bring to the stake, or the gibbet, under the direction of our good friend Crudelis, who presides over those hells upon earth, by the name of the holy Inquisition. *Avaro.* Hells did you say? Right, hells indeed! one holy Inquisitor goes beyond a hundred of our fraternity in the art of cruelty, which you know is the first of the learned sciences at Rome. Such wonderful inventions for torturing, one would have thought could never have been contrived. What ingenuity does the rack display! how excellently formed for exquisite torture! What an apt resemblance of the Infernal furnace is the dry-pan! A contrivance worthy of the most skillful of the Beelzebubian artists. But their watery torment, the gag and the pitcher, is what raises them most in my esteem. Almost every block-head hath some notion of a hell of fire; but it is peculiar to the skill of an holy inquisitor to contrive an hell of water. In this, Fastosus, we must all knock under to them, for indeed they are our betters. And to enhance their merit, their torments are inflicted upon the unhappy wretches who fall into their hands under a show of the greatest sanctity towards God, and pity to the unhappy victim of their cruelty. And so very strictly do they and their assisting familiars observe the rules of inviolable secrecy, that the world can never know the hundredth part of their villany. *Fast.* Secrecy is indispensably necessary to a people so much devoted to our interest, as the worthy inquisitors and the rest of the Roman clergy are. Were it known to the world, what methods they take to aggrandize themselves, and support the papal Hierarchy, the cheat would be discovered, the fabric would fall to the ground, the craft by which they have their wealth would soon be at an end, and their reverences would be brought in to contempt. Certainly great Beelzebub will deal gratefully with the Holy Father at Rome, and his Cardinals, Inquisitors, and Bishops, when they arrive in Hell. For my own part I stedfastly believe that if our good friends the Pope and Inquisitors are not served below their quality, they will be put in possession of the seats on the right hand of his Majesty's throne, as our friend Mahomet and his musties were in those on the left. And when their extraordinary merit is considered our infernal nobility will have no need to grumble at their advancement; for nothing less can be deemed equal to their uncommon merit and usefulness in confirming our dominion over mankind. And so fervently have they our interest at heart, that it would be very extraordinary indeed, if any of them should be lost and fall short of our dreary abode. *Avaro.* The basest ingratitude to use them otherwise, Fastosus: for my own part I shall always give place to a pope or inquisitor, and I think it is the duty of all our sable fraternity so to do, for when their inferior species is considered, it will appear that they not only vie with, but even exceed the most dexterious among us in many things. *Fast.* I am thinking,

Avaro, of the easy station you have got in comparison of mine. You are concerned with but a few, I am concerned with every one. You chiefly serve the higher ranks of people; but I am hackneyed night and day by all sorts of men, from his holiness the pope, to the hermit in his cell, from the queen upon the throne, to Bridget the farmer's maid. But was it not that I find my account in it, and by that means am adored as a divinity, my princely mind would never submit to such constant drudgery. *Avuro.* Good Fastosus, I speak it with reverence, but you are exceedingly mistaken in my business. I assure you it increaseth upon my hands every day; and requires very constant application, insomuch that for twelve years I have not had time to close my eyes for one refreshing nap. Ah! uncle I am concerned with, and for many, and with none more than the sons of the mystic whore. This old bawd with the scarlet gown hath many children, who swarm as locusts along the face of many European countries, and eat up the good of the land before them. And there is not one amongst them who knows how to spend a day without my company. When I would gladly lay me down for a little rest, one or other of them conjures me up to enquire after pay for this funeral mass, that dispensation, or t'other pardon, for you may know that with them there is nothing done without ready cash; for they never give credit. *Fust.* That old proverb "money answereth all things," seems well adapted to the tenets of your disciples, Avaro. *Avuro.* Wonderfully adapted, Sir! wonderfully adapted! for money forwards their devotion vastly, and helps them strangely on in their way to heaven. Dear children of mine, I own them to be! For notwithstanding of their pretended love to devotion, and the souls of their fellow creatures, if a poor man travelling from earth to heaven should happen to be arrested by any of the officers of purgatory (who make it their business to way-lay travellers) and be turned over to the tormentors, if such a man has not left a sufficient sum for purgatorial masses, and no well disposed lay-man is found to supply the deficient assets of the prisoner, he may lie if it be possible till he is burnt to tinder, ere any person of the convent will put one hand to help him out of those dreary flames. But on the other hand, if a sufficient sum is left for masses to be said to the lady of Loretto, St. Domini, St. Denis, or any other eloquent saint, all the parsons will apply as cheerfully as young dromedaries, and put their shoulders to the work like so many bulls in a yoke, till they have cleared him of his prison. You may always be sure that with them, according to a well known proverb, "It is money that makes the mare to go." *Fust.* I pray you, Avaro, where does this same Purgatory stand? I have often heard of it, but never could meet with it either in this, or the other world, notwithstanding I have sought it with care. *Avuro.* You have sought for it in the wrong place, Uncle; you should have ransacked the brains of the pope and his clergy; for there and no where else the chimera is to be found. It is only a scheme to get money that I contrived for them, and hitherto it has answered our highest expectations, for by this craft the parsons have great emolument. *Fust.* This I do know that nothing is more attractive of the attention of their reverences than brilliant Gold, for the sake of which, systems the most absurd are imposed upon mankind with the sanction of priestly authority. Indeed, it is presumed that these holy men will authorise nothing but what is lucrative. O! the wonderful trade of Priestcraft. Indeed, Avaro, I begin to think you a Devil of good abilities, and an honour to the race of Beelzebub. *Avuro.*

I am highly obliged to you for your good opinion, Sir, and assure you that were you acquaint with the system of our government, I should go near to rivet myself in your esteem, an honour which I much desire, and in order to which I shall relate a certain affair which wonderfully displays the genius of Priest-craft, and gives the most just idea of the doctrine of Purgatory. *Fast.* I shall be glad to hear it another time Cousin; but for the present I must be gone to forward my lady's robes; for the mantua-maker dare not touch them till my arrival at Paris. Exactly four hours hence, I shall give you the meeting. *Avaro.* I shall think of the appointment, Uncle. Success to your enterprise.

---

#### ART. V. *The Christian World Unmasked.*

(Concluded from page 489.)

Doctor, I am told by the vicar, that his brethren drop the doctrine of justification by faith *alone*, because it seems unfriendly to morality. And he says, the *Whole Duty of Man* was sent abroad, as a public bell-man, to cry the doctrine down. The clergy now are straining all their nerves, in support of common duties; and seem so fervent in this matter, that a jack-daw dares not perch upon the steeple, while they are shouting in the pulpit for morality. They give a lash sometimes at fornication, when the 'squire keeps from church; but do exclaim against all thieving and hedge-breaking most delightfully. Indeed their lungs have been so often strained, by uncommon zeal for morality, that they are forced to wind up matters very speedily. Many cannot roar above ten minutes at a preaching, for want of breath; and others are constrained to keep a journeyman to shout for them.

Sir, morality, like beauty, is a charming object; but, like beauty, often is made up with paint. Such seems morality at present; a pretty play-thing, when dandled on a consecrated cushion, or chanted in a modern midnight conversation; but it will not keep men from an ale-house, nor from a bawdy-house. The people, who are chiefly loaded with morality, are the booksellers; and they have got a shop full, but are sick of the commodity, and long to part with it. Though gilt and lettered on the back, it moulds upon a shelf, like any Bible: and Mr. Hales's tract on salvation, will post away through ten editions, before a modest essay on morality can creep through one.

The *Whole Duty of Man* was sent abroad with a good intent, but has failed of its purpose, as all such teaching ever will. Morality has not thriven since its publication; and never can thrive, unless grounded *wholly* upon grace. The heathens, for want of this foundation, could do nothing. They spoke some noble truths, but spoke to men with withered limbs and loathing appetites. They were like way-posts, which shew a road, but cannot help a cripple forwards; and many of them preached brisker morals than are often taught by their modern friends. In their way they were skilful fishermen, but fished without the gospel-bait, and could catch no fry. And after they had toiled long in vain, we take up their angle-rods, and dream of more success, though not possessed of half their skill.

God has shewn, how little human wit and strength can do, to compass reformation. Reason has explored the moral path, planted it with roses, and fenced it round with motives, but all in vain. Nature still

recoils; no motives drawn from Plato's works, nor yet from Jesus' gospel, will of *themselves* suffice: no cords will bind the heart to God and duty, but the cord of grace.

*Man is conceived and born in sin; what can he do? Nature is sunk and fallen; and nature's creed is this, Video meliora proboque, deteriora sequor, I see and I approve the better path, but take the worse.* Nature may be *over-ruled* for a time by violent restraints; but nature must be *changed*, or nothing yet is done. The tree must first be made good, before the fruit is good. A filthy current may be stopped; but the brook is filthy still, though it cease to flow. The course of nature may be checked by some human dam; yet opposition makes the current rise, and it will either burst the dam, or break out other ways. Restrained sensuality oft takes a miser's car, or struts in pharisiac pride. Nothing but the salt of grace can heal the swampy ground of nature; as Elisha's salt, a type of grace, healed the naughty waters, and the barren grounds of Jericho. 2 Kings ii. 20, 21.

The law is not given to make a sinner *righteous*. Through the *weakness of his flesh*, it has no power to justify or sanctify him. It shews the path of duty, but neither lends a crutch to lame travellers, nor gives an heavenly title unto sinners. Paul knew the use of the law, and declares, *it was added, because of transgressions*, Gal. iii. 19. It was *added* to the promise made to Abraham, which contained the covenant of grace, and was added *because of transgressions*, that men might know what heinous things they were.

Again, *The law entered, that the offence might abound*. Rom. v. 20. The offence (τὸ παράπτωμα, the fall) of Adam, mentioned in *ver. 15*, was a sin with penalty of death: but no such penalty had been annexed to any sin, besides *murder*, from Adam unto Moses. Men knew themselves to be offenders, but did not know that death was the penalty of each offence, till the law pronounced *a curse on every one, who continued not in all things*. Deut. xxvii. 26,—Gal. iii. 10. 'Then they saw that death was the wages of every sin. Thus, when the law entered, (τὸ παράπτωμα) the offence, with penalty of death, did abound; and the law entered, that such offence *might* abound, to certify sinners of their *lost* condition, and their utter need of a Saviour. Hence we read, *The law worketh wrath*, not our justification, but our condemnation: Rom. iv. 15. and *by the law is the knowledge of sin*: Rom. iii. 20. The law, by its penalty, discovers my *condemned state*; and by its spirituality, discloses my *corrupted heart*. Therefore Paul says, *I through the law, am dead to the law*; Gal. ii. 19, dead to all expectation from it, either to justify my person, or to sanctify my nature. And his conclusion is this, *Wherefore the law is our schoolmaster, to bring us unto Christ, that we might be justified by faith*. Gal. iii. 24. The law sends us unto Jesus, not with recommendations in our hand, but with condemnations in our bosom; and is meant to empty us of every fancied legal hope, arising from our own obedience; and force the heart to seek salvation *wholly* by grace, through faith.

When the law has done this office, and sent a sinner, wounded, poor and naked, to the good Samaritan, then it becomes *a rule of life* in the Mediator's hand. And Jesus having justified a sinner by his blood and righteousness, sanctifies him by his word and Spirit. The work belongs to Christ *alone*, as Saviour; and a believer's business is to live upon him wholly, calling on him fervently, trusting in him steadfastly, and, by a life of faith, to receive from his fulness a supply for every

want. No real holiness of heart, nor true morality in life, can be had, but through him, and by faith in him. He is the true vine, producing every branch, with all its leaves and grapes; and is the *green fir-tree*, from whom our fruit is found. Hosea xiv. 8.

For a century past, the noble building of God's grace has been shored up with legal buttresses: Moses is called in hastily to underprop his master Jesus: *Galatian* anvils are bought up, and gospel doctrines hammered thin, and beaten out upon them: Jesus can behold no cast of grace in his own gospel: and Paul, were he alive, would cry aloud, *Who has bewitched you O foolish Britons?*

Now, Sir, I ask, what good effects have been produced by this modern gospel? A century is time sufficient, to give us full experience of it. Do we find more praying families, more crowded churches, and more empty jails? Are ropes pulled oftener in a chiming steeple, and stretched seldomer at Tyburn? Can we travel roads with more safety, and sleep with fewer bolts upon our doors? Are play-houses, gaming-houses, and bawdy-houses, become exceeding rare; and their owners grown very meagre, quite abashed at their occupation? Have we more preaching bishops and pains-taking clergy, more staunch patriots and upright lawyers, more gentle masters and faithful servants, and more fair dealing practised in buying and selling?

Alas, Sir, you know, and I know the contrary. Adultery and whoredom, gluttony and drunkenness, cursing and swearing, gaming and gambling, diversion and dissipation, are become so common, as to make the fashion: and sodomy, the last scum of a filthy land, is bubbling in the pot apace, boiling over. Wickedness has found a whore's forehead; it wears no mask, and fears no censure. Ever since the new-gospel shewed its face, profaneness and infidelity have been pouring in, like a sweeping rain, and overflowing the land. God has lost his worship, Christ has lost his office, scripture lost its credit, and morality has lost its carcass. It is become a pageant, held up in a pulpit, but seldom noticed out of it: and as for holiness, it is the land's abhorrence. The Christian title, *saint*, not applied in scripture to apostles, but to all believing churches, is become a name exceeding fulsome. A Christian nose will wind up, like a bottle-screw, at the mention of it; and Esau cannot vomit out his spleen on Jacob more effectually, than to cry, "You saint."

Sir, these things are notorious; and a judicial consequence of departing from the scripture doctrines. God will bear no witness to any doctrines but his own. All endeavors for a reformation will be blasted, when they build on human merit, will, and power; and are not grounded *wholly* on the grace of Christ. A legion of discourses have been published on morality, and a little host of volumes have appeared against infidelity; yet immorality and infidelity are making rapid progress through the land. And how can this be well accounted for, if the modern gospel is the gospel of Christ Jesus?

Where the doctrines of grace are truly preached, a spirit of grace will be poured forth to make the word effectual. For thus the Lord speaketh, *As the rain cometh down from heaven, and watereth the earth, and maketh it bring forth and bud; so shall my word be, it shall not return unto me void, but shall prosper.* Isa. lv. 10, 11. And again, *If the prophets had caused my people to hear MY WORDS, (had truly delivered my doctrine) then they should have turned the people from their evil way, and from the evil of their doings.* Jer. xxiii. 22. And this

was spoken also of such prophets, *as ran before they were sent*, (verse 21.) had no commission from the Lord. Yet of these the Lord says, *If they had caused the people to hear my words, they should have turned them from their evil ways.* Though they were interlopers, or even hypocrites, yet like Elijah's raven, they should have carried meat in their mouth to feed another, which they tasted not themselves. Judas, though himself a devil, casteth devils out of others, when he went in Christ's name, and preached Christ's word.

Now, Sir, the case standeth thus; God has promised a reformation, when his word is truly preached; but no reformation is produced by the modern preaching; things are visibly declining from bad to worse. Therefore we must conclude, either the word of a faithful God is fallen to the ground, or his word has not been preached faithfully. If God is not in the blame, preachers are and must be so.

For a long season, the good old church doctrines have been much forsaken; by some they are derided, and by many are deserted. Yet no doctrines can build the church of Christ up, but those which planted it. We may labour much in lopping off loose branches of immorality and infidelity, yet nothing will be done effectually, till the axe is laid to the tree's root. The root is cankered, and while it remains so, the lopping off a cankered branch, will only cause more cankered shoots.

The fall of Adam, and the total ruin of man's nature by that fall, together with his *whole* recovery by Christ, and through faith in him, are become exploded or neglected doctrines. Yet these doctrines are the ground-work of our religion, and prove the need of *regeneration* as well as outward *reformation*, shew the want of a *new nature* as well as *new conduct*. Scripture represents mankind, as dead in sin, and dead to God; and dead souls can have no power to help themselves. *We are without strength*: and therefore God has laid help on one that is *mighty*, able to save unto the uttermost.

Men are rightly treated in a reading *desk*, and called by their proper name of *miserable sinners*: but in a pulpit they are complimented on the *dignity* of their earthly, sensual, devilish nature; are flattered with a princely *will* and *power* to save themselves; and ornamented with a lusty sledge of *merit*. Justification by faith, the jewel of the gospel covenant, the ground-work of the reformation, the glory of the British church, is now derided as a poor old beggarly element, which may suit a negro or a convict, but will not serve a lofty scribe nor a lewd gentleman. And the covenant of grace, though executed *legally* by Jesus, purchased by his life and death, wrote and sealed with his blood, is deemed of no value, till ratified by Moses. Paul declares, *No other foundation can one lay, beside that which is laid, Christ Jesus.* 1 Cor. iii. 11. But men are growing *wise above what is written*, and will have two foundations for their hope, their own fancied merit added to the meritorious life and death of Christ.

If an angel should visit our earth, and vend such kind of gospel, as is often hawked from the press and pulpit, though he preached morality with most seraphic fervency, and till his wings dropped off, he would never turn one soul to God, nor produce a single grain of true morality, arising from the *love* of God, and aiming *only* at his glory.

When Nicodemus waits on Jesus, he receives instruction, such as every heart should receive from his teacher. The sermon is recorded, as a model, for the ministers of Christ to copy after. Nicodemus ap-

pears to be a very upright man, though somewhat timid; he was a teacher too in Israel, *διδάκταλος*; and of course explained the two tables, and preached what we call morality; he also was a lowly man, and therefore wanted more instruction; and he came to Jesus with an high opinion of his character, believing him to be *a prophet, a teacher come from God*.

Had Nicodemus lived in the present age, he would have been esteemed a topping gospel minister, and might have made a notable arch-deacon. For, though a stranger to the *new birth*, and to *faith* in Christ's *attnement*, he was a teacher of morality, a moral man himself, and had full faith in Jesus, as a *prophet*. Well, he comes to Christ; and expects, no doubt, a famous lecture on morality; perhaps a handsome compliment for himself; but lo! he hears strange news, *Except he is born again, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God*, his kingdom of grace and glory, John iii. 3, 4, 5. A moral conduct shall avail him nothing, without a new birth, a new nature from above. The Jewish ruler was a stranger to this doctrine, (as some modern teachers are,) and asks a mighty staring question about it; and seemed much bewildered, even after Jesus had explained the doctrine.

Yet Nicodemus, as a teacher in Israel, must have read his Bible, and of course understood the necessity of *reformation*, or a *new moral conduct*. And who can be a stranger to this matter. Heathen, Jew, or Christian, whose conscience is not wholly seared; But if Jesus meant a reformation of life by regeneration, his behaviour to the ruler was disingenuous, and cannot well be justified. For on this supposition, Jesus only proposed a matter to Nicodemus, which he knew perfectly well; but proposed it craftily under a new name, or a metaphorical expression, which he knew not, and then takes occasion to upbraid the ruler with his ignorance, *Art thou a master in Israel, and knowest not these things?* Jesus, therefore, must either mean something more than mere reformation of life, or his conduct towards Nicodemus will appear crafty and captious.

If by regeneration Jesus did not intend a *moral reformation* of life, but a *spiritual renovation* of nature, a real, but secret work of the Holy Spirit on the souls of men, producing a new and spiritual service, and divine communion in that service, then his reproof of the ruler was just; because he might have learnt the doctrine of regeneration from Ezekiel, where God says, *I will take away the heart of stone, and give you a new heart and a new spirit; and I will put my Spirit within you*: herein consists God's work of *regeneration*; and the *true reformation* results from it, yet by the Lord's hand, for so it follows, and *I will cause you to walk in my statutes, and keep my judgments, and do them*. Ezek. xxxvi. 25, 26, 27.

So, when Moses gives his dying charge to Israel, he tells them, *The Lord thy God will circumcise thy heart, and the heart of thy seed, to love the Lord thy God, with all thy heart, and with all thy soul*. Deut. xxx. 6.

Jeremiah also preaches the same doctrine, *I will give them one heart, and one way; and I will put my fear in their hearts, that they shall not depart from me*. Jer. xxxii. 39, 40. See further, Ezek. xi. 19, 20.—Jer. xxiv. 7.—xxx. 33.—Prov. xvi. 1.—Psal. li. 0.

Much people, who are strangers to the work of regeneration, suppose the new birth is only Christian baptism; and that every one is *born again*, who is baptized. Indeed the new birth may be conveyed with



baptismal water; and has been conveyed to an infant, before its birth, or at its birth; as we read of John the Baptist, that *he was filled with the Holy Ghost from his mother's womb*; yet the generality of Christians are *not born of the Spirit*, when baptized with water, because no proof is given of it, in their childhood, youth, or manhood. No appearance can be found of an heart devoted unto God, which is the fruit of a *spiritual birth*. The nature of a baptized child, belonging to a churchman, is still as froward and as evil, as the nature of an unbaptized child, belonging to a quaker. Which shews that after water-baptism is received, a spiritual birth is wanting still, not merely to moralize the conduct, but to sanctify the heart, and devote it unto God.

When Jesus had declared to Nicodemus the necessity of *regeneration*, he then speaks of the *atonement*, and of *justification by faith*; *As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the son of man be lifted up; that whosoever believeth on him, should not perish, but have eternal life.* John iii. 14, 15. And so the conference ends.

The Spirit's birth brings a *meetness* for heaven; it teaches men to offer spiritual sacrifices, but gives no right to pardon, nor any claim to eternal life. These blessings are wholly treasured up in Christ, and *only* are obtained through faith in him; even as you heard just now, *Whoso believeth on him hath eternal life.* Therefore Jesus conducts the ruler through regeneration to the atonement, and justification by faith, and there ends; ends with what truly finisheth the Christian character, a *whole* dependence upon Jesus Christ, even after spiritual life is received, and manifested by an holy walk.

Doctor, pray save your breath a little. A small scruple has just popt into my head, and I must be satisfied. Your talk about baptism, together with the breadth of your beaver, and the scanty number of your button holes, make me suspect you are some quaker. I do not mean to scandalize that people: they are notable men in business, and honest men too; very friendly with one another, and take special care of their poor; but I will not leave my own church, Doctor. Tell me then, and tell me honestly, whether you meant to revile the church-baptism, by what you said concerning it?

No Sir, not at all: I only meant to keep you from relying on baptismal water, without the Spirit's baptism. I have no doubt, that infant baptism is attended with the same blessing now, as infant circumcision was formerly. Both the ordinances are of God's appointment, and introductory rites into his visible church on earth. The Jews were saved, as Christians are, by faith: the gospel-covenant belonged to them, as well as to ourselves: only the introducing rite was different. And if Jewish children were received into the church's fold by circumcision; why not Christian children too by baptism? Nothing is said to forbid them: Jesus encouraged the bringing little children to him, and rebuked his disciples, when they sought to prevent it. And how can little children now be brought to Jesus, but by baptism?

Long before the law was given, God declares to Abraham, *that an uncircumcised child shall be cut off from his people; he hath broken my covenant.* Gen. xvii. 14. These are awful words, and should be well attended to. The *covenant* here spoken of, is not the Sinai covenant, but the covenant of grace. Circumcision was the outward sign of this covenant to Abraham, as baptism is to us. The outward rite is different, but the covenant the same. And therefore this awful threat

against neglecting infant circumcision, may cast a further look to the sister-rite of infant baptism.

I would hate no man, and do condemn no man for thinking differently in this matter; yea, I feel a tender brother's love for many, and can lay them on my heart, though they do think differently: yet surely it behoveth every parent to act cautiously. No harm can possibly arise from baptizing an infant; but harm may arise from neglecting baptism. Such neglect may be considered as contempt: so it was considered formerly, and so it may now.

But enough of this matter: your suspicions drew me from my proper walk; and now, Sir, I return to finish it. When the doctrines of regeneration and justification by faith, become despised or deserted doctrines, the labours of the clergy will prove useless, their persons will grow cheap, their office seem contemptible, and they at length may be ashamed of their *function* and their *livery*.

The present age would fain be called a learned age, and the giddy people think themselves a wise people; *wise to do evil, but to do good have no knowledge*. Reason flirts at revelation, merit spurns the thought of grace, tapers would out-blaze the sun, and human fancies far outweigh the truths of God.—But, Sir, I must be moving.

A word or two more, Doctor, and then we take a friendly leave. Your visit to the grazier will certainly get wind. Every creature will be staring, as you walk through the parish. Your look and gate are primitive; and your beaver would almost fill a bushel. A dozen skimming dish hats, such as gentry wear, might be scooped from it. Tomorrow I expect the vicar at my house, to dine upon a good fat capon, and he will surely make enquiries after you. Can you put a brief account of faith into my mouth, which may lay at my tongue's end, ready for him when he comes? He will hear what is said patiently; and if he does not approve, he will not revile. He rails at nobody; and has never had a single squabble with the parish, since he came, about tythe-eggs, pigs, or turnips.

Faith in Christ, Sir, implies not only an *heartly belief* of the Saviour's doctrines, but an *whole dependence* on the Saviour's person, as our prophet, priest, and king. It requires a careful use of the means of grace, but forbids all trusting in the means. I must read the word of God with care, yet not rely upon my own ability, to make me wise unto salvation, but *wholly* trust in Jesus, as my prophet, to open my dark understanding, and direct me by his Spirit into all saving truth—I must watch against sin, and pray against it too; yet not rely upon my own strength to conquer it, but *wholly* trust in Jesus, as my king, to subdue my will, my tempers, and my affections, by his Spirit; to write his holy law upon my heart, and influence my conduct to his glory—I must be zealous of good works, as zealous to perform them, as if my pardon and a crown of glory could be purchased by them; yet *wholly* trust in Jesus, as my priest, to wash my guilty conscience in his purple fountain, and clothe my naked soul in his glorious righteousness, thereby receiving all my pardon and my title to eternal life.

The life of faith is thus expressed by Paul, *Run with patience the race set before you, looking unto Jesus*; looking unto him with a single eye continually; and looking so by prayer and faith, as to receive supplies for every want.

Faith is the master-key to the treasury of Jesus: it opens all the doors, and brings out every store. An heart, well nurtured in this pre-

cious grace, finds the gospel rest. In time of danger, sickness, or temptation, it flutters not, nor struggles hard to help itself, but *standeth still, and sees the Lord's salvation*. The eye is singly fixed on Jesus, the heart is calmly waiting for him, and Jesus brings relief. Faith calls, and Jesus answers, "Here I am to save thee!"

Indeed, Doctor, I am quite charmed with this account of faith: it is just what our church-homilies tell us: it secures the interest of holiness, obedience, and good works, and gives the whole glory unto God. Why, this is right; man is saved, and God glorified; man is brought to heaven through grace, and sings eternal hallelujahs for it. I wish we heard a little more about this gospel faith, and indeed a little more about *Bible-sin* and *holiness*; but these names, I think, are growing out of date. When I waited on the vicar to pay my last Easter-offerings, I found a fierce young fellow there, just arrived from college, who called himself a soph. He seemed to make a puff at sin and holiness, but talked most outrageously of moral *rectitude* and *obliquity*. I could not then fish out, who these *moral* gentry were, but I caught it afterwards in a market, where I sometimes pick up rags of learning. A string of two legged cattle, with tails growing out of their brains, and hanging down to their breech, rode helter skelter through the beast-market. The graziers were all in full stare, as you may think; some said they were Frenchmen; some thought they were Jesuits; some said, they were Turks, who had fled from the Russians: and some affirmed, they were monkeys, because of their tails; but the clerk of the market, coming by, assured us, they were a drove of *moral rectitudes*, who had been driving freely at the Hoop, and railing madly at the Bible, and were going post-haste to lodge with Miss *Moral Obliquity*. So I found that Mr. Moral Rectitude and Mrs. Moral Obliquity were own brother and sister, both of them horned cattle; only one was male and the other female.—Doctor, I have no wine to offer; but you shall take a glass of my Holland gin, before you go; it is right special. The weather is hazy, and may require it: and my heart is quite free to give it.

Sir, I thank you, but I drink no drams. They are too violent for a Christian, whose understanding should be free and calm. Indeed no sort of cordial now is wanted: I am enough refreshed, if you are satisfied.

Well, but Doctor, let me drop a friendly word at parting. Do not pop your head into a house with sash-windows. They are all born without ears; or their ears are slipped into their mouth, and grown to their tongue; they talk at a vast rate, but cannot hear at all. And pray take heed of wasps; the country is wofully infested with them. They buz about every where, rob the parish hives of their proper honey, and fain would drive the labouring bees away. One can scarce read a news-paper, but two or three will settle on it; for they love a sip of printer's ink. Beware, lest they settle on your beaver, and sting your crown. Their tails are mighty venomous, and their virtue lieth there. Farewell, Doctor.

Farewell, Sir; grace and peace be with you.

ART. VI. *A Memorial addressed to the Associate Synod.*

On account of the "Letter" which forms the succeeding "Article," it is thought to be proper and just to publish in this place, the following Memorial, which has lately been put into circulation.

## "MEMORIAL.

[It has been deemed proper to send two copies of the following memorial and remonstrance, to each minister of the Associate Church, for himself and his elder, previous to the meeting of Synod, in order to put every member of the court in possession of our views, and to call his attention to the subject, that whether he agree with us or not, he may be prepared to act with judgment and deliberation in this trying crisis in our affairs; and accordingly a sufficient number for this purpose, and no more, has been printed.]

To the Reverend the Associate Synod of North America, to meet at Pittsburgh on the 4th Wednesday of May, 1837.

The subscribers, in common with many others, feeling deeply aggrieved with the proceedings and the decision of Synod in May last, in the case of the Rev. Andrew Stark, and believing them, as they do, to be contrary to the holy scriptures and to the principles and order of the Associate Church, would respectfully remonstrate against the same as in their judgment subversive of order and justice—calculated to injure the cause of religion among us, and to bring the discipline of the house of God into contempt; and they would earnestly petition Synod to review the proceedings of which they complain, and to reverse the decisions founded on them. More particularly:

1st. We remonstrate against the decision refusing to sustain, at least in part, the protest of the Rev. A. Stark against the proceedings of the Presbytery of Albany, allowing Chauncey Webster to attempt to prove things which he had retracted as "unwarranted and unfounded." To allow a man, and much more, to require a man to prove what he retracts as unwarranted and unfounded, in other words, to prove what he declares he believes is not true, is too absurd to admit of defence in any case, and is not defended in the report of the committee sanctioned by Synod. In that report it seems to be taken for granted, and very justly, that it such was the fact, there would be good reason for sustaining the protest and reversing the proceedings of Presbytery as irregular and unjust.—*And yet this very fact is admitted in the same report, at least as it respects "one or two things" which is the interpretation of the word "some" originally written by Mr. Webster in the retraction referred to.* Surely then on the principles of that report and on the principles of common sense, these "one or two things" ought never to have been admitted to proof by the Presbytery, and so far at least the protest of Mr. Stark ought to have been sustained. But further, "these some things," these "one or two things" admitted to have been retracted, do not appear to have been ever specified, and, therefore, they could not be known. The protest against the decision of Presbytery, therefore, in order to meet the case, behoved to be general, and in our opinion ought to have been sustained in its general form. But as the matter now stands, the Synod in fact by their deed sanction the very thing complained of in the protest.

2d. We respectfully and earnestly remonstrate against the course pursued by Synod in proceeding to try Mr. Stark on a libel put into his hands by the Presbytery of Albany, without allowing him that time for preparing his defence, to which every man is entitled by the rules which regulate judicial proceedings in every well regulated court, and are laid down in the book of discipline by which, as a church, we profess to be guided.—To secure the ends of justice, ample opportunity of defence should be allowed to every one on trial. As a general rule, 10 days at least are usually allowed, after notice given of the time of trial, to make the necessary preparation. More than this is often necessary and may be justly claimed, and the refusal in most instances would amount to a denial of justice. But Mr Stark, in a state of feeble health, and at the distance of 100 miles, receives notice on Saturday, that Synod will proceed to try the libel on Tuesday following. And when Mr. Stark appears on the day appointed, and states the impossibility of making a defence from want of time; and when a motion is made to postpone the trial to allow the necessary time, the Synod refuse it—proceed to try the libel in the absence of defence—find the charges proven, and suspend the accused indefinitely from the functions of the ministry and the communion of the church. This course, in our judgment, is unjust and oppressive in the highest degree, and we look in vain, in the history of the transaction, for any thing to justify or palliate it. If such is its true character, surely the Lord is not with the court in the judgment. Whether the decision, as it respects the merits of the case be right or wrong, is not here the question. It is a decision arrived at by violating constitutional law, and disregarding the very forms of judicial pro-

ceedings set up to protect the accused, and secure righteousness in judgement. For these reasons, justice injured by such proceedings and by sufferings unrighteously inflicted, calls for a review, and in order to this, for the immediate reversal of the decision founded on them.

3rd. We remonstrate against the proceedings referred to, because contrary to the practice of every well regulated court, the testimony on which the main charges in the libel were found proven, was testimony taken in another court, and in another cause, in which Mr. Stark was not a party, and in which the privilege of bringing rebutting testimony, was on this account refused to him—and also because testimony, even of this kind, was admitted to which there was no reference in the libel, in direct violation of one of the plainest rules of our book of discipline. This decision of Synod furnishes a case, we believe, wholly unprecedented in the Secession, or in any other church, in which a minister of the gospel is tried, convicted, and suspended indefinitely, from the functions of the ministry and from the communion of the church, without a single witness being examined on the trial to prove the things whereof he was accused. Can such proceedings be right? Can they be justified by any possible circumstances? Will they receive the sanction of the Secession Church, and go down as an example to be imitated by her presbyteries and sessions in the exercise of discipline? Are the ordinary rules of procedure laid down in our own books and sanctioned by the practice of all well regulated courts to be thrown aside as unnecessary and useless in our judicial proceedings? We hope not. But to such a result the course pursued by Synod clearly tends: it establishes a precedent of the most dangerous kind and assumes an authority to dispense with the established safeguards of justice which belongs to no court on earth. Under a full persuasion that this is the case, and actuated, we trust, by a sincere desire to promote the best interests of the Secession Church and the cause of righteousness and truth, we feel it our duty earnestly to remonstrate against the proceedings referred to, and respectfully to express our resolution to testify against and resist them in every lawful way.

4th. We remonstrate against the proceedings in the case referred to, because of the injury they have done already, and if not corrected, are still likely to do in the church. While we consider it the duty of the courts of Christ's house to act justly and righteously in all cases, leaving consequences in the hand of God, yet if any thing injurious to the peace and interests of the church, arise out of an unjust and unwarrantable exercise of authority, those who exercise it are justly responsible, and it is their duty, as speedily as possible, to correct the evil and to *do every thing* in their power to repair the injury inflicted. The first congregation in New York, one of the most respectable under the care of Synod, for numbers, intelligence and piety, and for their steadfast adherence to the principles of the Associate Church, feel themselves so deeply aggrieved with the proceedings of Synod, that with a unanimity unequalled, they have resisted its decision. They now support their pastor in his protest against the course pursued towards him, and stand in the attitude of a people protesting against injustice and oppression on the part of their ecclesiastical rulers. In this position, they are justified in the judgment of a great portion of their brethren in other congregations, and share in their sympathies: for if the course pursued by Synod really is what they consider it to be, it is not only their privilege, but their duty, to protest against and resist it.

5th. We remonstrate against these proceedings and pray for a review of the same, because in our opinion there has not been in them a due regard to the state of things in this section of the church for a number of years past. Though perfectly united in a cordial adherence to the principles of the Secession Church, yet that we have been in a most unhappy state of division for a long time, is too well known. Strife and contention have characterized the meetings of our Presbyteries, and spread with their baleful influences among the people, withering and destroying their peace, and comfort, and edification. The good and pleasant sight of brethren dwelling together in unity, which in a good degree was formerly seen among us, has passed away, and, we fear, is not likely soon to return. This spirit of contention, however introduced, and so inconsistent with the spirit of the gospel of peace, has changed our once fruitful field into a wilderness, and made us a hissing and a reproach to all that are about us. The result of such a state of things is as usual, a want of confidence in each other, and a total incapacity arising from prejudice and biassed feelings, to judge of the conduct and actions of each other, with fairness and candor. Instead of bearing one another's burdens, and so fulfilling the law of Christ, we are but too ready to heap burdens on each other—to charge with deeds never committed—to impute motives never felt—to wrest the words and misinterpret the actions of each other,

in the plainest and simplest matters. Hence there is thought to be, on the one side, an eagerness to criminate and convict, totally unfitting for the exercise of impartial and righteous judgement; and on the other a disregard of authority which is conceived to be so used. Each party appears to consider itself as wholly right, and the other as wholly wrong, and chargeable with all the sin, and responsible for all the evils, under which we are now suffering. In such a state of things, an impartial observer would doubtless perceive, that errors have been committed on both sides, and there can be as little doubt that any decision affecting either of the parties, which overlooks this, can hardly be a righteous decision.—For these reasons, we feel persuaded that, had due attention been paid by the Synod to these painful facts, their decision even on the merits of the case, would have been very different. As it is, however, we feel confident that, instead of being viewed as an impartial proceeding, tending to heal the divisions unhappily existing, it can be regarded only as, we regret to say, some decisions of Synod connected with this have already been regarded, as taking sides with one of the parties, encouraging them in their course, and wounding still more deeply the feelings of others. Thus, instead of the breach being healed, it has only become wider, and a crisis in our affairs has been induced, which, if not treated in the spirit of impartial justice and conciliation, can tend only to greater alienation—to more serious and painful consequences. We esteem it our duty to render submission to the Courts of Christ's house, when these act in the spirit of Christ, and judge righteous judgment; and we are far from wishing to uphold or countenance any in resisting authority so used. But if, in our judgment, the authority of church courts is exercised in subverting judgment, and in such a way as to destroy, instead of building up, the house of the Lord, we have a right, and it is our duty, to remonstrate, as we now do, and to exert every lawful mean in our power that judgment may return to righteousness, and that peace, the effect of righteousness, may be restored to this suffering section of the Secession Church.

ARCHIBALD WHYTE,  
DUNCAN STALKER,  
ALEXANDER BULLIONS,  
PETER BULLIONS,  
THOMAS GOODWILLIE,  
WILLIAM PRINGLE.

January, 1837.

ART. VII. *A Letter addressed to the Signers of the foregoing Memorial.*

To the Rev. Messrs. A. Whyte, D. Stalker, A. Bullions, P. Bullions, T. Goodwillie, and W. Pringle.

DEAR BRETHREN:

I have received through the Post Office, two copies of a Memorial and Remonstrance, addressed by you to the Associate Synod, one for myself, and one for "my elder." In this document you express the grievances which you profess to feel on account of certain proceedings of the last annual meeting of our Synod: and in thus doing what you doubtless regard your duty, you bring grievous charges against your brethren—you "accuse them of many things, which you cannot prove," and to which they will never consent to plead guilty. I greatly regret the appearance of this paper, at a time, when matters in this section of the church were rapidly settling down into a quiet and pacific state; and, more especially, as you express an intention of presenting it to the consideration of the next Synodical meeting. And my object, brethren, in addressing you at present, is to remonstrate—affectionately, but earnestly remonstrate, against the course you have adopted, and to endeavor to prevail with you to abandon the intention of carrying your alleged grievances before the Synod. And my reason for this is, because, as will be seen in the sequel, you either do not understand, or you evidently misrepresent

the case, which you present as the matter of your grievance; and consequently your course, if persisted in, must inevitably end in your own confusion, unless you succeed in practising a deception on the supreme Court of the Church to which you belong—both of which unhappy alternatives had better be avoided; and the power to avoid them rests, at present, entirely with yourselves. That there are misstatements and misrepresentations in your Memorial, I think, dear brethren, can easily be shown; that these are *intentional* I will not assert; indeed with some of you I *know* they are not. When, therefore, these incorrect and partial statements and high colored representations, together with the obvious tendency of your conduct are faithfully pointed out to you, may I not hope that your christian candor will lead you to correct your mistakes, and that you will henceforth cease your opposition to the decisions of Synod, made in the case of the Rev. Andrew Stark?

There are *five* things in your Memorial which you present as grounds of grievance, against which you remonstrate, and for the immediate removal of which you pray the Synod.

The *First* of these is "The decision [of Synod] refusing to sustain, at least in part, the protest of the Rev. A. Stark against the proceedings of the Presbytery of Albany, allowing Chauncey Webster to attempt to prove things which he had retracted as 'unwarranted and unfounded.'" This statement, brethren, respecting Mr. Stark's protest is not correct. His protest was not against "the proceedings of the Presbytery of Albany, allowing Chauncey Webster to attempt to prove," &c. but against the *single act* of that Presbytery, by which they rejected a resolution which Mr. Stark offered in bar of the trial of Mr. Webster, and which ran in these words—"Resolved, that it is contrary to the discipline of the Associate Church to allow a person to prove what he had already declared to be unfounded." As this resolution embraced an abstract proposition, which the Presbytery were not called to act upon, and as it had no bearing on the case then before them, but was designed to interrupt their regular proceedings, it was of course rejected. And it was against this *deed of rejection* that Mr. Stark protested and appealed to the Synod. It is material to have this point correctly stated, in order to remove a wrong impression your language is calculated to produce.

Now, any grievance arising from the Synod's refusal to sustain this appeal of Mr. Stark must seem remarkable enough. Had the Synod sustained the appeal, they would by that deed have sanctioned the correctness of an abstract, universal proposition, which certainly admits of many exceptions—they would have sanctioned a principle in judicial procedure, which is expressly repudiated both by civil and ecclesiastical law—they would have affirmed a thing to be contrary to the discipline of the Associate Church, which is contrary to the discipline of no community deserving the name of a Church. But, brethren, as you profess to differ from others in judgment on this point, laying assertion aside, let us reason the case.—Is it indeed "contrary to the discipline of the Associate Church to allow a person to prove what he had already declared to be unfounded?" Or in other words, is a confession of guilt in *all cases* to result in conviction without any further investigation? The rule which governs the practice of our civil courts in relation to confessions of guilt is founded in common sense and equity,—“Every species of confession, to be admissible must be free and voluntary. And in the case of a confession made before a magistrate or other person, if it appear that the defendant was induced to make it by any promise of

favor, or by menaces, or under terror, it shall not be received in evidence against him." (2 Hale, 285. Archbold's practice, 117.) "However slight the inducement may have been, a confession so obtained cannot be received in evidence, on account of the uncertainty and doubt whether it was not made rather from a motive of fear or interest, than from a sense of guilt." (Chitty's Pleadings, p. 118.) These quotations from standard works on Law are sufficient to show what is the practice of civil courts relative to confessions of guilt. You surely could not have been ignorant of this; and yet because the Synod did not sanction a principle directly contradicted by such practice, you affect to be greatly aggrieved! Were any civil court to practice according to the rule, you would have had the Synod to establish, it would subject itself to the scorn and contempt of all honest minds, and expose itself to an impeachment on the ground of imbecility or wilful disregard of the claims of right. You have doubtless read of the feelings of deep abhorrence and reprobation that were excited in the breasts of all the pious and intelligent in Scotland, when the Justiciary Court acted on the plan, on which you would have the "discipline of the Associate Church" conducted. I refer to the case of James Mitchell, who was convicted and condemned to death by that unrighteous court, simply on the ground of a confession, he had formerly made, of an attempt to assassinate Sharp, the bishop of St. Andrews. When arraigned for trial, my author states, that "Sir George Lockart argued in behalf of the prisoner, with great judgment and learning to the admiration of the audience, showing, that no extra-judicial confession could be allowed in court, and that his confession was extorted from him by hopes and promise of life." (See Crookshank's History of the Church of Scotland.) But you may perhaps object to this appeal to the practice of civil courts, respecting an ecclesiastical affair. I have indeed only appealed to such practice, because it is based on a common-sense principle; a principle, which I will now proceed to show you, is also acted on in the matter of ecclesiastical discipline. In our Book of Discipline we have no express rule on the subject, but we have one laid down in Stewart's Collections, a book which has always been regarded as of authority in our church courts. The rule to which I refer is the following—"Probation by confession, *if judicial*, is the strongest of all probation; but if men confess a crime, rather from weariness of, or aversion to life, than from conscience of guilt; or, if there appear any signs of distraction or madness, then such confessions ought not to be rested upon," &c. (See Book iv. Tit. 3. sec. 5., also sec. 11.) What say you, brethren, to this rule? What now becomes of your grievance? Or is it a matter of grievance to you that the Synod did not repeal this long standing rule of the Church relative to confessions of guilt? Would you have had the Synod to establish in its place a rule admitting of no limitations or exceptions? for such was the nature of Mr. Stark's resolution, the rejection of which you lament as an awful grievance! But the rule prescribed to you in the above quotation, and which is embraced in the "discipline of the Associate Church," is carefully guarded, is strictly limited. It declares that a confession of guilt, in order to be received in evidence, must be *judicial*; that is, it must be made by the accused in the presence of the court, after his arraignment for trial; and not only so, it must also possess certain other attributes, as you will perceive by again turning your eye upon the rule.

Thus far I have been considering Mr. Stark's resolution in the *ab-*



*tract*, and have clearly shown that the Synod would not have been justified in adopting it, which would have been the case had his appeal been sustained. Let us now consider it in the *concrete*, at least so far as it had a bearing on the case of Mr. Webster. And suppose for a moment, that Mr. W. did make the confession which you impute to him; was not that confession alleged to have been made before the Presbytery of Albany commenced their process against him? Consequently it was not a *judicial* confession. And besides may it not have been extorted under a *promise of favor*, or under *menaces*, or under *terror*, or from a motive of *fear or interest*, rather than from a *sense of guilt*, and, therefore, inadmissible by "any well regulated court?" And would you have the Synod to say that a confession made under such circumstances was a sufficient evidence of guilt, and that it would be a horrible outrage to investigate the case any further? But *let it be remembered* that Mr. Webster when arraigned before the Presbytery for trial, *utterly denied* having made the *extra-judicial* confession imputed to him, the truth of which denial has since been established by unimpeachable testimony. Where then was the error of the Presbytery? And where was the error of the Synod in approving of the procedure of the Presbytery? Brethren, are you not too easily offended?

I have clearly shown that Mr. Stark's resolution, when considered in respect of its *merits*, as an abstract proposition can by no means stand the test, and yet, let me remark, that it was not rejected by Presbytery and Synod simply on that ground, but chiefly on the ground of its *mis-application* to a particular case. Even though it had contained a true proposition, from the wrong application that was attempted to be made of it, it behooved to be rejected. *The thing had no business there.* It was evidently presented with the intention to impede the course of justice and to screen guilt; besides in the application that was made of it, it was based on the false assumption that Mr. Webster had confessed the truth of the charges, laid in the Presbytery's libel against him. Accordingly the Synod, as you will see from their proceedings in the case, without particularly affirming or denying the principle of the resolution, proceeded to satisfy itself from the examination of witnesses, whether the resolution did really apply to the case of Mr. Webster: and the judgment of the court was that it did not. And the reason why the Synod decided the matter rather in its *concrete* than its *abstract* form, was, because Mr. Stark's "reasons of protest," and the Presbytery's "answers" presented the subject particularly in that point of view.

I extremely regret, dear brethren, that you should still persist, notwithstanding the testimony of Messrs. Campbell and Smart, in holding out the idea that Mr. Webster confessed the truth of the charges for which he was libelled by the Presbytery of Albany, in so far as they affected the character of Mr. Stark. In what a sad dilemma do you place both yourselves and your friend Mr. Stark! Did not Mr. Stark notify Mr. Webster, through his counsel, and did he not repeatedly declare in Presbytery that if Mr. W. would *retract* his injurious statements, he would withdraw the civil suit which he had commenced against him? If then, Mr. W. did *retract*, as you, after Mr. Stark, affirm, why was not the civil prosecution withdrawn, according to promise? Will you please to answer me that? Did not the continuance of the prosecution argue that the retraction you talk about was never made? O, but says Mr. Stark, and I suppose you are ready to reiterate it, Mr. Webster fell from his retraction! Well, dear brethren, if

Mr. Webster's falling from his retraction would justify Mr. Stark in his civil prosecution, would it not also justify the Presbytery in their ecclesiastical prosecution? How will you extricate yourselves and your friend from this dilemma? If Mr. W. retracted, why was he contrary to a solemn pledge given, prosecuted? If he retracted, but afterwards fell from it, his prosecution in a church court was surely as justifiable as his prosecution in a civil court!

But I am not yet done with you on this point, as it appears to me so amazingly strange that you should still insist on Mr. Webster's having made the retraction in question. All the evidence that either Presbytery or Synod, or you or I, have, or ever had, or ever can have, on this point, is contained in the testimony of Messrs. Campbell and Smart. And their testimony is of such a nature that it cannot possibly be set aside, as they were the only persons present at the time when the alleged retraction was made. True, Mr. Stark insinuates that their testimony is not correct; and you seem to give entire credence to the insinuation. In this you resemble the lady in Mr. Stark's congregation, who said she would rather believe Mr. Stark, than *twenty Synods!* But who is Mr. Stark, that his statements in this case, should be entitled to such implicit credit? Is he not a party concerned? Moreover, has he not been suspended from the exercise of the ministry, for "uttering falsehoods?" Is his naked word, therefore, to be believed in preference to the testimony of two as unexceptionable witnesses as ever appeared in any court? But Mr. Stark has published an *anonymous* letter in corroboration of his statement! So he has, but as he has been convicted of writing *anonymous* letters and pamphlets of a "mendacious" character, it is probable that this letter also, is the production of his own fruitful imagination. But if not; if the writer of that letter be some other person than Mr. Stark himself, only let him be brought into court, and he can easily be convicted of falsification. I say then, is it not strange—is it not at least very inconsistent—that while you condemn the Synod in another part of your memorial, for grounding a decision on what you think was illegal testimony, you should in the present case reject the legal testimony of two unimpeachable witnesses, and ground your faith and matter of grievance on the bare assertion of an interested party, and of some other individual, if it be right to call him *another*, whose name is concealed from the public!

You charge the Synod with interpreting the word "some," contained in Mr. Webster's original paper of retraction, to mean "one or two things;" and you state that "these 'one or two things' do not appear to have been ever specified;" and further, that "these 'one or two things' should never, at least, have been admitted to proof by the Presbytery." If you will examine Mr. Smart's testimony, which has been published, you will find that he makes the *interpretation* you ascribe to the Synod; and also that he *does specify* the "one or two things" of which you speak. In answer to the interrogatory, "How many of the statements in the pamphlet did Mr. Webster admit, that he had found to be incorrect, and what were they?" Mr. Smart stated, "I believe that there were two. I have no recollection of any more at present. The first was the statement that Mr. Stark had attended infidel lectures. He had no proof of this, and it was most probably not the fact. The other was in reference to the offer made by Dr. Mason to Mr. Stark, of the professorship in Dickinson College. This was incorrect as to the amount of money offered by Dr. M. to Mr. S., but not as to

the fact." This testimony, brethren, ought to have been carefully read by you.—And now, with respect to these "one or two things," I assert that the Presbytery of Albany never required Mr. Webster to prove them, but left him perfectly free to confess or retract them: and I assert further that Mr. Webster never attempted to prove them, but did frankly confess to the Presbytery that he was mistaken about them, to the extent stated in Mr. Smart's testimony. The minutes of the Presbytery of Albany show this. What now becomes of the accuracy of your statements?

After all that you have said, brethren, in this part of your Memorial, there is something in your language which seems to intimate that your grievance is not very great. It appears that had the Synod only "in part" sustained Mr. Stark's appeal, your ground of remonstrance would have been done away. An appeal from a *solitary* act or deed of a lower court, has usually, I believe, been either sustained or rejected by the Synod. But had the Synod in this instance, adopted the unusual course of *partly* sustaining and *partly* rejecting the appeal, or in other words, taken middle ground, or followed Balak's plan of managing a difficult case, (see Num. xxiii. 25.) it seems you would have been satisfied: How slight, then, is the ground of your grievance here, about which you so solemnly remonstrate! And even this ground is done away by your own interpretation of the Synod's decision. For, in the minute containing that decision, you represent the Synod, (incorrectly I think,) as *taking for granted* the correctness of the principle for which you plead, viz: *that* involved in the Resolution of Mr. Stark. But if the Synod *took for granted*, and thus sanctioned that principle, was not this sustaining "at least in part," Mr. Stark's protest and appeal? According, therefore, to your own interpretation of the Synod's decision, you have little or no reason for remonstrating, in the manner you do.

But, now, were I to admit for a moment, that the Synod erred in "refusing to sustain, at least in part, the protest of the Rev. A. Stark," you, dear brethren, ought to treat their error with great lenity, since, at least one of your number, [the Rev. P. Bullions] and even Mr. Stark himself, was for a considerable time under the influence of the same error. After Mr. Webster had made the alleged retraction which has been imputed to him, that brother, who, I suppose, is the writer of the *Memorial*, insisted on his being *libelled for the very things*, which, it is now pretended, he had retracted as "unwarranted and unfounded," urging at the same time that "this was the best way to do justice to all parties." Accordingly at his importunity, and contrary to another course which had been previously adopted by the Presbytery, he was authorised by the Presbytery to draw up a libel against Mr. Webster, which at a *subsequent* meeting was read, admitted, and put into the hands of the accused, who was ordered to be ready for trial at the next meeting of Presbytery, which was to take place in about six weeks from that time. And it was not till that meeting, when Mr. Webster had presented himself at the bar of the Presbytery, with a very formidable array of witnesses, that Mr. Stark presented his celebrated resolution, and the brother in question changed his mind. The presentation of that resolution seemed instantly to flash light and conviction into his mind; for from that moment he affected to be greatly shocked at the idea of the Presbytery's trying Mr. Webster on the libel which he had himself been the chief instrument of getting up. Surely that brother ought to bear with the Synod on a point, respecting which he was so

long in error himself; and perhaps it would be safe to say that he ought by all means to *retract* this part of his remonstrance: because it seems so strange that he should be found remonstrating against a thing which he was himself the prime agent in producing.

Thus, brethren, I have finished all I intend to say on your first ground of grievance—I have dwelt the longer on it, because I know that an evil disposed person, one who is inclined to act the demagogue, may by means of it succeed in misleading ignorant and unsuspecting people. Mr. Stark has rung his thousand changes on it, in these or similar words, “The Presbytery and Synod have made it lawful to prove false statements to be true,” than which a more glaring perversion of a simple fact, is scarcely imaginable. I am sorry, indeed, that in the account which you give of this matter, you should have manifested so much of the same spirit. But, I trust, from the facts and arguments I have laid before you, that you will see that you have not as good ground to stand upon, as you may have supposed, and that you will at least expunge this part of your Memorial, before it be presented to the grave consideration of the Associate Synod.

The *Second* ground of grievance presented in your Memorial is, that Mr. Stark had not sufficient time allowed him, by Synod, to prepare his defence on the libel which was put into his hands by the Presbytery of Albany. Here, brethren, I think, you do the Synod great injustice. I trust, I can easily convince you that you accuse and condemn that court very wrongfully. It is some consolation however to know that on the present point you are so *definite* as to *name* the *rule* which you assert has been violated; this circumstance will tend greatly to curtail my remarks. For, strange as it may appear, amidst all the charges of violating rules which you so lavishly bring against the Synod, you have only, I believe, condescended explicitly to name but *one*, and that one you entirely misapply. You here quote the rule which allows the accused “ten days” for preparing his defence, prior to his trial; and you maintain that this rule is to be observed by the Synod in the trial of causes, which originated in a lower court, where a sufficient length of time for preparing a defence had been granted to the accused. What a strange and novel interpretation of this rule! Brethren, are you really serious!—What! after a cause from a lower court, is called up in Synod for trial, must the accused be allowed *ten days* more for getting ready his defence! But these “ten days” would amount to a whole year; for, before their expiration, the Synod is necessitated to adjourn! And if this rule be applicable in the case of such trials, it is surely applicable in *all its extent*; hence, at the next meeting of Synod, the accused is only to absent himself, and this will secure him another year for making preparation! And as he is by the aforesaid rule entitled to a *third* citation, he is only to absent himself again and by this means he will gain *three whole years* for preparing his defence! And if the witnesses to be used against him should happen to be his personal friends, perhaps he might prevail on them to absent themselves, when he could do so no longer himself, and this manœuvre would gain for him a *fourth year* for making preparation for trial! In a word, if your application of the rule in question be correct, then it is put in the power of the accused, if he be so disposed, to evade a trial altogether. What would become of church discipline in your hands, if this be your way of interpreting rules? And now, because the Synod acted more in accordance with the dictates of common sense and common equity, than to follow your construction and

application of the aforesaid *rule*, it seems, they acted very *unrighteously*, and that "God was not with them in the judgment." But perhaps you will say, that, in the present case, *one year* would have been sufficient. What, then, becomes of the rule you charge the Synod with grossly violating? That rule expressly admits of *three* citations; and, dear brethren, *you* are specially bound to stick to the rule.—But is it not strange that such an application of this rule, as that for which you plead, was never discovered before? The Associate Synod, at almost every session, tries some cause sent up from a lower court, but never before was it heard of, that the defendant in such a cause had a right to obtain, under this rule, three years to prepare his defence! For if he could claim "ten days," he could also so manage it, as to obtain, by virtue of the same rule, three years and perhaps more.

Brethren, you entirely misapply the rule in question. For it is *wholly* confined in its provisions to that court where the judicial process commences, as any one will be able to see from the connection in which it stands in the Book of Discipline. Now, you know, that the process against Mr. Stark commenced in the Presbytery of Albany, where he was cited according to the rule, a *first, second* and *third* time. You know also, that from the time the libel was put into his hands, till the time when Synod entered upon the trial of it, at least *four months* intervened. The assertion, therefore, that a sufficient length of time was not allowed him for preparing his defence, or that the rule to which you refer was violated by the Synod, is utterly groundless. So far was the Synod from violating any rule of this kind, that it acted in entire accordance with the rule which relates to causes, which, like Mr. Stark's, come before it by reference; and which was the only rule that had a bearing on the case. The rule to which I refer is the following—"Upon a reference made and intimate all parties present are thereby cited *upud actu* to the judicature referred unto: but if absent, the clerk must be ordered to direct summons against them, which if omitted the reference cannot be received." Such a citation is also declared to be *peremptory*, and if not obeyed the accused is to be treated as contumacious. (See Stewart's Col. Book iv. Tit. 5. sec. 14. Also, Form of Process ch. ii.) Now, brethren, you knew very well the existence of this rule, for not long since it was specially presented to your consideration; why then have you entirely passed it by, and in your eagerness to convict the Synod, grasped at a rule, which you ought to have known could not apply to the case? Is this right?

But why have you not presented the case fairly? Why have you not told the whole truth, or at least given the material facts? Why have you not mentioned that this case came before the Synod by *reference*? That it had commenced four months before that time in the Presbytery of Albany? That Mr. Stark had been cited *three* several times to appear before that court and defend himself? That in answer to the third citation he denounced the Presbytery and renounced their authority? That when the Presbytery *referred* the case to Synod for *final adjudication*, they notified the accused, and that too more than *ten days* before the time that his trial came on in Synod? I say, why have you artfully concealed these important facts, without a knowledge of which it is impossible to understand the merits of the case? And now, if you will allow me to appeal to your candor, I will just ask, if, with a knowledge of all these circumstances, you have done *well* in representing Mr. Stark as only being allowed from *Saturday* till *Tuesday*,

three days to prepare himself for trial on the libel which had been in his hands *four months*? If you say that all you mean is, that Mr. S. did not *know certainly* that the Synod would try him, till the Saturday you mention; I reply, that *that is a matter with which you have nothing to do*, since, in the notice the Presbytery sent him, the week before, he was told, that his case was referred to the Synod for final adjudication. Observe the language, *referred for final adjudication*; which reference was made, not to the Synod of 1837, or 1840, but to that one which was to meet in Philadelphia on the 4th Wednesday of May, 1836. I should suppose that any reasonable man, who was accused of many and gross iminoralities, upon receiving *such a notice* as this, would immediately go to work and prepare his defence if he had any to make, and not plead the pureile excuse, that he did *not know certainly that the Synod would try him!* But as you were not at Synod, who told you that Mr. Stark was in a state of feeble health at that time? He was able to attend to his ministerial duties in his congregation—he looked about as well as usual—he was surely enjoying as good health as some others who travelled a much greater distance, than he had to travel, in order to attend the meeting of Synod. What makes you refer so particularly to Mr. Stark's state of health? Is it to excite sympathy in his behalf? Is it to show the *inhumanity* of the Synod? Or, is it that the next Synod might be induced to act more from *feeling* than from *judgment*?

It is with pain, dear brethren, that I read the *hard things* which you say of the Synod in this part of your Memorial, when I consider that you have not the least possible cause for saying them. It would seem that you "are not afraid to speak evil of dignities." Because the Synod could not apply the rule which you mention, as you mistakingly think it ought to have been applied, you charge them with adopting a course "unjust and oppressive in the highest degree," and which has nothing "to justify or palliate it;" with having "arrived at a decision by violating constitutional law and disregarding the very forms of judicial proceedings;" with having "injured justice and inflicted unrighteous sufferings," yea, with not "having God with them in the judgment." These, brethren, are weighty charges! Surely the Associate Synod deserved better treatment, at least at the hands of *some* of you. But as you charge the Synod with violating *constitutional law*, I hope, when you come to read over these "hard speeches," which I have just specified, that you will calmly and seriously reflect on that rule of *moral law*, which says—"Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor."

The *Third* of your grievances relates to certain technicalities which you allege were not duly observed in the admission of testimony on Mr. Stark's trial. Your first objection to said testimony is, that it "was taken in another court." But the Book of Discipline declares such testimony to be admissible, when it says, that "authentic documents and deeds of judicatories may be read in evidence." Indeed this is ordinarily the only kind of testimony that is admitted in cases of appeal. Cases of reference stand in the same situation. The General Assembly's Book of Discipline states expressly in relation to all such cases, that the testimony must be taken by the "Judicatory referring." Your next, and I suppose principal objection, is that the testimony used, was taken, "in another cause in which Mr. Stark was not a party;" and you add that even to some of it "there was no reference in the libel." The "other cause" to which you refer, was that of Mr. Webster before the Pres-

bytery of Albany. He was tried for having published, among other things, certain charges against the Rev. A. Stark. In exculpating himself from these charges, he adduced witnesses to prove that Mr. Stark was the author of certain anonymous pamphlets of a bad character, and also, that he was the writer of a certain paper signed K. in the Monitor, which he afterwards had repeatedly denied. Now, how far Mr. Stark *was* or "was not a party," so far as these two items were concerned, I leave it to others to judge. At all events he *felt* as though he was a party, as might have been seen from the manner in which he cross-examined the witnesses. And if you did not know, I will now tell you, that it was only the testimony which was taken on these two points, that was afterwards admitted by the Synod against Mr. Stark. Your statement, respecting this matter, is so extremely *defective* that it is well calculated to mislead the uninformed. And I had almost said something more severe with respect to your statement, that "Mr. Stark was refused the privilege of bringing rebutting testimony." If he *had* been, you have no right to complain, since there "was no reference to such testimony in the libel," that Mr. Webster was tried on. But I assert that Mr. Stark *was* allowed to adduce rebutting testimony, and that his explanation of any criminating circumstance was always received. Accordingly, in exculpation of himself, he presented "extracts" from the records of a Presbytery in Scotland, a letter from a Presbytery clerk, a letter from Dr. Mason, &c., all of which was received. Indeed, I have no recollection that you had any ground for your assertion whatever, except that on a point casually introduced by a witness, but having no connection with any thing contained in Mr. Webster's libel, Mr. Stark did propose to prove the contrary, but was over-ruled by the court, as Mr. Webster, refusing to be thus interrupted, insisted on a technical adherence to the rule. The insinuation that "rebutting testimony" was refused, so far as the "anonymous pamphlets" and the "K. paper" were concerned, is utterly destitute of all foundation, and left uncontradicted, might deceive.

Now, brethren, I maintain that the testimony obtained as above, was admissible on Mr. Stark's trial. For "authentic documents and deeds of judicatories may be read in evidence." This rule is still more plainly expressed in the General Assembly's Book of Discipline, and also in that of the Associate Reformed Church. These Books say, that "Testimony taken by one judicatory, and regularly certified, shall be received by *every other judicatory*, as no less valid than if *it had been taken by themselves*." Your objection, therefore, that the Synod admitted "testimony taken in another court, and in another cause," falls to the ground. And that "there was no reference in the libel to some of this kind of testimony," is a circumstance, which can have but little weight with any judicious mind; when it is remembered, that "the some testimony" alluded to, was not introduced as *direct* but as *incidental* testimony, and as *illustrative* of that which was named in the libel as *direct and principal*. But it is not my design to argue these points at present, as this has been sufficiently done by the Presbytery of Albany in their Narrative, to which I would refer you.

I would, however, present to your consideration the following rule contained in the General Assembly's Book of Discipline—"In cases of reference, the judicatory referring ought to have all the testimony and other documents, duly prepared, produced, and in perfect readiness; so that the superior judicatory may be able to consider and issue the case

with as little difficulty or delay as possible." The Presbytery of Albany acted according to the spirit of this rule, but, through the contumacy of the accused and the blameable conduct of some of the witnesses, was only enabled to present to the Synod the kind of testimony they did; and consequently the Synod found itself in a measure necessitated to receive it. Indeed, there is another consideration, which I might add, as going to show that the Synod acted right in receiving the testimony against which you demur. You probably know that in civil courts, on the failure of the accused to defend himself, judgment goes against him by *default*. This principle is recognized in ecclesiastical courts of judicature. The Synod would have acted perfectly according to rule, had they suspended Mr. Stark without taking any testimony in the case, solely on the ground of his contumacy and refusal to plead. His conduct was a tacit evidence of his guilt. Judgment might have been entered against him by default. But the Synod instead of dealing with him in this summary manner, proceeded to try him on the libel—on the *merits* of the case. And in accordance with another principle of law, which you have probably heard of, they "made use of the best testimony offered in the case," and which they found to be abundantly satisfactory as to the guilt of the accused. Your grievance, therefore, grounded on the illegality of the testimony in question, is destitute of any solid support.

But, though all the irregularities of which you speak, were admitted, inasmuch as they are merely *technical*, and not at all affecting the *merits* of the case, they afford you no ground whatever to sue for a "review" of the case, or in other words, a "new trial." I hope you will not attempt, at this late day, to overthrow the correctness of the principle that, the accused is not entitled to the advantage of an irregularity in the proceedings had against him, when he refuses to defend. Mr. Stark had notice given him in the "libel" that "recorded testimony" taken in "another cause" would be adduced against him, but he refuses to make a defence, and of course offered no objection to said testimony, when the *admissibility* of the libel was tried; and yet you plead that he is entitled to the advantage of what you allege to have been an irregularity committed on his trial! Brethren, you only expose yourselves when you take this ground. I presume you do it from thoughtlessness. But to convince you (if possible,) even on the supposition, the irregularities of which you complain did really exist, that they do not entitle Mr. Stark to a new trial, let me present to your consideration certain principles of law on this particular point.

The New-York Digest, page 80, says on the subject of a *new trial*, "There are certain principles which must be considered settled. 1. Testimony must have been discovered since the former trial. 2. It must appear that the new testimony could not have been obtained with reasonable diligence on the former trial. 3. It must be material to the issue. 4. It must go to the *merits* of the case. 5. It must not be cumulative." On page 82, it says, "A new trial will not be granted on the ground of the admission of improper evidence on the (former) trial, unless there be probable grounds to believe that *injustice* has been done by the admission of such testimony." Again on page 83, it says, "To induce the granting of a new trial, there should be strong probable grounds to believe that the merits of the case have not been fully and fairly tried, and that *injustice* has been done." These extracts are too plain and pointed to require comment. Every reflecting mind must in-



stantly perceive the absurdity of asking a new trial for your friend, when you do not even dare affirm that the Synod decided wrong on the merits of the case, or did *injustice* in convicting him of being the author of the "anonymous pamphlets" and the "K. paper," and when you do not pretend that any new testimony "material to the issue" has been discovered.

But I add that the foregoing plain and obvious principles are incorporated in the system of Presbyterian Discipline. In Stewart's Collections (Book iv. tit. 5. sec. 7.) it is provided, that "Assemblies from which their lies no appeal, may review or recall their own decisions, on some new or extraordinary discovery." And we meet with the following in the General Assembly's Book of Discipline, (ch. ix.) "If after a trial before any judicatory, new testimony be discovered, which is supposed to be *highly important to the exculpation of the accused*, it is proper for him to ask, and for the judicatory to grant a new trial.—But the superior judicatory ought to be well satisfied that the alleged testimony is of *real importance*, before they determine to put the inferior judicatory to the trouble of a new trial." On the whole then, it seems, that in both civil and ecclesiastical discipline, on application for a review, or new trial, mere *technicalities* are thrown aside, and the *merits* of the case becomes the point in question; and this course is absolutely necessary in order to preserve courts from being continually pestered with applications to reverse former decisions. Taking the matter therefore, just as you represent it, viz: that the Synod did not observe all the technicalities of order, here are well established and, I may say, sacred principles, which array themselves in opposition to the prayer contained in your Memorial.

In this connection, I cannot avoid stating a maxim, according to which, I think, remonstrants ought to govern themselves; viz: never to remonstrate against a thing which they themselves were the chief instruments in producing. One of yourselves, brethren, (the Rev. P. Bullions) was cited to attend Synod as a witness in the case of Mr. Stark, but he begged to be excused on the ground, that his testimony given in "another cause" would answer the purpose equally well; adding at the same time, that his engagements in the Academy rendered it almost impossible for him to leave home, and that if he were compelled to attend the Synod, he could not testify any differently from what he had already done. The Presbytery, always ready to yield to what appears reasonable, acquiesced. But now, alas! we have our brother expressing in the strongest terms his abhorrence at the "unjust and oppressive" conduct of the Synod in admitting his written testimony as evidence in the case! Strange inconsistency! The brother is now remonstrating against the very thing for which he then plead. Having artfully drawn the Presbytery and Synod into an irregularity as he supposes, he now turns upon them and charges them with every thing that is indecent and disorderly! The poor unsuspecting Presbytery of Albany will learn for the future to scrutinize very closely the counsels of that brother. Whether he intended to lay a trap for his brethren, I am not sufficiently versed in the art of Jesuitism to tell; but if not, he was once of the same mind with the Synod, that regularly recorded testimony, though taken in "another cause," was, under certain circumstances, admissible; and therefore he ought not to use the harsh language which he does relative to the Synod's conduct in this particular.—Again, your singular and anomalous course renders it justifiable in me to remind

you and the public also, that another of your number (Dr. A. Bullions) was cited by the Presbytery of Albany to give testimony in Mr. Stark's *own case*, but he refused to obey that citation, without even deigning to render an excuse for his delinquency; and now *he* also is found remonstrating against the Synod's course, in proceeding to try and convict Mr. Stark without *his testimony*, yes, "without a *single witness* being examined on the trial to prove the things whereof he was accused!" Without offering any comment on such conduct, I have only to say, that instead of remonstrating against the Synod, he ought rather to be expressing his gratitude for the lenity that has been shown him, inasmuch as he has not been *himself* laid under a sentence of suspension for his refusal to give testimony in the case. Indeed, had the following rule of Presbyterian Discipline been faithfully applied, some brethren would have been occupied with other matters than the writing of "remonstrances." "A member of the church summoned as a witness and refusing to appear, may be censured for contumacy, according to the circumstances of the case."

Dear brethren, you betray great inattention to ecclesiastical rules and precedents, when you allege that "the suspension of a minister of the gospel, without a single witness being examined on the trial, is wholly unprecedented in the Secession or any other church." Examine once more the history of ecclesiastical courts of judicature, and see whether the rule requiring suspension for *contumacy alone* has never been applied in the "Secession or any other church." The rule referred to is expressed by one Presbyterian Body, in these words, "If a minister accused of atrocious crimes, being twice duly cited, shall refuse to attend the Presbytery, he shall be immediately suspended. And if after another citation, he shall refuse to attend, he shall be deposed as contumacious." Had Mr. Stark been suspended according to the spirit of this rule, nay, deposed, justice would only have been done him, and the procedure would not have been so "unprecedented" as you seem to imagine. Again, where is the "unprecedented" conduct of a church court, in suspending a minister on the ground of *testimony*, although a *witness* may not have been examined in the case? There was indeed technically speaking no *witness* examined on the trial of Mr. Stark, but yet there was *testimony* adduced. (I hope the ambiguity in your language was not designed.) And even rejecting all that kind of testimony against which you object, you know that there was *other testimony* presented on the trial in question, testimony against which there are no objections, and testimony which of itself, in my opinion, was every way sufficient for the conviction of the accused. I mean the testimony arising from the style, manner, sentiments, peculiarity of expression, &c. of the pamphlets themselves, of which Mr. Stark was accused with being the author. What now, brethren, becomes of the justness and accuracy of your great assertion respecting the *unprecedented* nature of the Synod's decision in the case of Mr. Stark?

Your *Fourth* reason for remonstrating "against the proceedings in the case referred to," is, "because of the injury they have done already, and if not corrected, are still likely to do in the church." While I entirely differ with you, brethren, as to the matter of fact here expressed, I do very cordially subscribe to the sentiment contained in your next sentence, and which I think completely upsets your alleged ground of grievance. Church courts are to act uprightly and leave all consequences with God; but they are responsible for all evil consequences

arising from an "unjust and unwarrantable exercise of authority." This is true doctrine. And as I have clearly shown that such an exercise of authority by the Synod as you refer to, has no existence, save in the imagination of a few dissatisfied individuals, I have no work left me on this part of your Memorial. It may be stated however, that the handsome compliment, you pay the "first congregation in New-York," cannot easily be misunderstood. I also admit that that is a very numerous congregation, and by far the *wealthiest* that was in our Body at the time they withdrew from us; but it will be doing them no injustice, when I state, that many small and feeble congregations far excelled them, of late years, in supporting the institutions of the Associate Church, by pecuniary contributions. As to their "intelligence and piety, and their stedfast adherence to the principles of the Associate Church," I have nothing to say, only, that I do not think, they gave the very best evidence of possessing these *attributes*, when they resolved to follow their suspended pastor out of the communion of the Associate Church, before they had acquainted themselves with the grounds of his suspension. But doubtless, they are far less to be blamed than some of you, dear brethren, who have encouraged them in this course, by justifying both them and their pastor. I fear, from this, that many will be inclined to think that your own "stedfast adherence to the principles of the Associate Church," is rather problematical. The "great portion of their brethren in other congregations who justify them in their present position," is not, I apprehend, so very great as you would have it believed; but let it be ever so great, I hazard nothing in saying, that it embraces such only as have been imposed upon and misled, by such unfair statements and representations as are contained in your Memorial.

The *Fifth and last* of your grievances, and which has furnished you with additional cause of remonstrance, is, that the Synod in deciding Mr. Stark's case, did not pay "a due regard to the state of things in this section of the church for a number of years past." It seems, then, that the very thing, for which all candid and intelligent people must approve the conduct of Synod, is to you a matter of sore grievance, viz. that that court was enabled to decide the case under consideration, simply on the ground of its own *merits* without regard to *extraneous circumstances*, and without consulting the local feelings and prejudices of any! I cannot allow myself to make any comment on this your *last* reason of remonstrance, as it must be obvious to all, that you had run out of *reasons* before you got the length of *Fifthly*. I have no objections, however, to what you state by way of confessing sin, in this part of your Memorial, though I do object to your attempting to implicate others besides yourselves. It is pretty well understood throughout our church, who have been the real authors of all the "division, strife and contention," which has existed in "this section of it for a number of years past." And I apprehend, that the appearance of your Memorial will tend greatly to strengthen former opinion on this particular point. I must say, however, that your description of the state of matters in this section of the church, appears to me to be rather overstrained; but at the same time, it is confessed, that here there is too much ground for lamentation. "It must needs be that offences come; but woe to that man by whom the offence cometh."

Brethren, I have finished my examination of your *Five* grounds of grievance and reasons of remonstrance, and am not altogether without hope, that some of you at least, will become convinced that they are en-

tirely too weak and lame to bear the weight of your Memorial. The whole subject has suggested to my mind a few additional remarks which I will briefly lay before you, and then conclude my letter, which I fear you may already consider as quite too long.

In the perusal of your Memorial, there is one thing which cannot escape particular notice: In the account, you give of the proceedings had in Mr. Stark's case, you evidently follow his version of the matter, and entirely overlook the *facts in the case* as given in the Narrative of the Presbytery of Albany. This seems to argue a great degree of recklessness. It has caused a judicious correspondent to say—"It gives me great distress to think of it (the Memorial;) because if it was drawn up while the Narrative of the Albany Presbytery was before them, it leaves not a hope of convincing them by *any testimony or sound reason.*"

There is another thing which cannot but be noticed by persons reading your Memorial; that while you charge the Synod with breaking rules, your Memorial itself is a gross violation of a very prominent rule. I refer to the rule, which is to be observed in the "review and reversal" of judicial deeds, and which has already been stated in this letter. You do not pretend that any "extraordinary discovery" has been made, that any new testimony has been obtained "going to the merits of the case," or that any consideration *affecting the issue* is found to exist, and yet you pray the Synod to *review* and *reverse* their decision in Mr. Stark's case! You do not, indeed, even pretend that the Synod erred in judgment on the *merits* of the case, your only difficulty is that certain *technicalities* were not duly observed. As to the "merits of the case," you are doubtless of the same mind with the Synod. For, *two* of your number have declared under oath their *belief* that the main charge in the libel on which Mr. S. was tried, was *true*, viz: that Mr. S. was the author of the anonymous pamphlets, and have also stated as the grounds of their *belief* such facts and circumstances, as must produce the *same belief* in any unprejudiced and "well balanced mind."—One of your number also has confessed (judicially) his sin for the part he had in the publication of the pamphlets in question, thereby acknowledging in general the correctness of the charges in the libel grounded on those pamphlets. Besides, with respect to another important charge in the libel, viz: the affair of the "K. paper," Mr. Stark himself does not pretend to deny the truth of it: for in his review of the Presbytery's Narrative he passes over, in dead silence, all that part of it which is occupied with the proof of this atrocious charge. Convinced, therefore, as you must be, of the righteousness of the Synod's decision on the merits of this case, it was hardly expected, that in the face of reason, and an express rule on the subject, you should now be found petitioning for a *reversal* of that decision!

It is well known, brethren, that you are exceedingly remiss in attending the meetings of the Associate Synod; and this circumstance is calculated to render your Memorial somewhat suspicious. During the last twelve years I have myself attended Synod as often as the whole of you put together, except *one time*. Two of you have not attended at all during that period; and other two of you have only attended once apiece. There were *none* of you present at the last meeting of the Synod, against whose proceedings you are now remonstrating, nor did you forward any excuses, I believe, for your absence—a circumstance that would justify the Synod in promptly rejecting your Memorial. It is certainly a hard case, when those who attend to the public affairs of the church, become criminated, and have their proceedings censured and condemned by those who lie at home and save themselves the labor and expense, which the others, for the good of the church, are willing to encounter. And should your Memorial be favorably received, much will be done to discourage those who are in the habit of attending the meetings of the Synod, and much to encourage others, who, like yourselves, are in the habit of staying at home, minding their own concerns.

Many will be ready to regard your course, dear brethren, as verifying the statement which lately gave some of you great offence; viz: "that there were a few ministers among us, who were trying to break down the discipline of the Associate Church." Mr. Stark was no sooner suspended, than certain ministers, if he tells the truth, wrote him letters of condolence on account of the "persecution" he was suffering, and encouraged him to resist the *unrighteous* decision of the Synod. These, in a letter to

the Editor of the Christian Magazine, he styles "the pious and the orthodox" in our church, and expresses a hope that through their influence the deed of his suspension will be rescinded. It is well understood that you form, if not the whole, at least a part of Mr. S's "pious and orthodox" friends and correspondents; and now we have you remonstrating against the Synod for daring to exercise discipline on the said Mr. Stark. If, therefore, your Memorial, together with the fact just mentioned, be cot an attempt to break down the discipline of the Associate Church, it certainly will present to many that appearance.

It will be difficult, I apprehend, to convince the public, that your motives in this matter are altogether of the purest kind; because it will be remembered, that one of your number, (laying gratitude aside,) has a deep interest at stake with respect to the credibility of the statements contained in the anonymous pamphlets; for Mr. Stark's conviction on the charge of writing "calumnious and mendacious" pamphlets affects to a certain extent that brother's character. His zeal, therefore, to have the decision in question reversed, is easily accounted for. But it will also be remembered that three more of your number are the relatives and special advocates of the brother just referred to. People, therefore, will think that in this matter, you are not entirely "actuated," as you say, "by a sincere desire to promote the best interests of the Secession Church, and the cause of truth and righteousness." The remaining two of your number, being honest and unsuspecting, I am afraid, have allowed themselves to be imposed upon in this whole affair.

You speak of the Synod's course towards Mr. Stark, as being "unjust and oppressive," but do you really think that after a "review" of the whole case, the conclusion would be any different? What good, then, so far as he is concerned, do you expect to accomplish by your Memorial? You speak, indeed, in one place of a "reversal of the decision in order to a review." This might benefit your friend, but it would be *ridiculously absurd*, and I trust the Synod will never become so idiotized as to commit such a rash and unexampled act. Common sense teaches that "the review" ought to precede "the reversal." A review, or new trial takes place for the purpose of ascertaining whether the decision in question is to stand or be reversed. In the present case, were the Synod first to reverse, they would most probably be saved the trouble of any after review; as I much question, whether they would catch Mr. Stark again, or some of the witnesses either. But if a "review" simply were granted, besides the dangerous precedent this would set, and the transgression of a fundamental rule, together with the many evil consequences that would inevitably flow from it, the final issue, so far as Mr. Stark is concerned, you must be aware, could be no more favorable to him than it stands at present.

It is about four months since I learned, that your plan was to get, by means of a Memorial, as many of our ministers and elders, as you could, committed on this subject; and then for as many of yourselves and your elders as possible to go on to Synod; and thus carry your measures by a combination of force and artifice. A part of this plan has been executed, or attempted to be executed by the circulation of your Memorial; in the preamble to which, you are bold enough to declare your object, viz. that the ministers and elders receiving the Memorial "might be prepared to act with judgment in this trying crisis," that is to say, on your *ex parte* statements. Surely, you must draw very largely on the credulity of our ministers and elders if you suppose they would form any judgment in the case at all, on your *one-sided* representation of it. Hence to aid them in forming a *correct judgment*, I have thought it a duty to publish this letter to you, that they might have before them an outline of the facts and arguments, that can be urged on the *other side*. Besides, all the members of the church have a right to know what is the state of matters among us, what are our difficulties, and what are the grounds of "strife and contention," if any such there be.

I have many other things to mention, dear brethren, but time will not permit me at present. I may, however, take occasion to present them to your consideration at some future time. In the mean time, allow me to express the hope that enough has been said to convince you of the propriety of dropping your opposition to the proceedings of the last Synod, and of withholding from the next your Memorial. Indeed nothing would give me greater pleasure than to find you so doing. I am extremely sorry that the appearance of your Memorial should check the growth of that friendship and brotherly fellowship that had begun to show themselves "in this section of the church;" and it would afford not only myself but many others unfeigned joy to find you studying "the things that make for peace;" and "endeavoring to keep the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace." "Behold, how good and how pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in unity." O Jerusalem! "for my brethren and companions' sakes, I will now say, Peace be within thee." Yours respectfully,

A MEMBER OF SYNOD.

THE  
RELIGIOUS MONITOR,

AND

EVANGELICAL REPOSITORY.

---

MAY, 1837.

---

ART. I. *What is Present Duty.*

This is an important question at all times, but especially so at the present, with reference to the preservation of our rights against the invasions of Popery. It was an answer to such a question, that I promised in my former paper on the value of our liberty, and the danger to which it is exposed. Feeble as my endeavors may be on this great subject, I trust the reader will indulge me with his attention. When an enemy attacks with a mixed power, it becomes necessary to come to the defence with a similar one. Popery comes against us with a mixed power—a political and ecclesiastical power; therefore we ought to have this in view. It indeed bears the name only of the latter, on which account our political sentinels are allowing it to pass quietly into the midst of our camp. But the truth is, its ecclesiastical power, is but a cloak to hide the deadly weapons of the other, until the moment for action arrives. Some things which ought to be presently done, must therefore of necessity pertain to the magistrate both in his legislative and executive capacity. On this I will not speak here, only this much—He ought to be a terror to evil doers. Consistently with this view of his office, he never can admit the oath of an adhering Roman Catholic in any case, in which an oath *can be* violated to the injury either of the Protestant religion, or free government, or to the advantage of the Roman church. For it is not only the interest of Roman Catholics so to do, but it still is, as it long has been, one of their avowed principles, while the strongest inducements to act upon it are held forth. If he cannot consistently admit their oath in any such case, he can neither admit them into office nor to citizenship. If he does, he admits them to perjury, and the perpetration of every crime against innocent and unsuspecting society, to which their well known principles incline them, and their absolute obedience to the Pope binds them, whenever he shall judge it fit time to give the word. But there is small reason indeed to hope that any bar to their progress of this kind will be put in. Not that I suppose all the public men of this nation to be so ignorant of history as not to know what Popery has been, or so uninformed of the events

of the present time, as not to know what it now is. I will not offer such an insult to them : or that there is no truly patriotic men among them so far unawed by party influence as to express their minds on this subject without reserve. I know and believe there are among them spirits as free and independent as they are elevated. But that they should witness in silence Roman Catholic Priests, and people coming to do at the ballot boxes what they dare not so much as name at the bayonet—to overturn our liberties, can be accounted for only on supposition of national infatuation. Some things ought to be done by community. And I must cordially acquiesce in much that is done. The prompt and fearless avowal of public sentiment respecting Popery and its present designs ; the active perseverance and diligence that is employed to detect jesuitical sophistry, and to bring the interior of their nunneries to public view cannot be too much applauded or vigorously prosecuted. The associations that are forming through the States for diffusing knowledge on the subject by all peaceable and orderly methods, is as it should be. And I should hail it as a good sign, if all the friends of civil and religious liberty, especially the editorial part of them were taking proper measures to concentrate all their strength, and to co-operate in this work. If only the press were free and faithful all would be safe. Whatever differences may be conscientiously kept up among Protestant churches on other subjects, there ought to be none respecting popery. Let them too unite against the common foe in such a way as will not require any one to sacrifice what she is conscientious in holding for truth. Much good might be expected if they would come forward in such a way. What that way should be, it would be presumption for an individual to say. But one thing I am sure they could do, which would be exceedingly important. They could all join in *watching* every movement of popery throughout the country, and transmitting the intelligence to the centre of operations. They could be eyes to the public mind, looking at once on all the serpentine motions of the jesuits. And I would suggest whether jesuits are not, in many ways little suspected, spreading their poison. I would ask whether they are not working their way in district schools in the country, and poisoning the youth with their insidious tenets ? and whether they have not their secret agents as other associations have public ones, going through the country secretly, embracing every opportunity that offers to serve their cause ? They have adopted this expedient before. This suggestion occurred to the writer of this article upon finding their books in one instance with a pedlar, which he affected not to know, after admitting that he had them for his own personal devotion.

Ministers of the word ought to keep up at suitable intervals, the subject of Popery before their people, as it is exhibited in the Scriptures. And in particular its irreconcilable spirit to any thing like freedom. What else can a system be that is represented as coming from hell and as returning to it again at the end of its time, in the *act of fighting against Christ* and all his followers ? Wherever popery succeeds to the end of its being, it is to be by means of “ *all deceivableness of unrighteousness,*” and how long soever it sustains itself, it is by “ *deceit and violence.*” When the time arrives, it will be by these means that it will overcome and kill God’s witnesses.

If men will not believe, that, in the sad event of their succeeding and sustaining themselves in the United States, it will be by these means, viz. deceit and violence ; let them not pretend to believe that the

Bible is the inspiration of God. If these things were faithfully and fully exhibited in scripture proof to the religious public, we might hope that under God they would awaken some that are sleeping, and quicken the energies of others.

Both ministers and people should, while the moments of quiet continue, weigh with all care the worth of those sentiments which they preach and profess. They who preach human ability have nothing worth disputing with the Papists about in point of theology. They ought either to renounce their scheme of doctrine, and take up with the truth of Christ, or join the Roman church at once. Their faith is not worth the suffering of persecution for, neither can it support them under it. But you, who have built your hope on the righteousness of Christ imputed, and received by faith which is of God's operation, cannot choose a better position on which to meet the coming tempest. Here is a valuable consideration for which you cannot possibly risk or endure too much. Stand here and the "gates of hell shall not prevail against you." Yea, every Bible truth pertaining either to faith or practice is the pure gold, and worth contending for even unto death. And when a suffering time shall be fully come, and tries men's souls to the utmost, it will be of immense importance to have the worth of these before our mind, and operating on our hearts: nothing without this will enable us to stand. Therefore I say, consider it carefully *now* what it is you may be called to suffer for. For if suffering times come, they may bring enough to do with them besides this.

It would be wise and provident to instil these things into the minds of the youth; there is no harm in supposing that the cunning old serpent is contriving snares and traps to catch them—to allure them into his dens by fair speeches, false promises and jesuitical sophistry. From the past history of these men, we may learn that no means will be left untried to proselyte the rising generation. Therefore, the most speedy and energetic means should be taken to fortify and prepare the youthful mind.

Christians ought to study when it is a duty, according to scripture example, to flee from trouble and persecution. Christ says, "when they persecute you in one city flee ye to another." When this is the duty of our day and circumstances, it would be presumption to stay and suffer, it would be tempting providence and a casting of life or property away foolishly. But there is also a time and a case when we cannot flee without betraying the cause of truth. When we ought to remain at our posts at all hazards. Let this be maturely considered now; examine those cases when Christ and his apostles, and especially Paul fled, and when they stood their ground, and they will give us sufficient light on the subject.

Self preservation is the duty of christians in common with other men. This also ought to be duly considered. What means of self defence may christian people warrantably employ? when is it time to have recourse to them? and how far should they be carried? are questions of grave import. Were enlightened and sound answers found to them now, they might anticipate much trouble and inward disquietment of mind in the day of calamity.

But the main point of present duty is yet to be mentioned, without which all means for our defence and preservation will avail us nothing. *It is regarding our sins and provocations against the Most High.* And I am much, very much afraid that this will be least and last attended to. Sel-



fish in the extreme, we would willingly have the shield of his power over us, but at the same time are slow and reluctant to do any thing for his honor.

"The Lord is with you while ye be with him," said Oded to Aza, and equally certain it is, that 'if ye forsake him he also will forsake you.'" The histories of all nations and churches that have been since the world began, are witnesses to the truth of this word. It is one of the immutable principles in his government of corporate bodies, to which there is no exception. Sooner will the heavens and the earth pass away and all nations become extinct forever, than a departure from this shall be. If then a people have forsaken God, all means will be ineffectual for their safety, until they return to him under a proper sense of their sins. That we as a people have sinned in forsaking him cannot be a matter of doubt. We have sinned at no ordinary rate. Blessed with privileges beyond all that have gone before us, we have sinned beyond all. We have gone faster and farther in that dark and downward course than any other people. We have committed the sin of a hundred years, in ten. The wrinkles of old age are upon us before the term of our childhood has expired: we have cast off all fear. A flood of wickedness that defies law and equity to restrain it, rolls over the land, and bids fair to swallow up all in anarchy and atheism. All, all are guilty—church and state, from the highest ruler to the lowest citizen—the ministers of religion and the most obscene professor—the philosopher, the lawyer and the statesman, the trader, the mechanic and farmer, all are involved in the sin of the nation. They have drunk deep in the maddening cup of pride, ambition and the cursed lust of gold, and are become drunken and stagger in their vomit.

One of three things then must come out of this, either we must come to a true sense and confession of our sins, or we must be punished for them, or God must give up his government. The last is impossible, and the first is extremely improbable as regards the generality. Yet if it could be, we have reason to hope it would be a lengthening of our tranquility—if we would as a nation break off from our sins by righteousness, and our iniquities by showing mercy to the poor.

But there will be a few that will be disposed to hearken to this. There has been and will always be a few—not confined to any church or any place, but scattered over the country. They love the gospel in its purity. They know that God wrought a great deliverance for our fathers and for us at the reformation from Popery, and that he countenanced and advanced that great work for several generations.

They know that the reformation sowed the seeds of liberty wherever they have sprung up, in Europe or America; and that to the expanding influence of its doctrine on the human mind, is to be attributed the advanced state of society here in particular. And they know that we have made light of all this; that the reformed churches first grew cold in their love and gratitude, and then relaxation of integrity—remissness in duty,—pride and vanity succeeded, and that there have grown up in their places and under their names, a succession of men that "know not the Lord nor the mighty work which he did;" that instead of ascribing our civil and political privileges to him,—using them for his honor, and leaving them for an inheritance to our children unimpaired, we have been lifted up in pride and self sufficiency; we, though we pretended to set so high a value on freedom for ourselves, and claimed it as the birth right of the human race, have refused to

give it to others or even to let the oppressed go free. We have launched out on boundless unprincipled speculations after gain. Our main ambition is for power, for personal aggrandizement and party triumph. We have banished God from our thoughts and our councils, and expressly refused to regard his will. By this means the worst passions of human nature have been nurtured to a frightful maturity. The most unbridled licentiousness, the vilest perfidy, the foulest and most shameless corruption, are now common things. And now the aspect of things begins to appear terrible even to the stupid and the inconsiderate. And it is impossible for any to think that a day of retribution can be far off. But to the few, that sigh in secret for these things, and try to keep their garments clean, I would suggest as a direction to them, suitable for the time, the advice of the prophet at a similar time, Zeph. 2, 3. "Seek ye the Lord all ye meek of the earth which have wrought his judgments, seek righteousness, seek meekness; it may be ye shall be hid in the day of the Lord's anger." This is the only course which we can take for safety. It lies out of the view of the popular world, and beneath the observation of the Great Spirit, and on that account is the more safe; in a word, it is to live and walk with God. It was the negative side of this same course that Jeremiah pointed out to Baruch in an evil time, when judgment was on the very threshold. "Thus shalt thou say unto him, the Lord saith, thus behold that which I have built will I break down, and that which I have planted will I pluck up, even this whole land. And seekest thou great things for thyself? *seek them not*, for behold I will bring evil upon all flesh saith the Lord, but thy life will I give unto thee for a prey in all places whither thou goest." Jer. xlv. 4. Then be advised not to seek great things, a great name or great property, or a high office; live retired and hidden as much as in you lies.

One thing more. It is your duty to be constant in prayer for the churches and for the nation. It may be that God will be pleased so far to regard it, as to delay or mitigate his judgments. Here it is proper to remember, that God would have spared Sodom and Gomorrah at Abraham's intercession if there had been ten righteous in them. We believe there are yet many tens here and tens of hundreds too. How many times did God remove destruction from Pharaoh and his people at the prayer of Moses. How often did he spare Israel for the intreaty of this same praying individual. The destruction of Nineveh was put off because the king and his people feared the word of the Lord and fasted. Because even wicked Ahab, who sold himself to do mischief, walked softly and humbled himself outwardly, the Lord would not bring all the evil in his days. Who knows, therefore, if he will not return and leave a blessing; if we seek him with all our heart it may be that he will not bring all the evil in our day, and we may be allowed in the undisturbed possession of all our privileges, and come to our grave in peace.

EGO.

---

**ART. II. *A Caution against a common mode of Deception.***

"He said unto him, I am a Prophet also as thou art."—1 Kings xiii. 8,

This verse exhibits one of the means most commonly used by the backsliding and erroneous for the purpose of seducing those, who ad-

here to the cause of God and truth, to turn back with them—a means which has been more successful to this purpose than persecution itself, a means which in this day of defection is handled with peculiar cunning by the adversary—here you have it in the address of the old prophet of Bethel, to the man of God from Judah: “I am also as thou art.” This, it will be seen from the narrative, was successful in seducing a man who had exhibited a singular example of boldness, self-denial, and attachment to the cause of God—a man whom neither the fear of the wrath of the king, nor the hope of rewards and honors, could shake from the faithful discharge of his duty, yet this man was brought by the smooth words and fair speeches of a pretended friend, to turn back and transgress the commandment of the Lord.

The man of God from Judah, is to be considered a professor of the true religion: he had that day borne a faithful testimony against the idolatrous worship at Bethel: and that this testimony might be followed up in practice, he was expressly commanded to turn his back upon that corrupt society, as soon as he had delivered the Lord’s message. On the other hand the old prophet who seduced him must be viewed as a backslider. He had been brought up in the school of the prophets, and professed the true religion, when it was in credit in the days of Solomon; but when Jeroboam set up idolatry at Bethel, he still continued to reside there, and thus dropt his testimony for the true religion and if he did not attend himself upon the idolatrous worship of the calves, he made no opposition to it, and even permitted his sons to be present.

These two men we think may fairly be considered as representing two classes of persons, viz: professors of the true religion, and backsliders. And the conduct of the old prophet of Bethel towards the man of God from Judah, may be considered as furnishing a striking representation of the behaviour of the erroneous and backsliding towards professors of the true religion. We see the same assiduity in enticing them back, the same pretended friendship, and we hear the same smooth words, still employed for this purpose: *I am also as thou art.*

The days of persecution have now passed away; those who maintain a testimony for the truth cannot be put down in this way. Their opponents seem sensible that nothing can be gained by attacking them with scriptural weapons: this would only verify the words of the psalmist: *Their sword shall enter into their own heart, and their bows shall be broken.* But they hate their testimony, because it condemns principles and practices on which their hearts are set; they hate their strictness, because they refuse to extend to them the right hand of fellowship. They therefore take the same method as the old prophet of Bethel practised with such success upon the man of God from Judah—they hold out the idea that we are all the same, that there is no difference, or that it is not worth contending about. “I am also as thou art,” said the old prophet: well, certainly, if this is so, we will find him accompanying the man of God; he will forsake the idolatry of Bethel, and go to the sanctuary of the true God at Jerusalem. But no, this is far from being his design; he becomes all one with the man of God, that he may induce him to go back with *him*, and thereby transgress the commandment of God, and destroy the testimony which he had that day faithfully borne.

And what is the design of those, who use similar language to us at

the present day? "We are all one," say they, "there is no difference:" very well, we might reply if this is the case, you can have no objection to accompany us—to abandon human inventions and corruptions in the worship of God, and unite with us in a profession of the truth, and a testimony against these things. This we might think a natural conclusion; duty would require this; a separation without cause should not be maintained a moment longer in the Church of Christ. Urge this duty then upon those who address you in similar language to that of the old prophet, and you will soon see that their design is like his, to persuade you to go back with them. This is in fact their way to be all one; it cannot be on any other terms; they act as strictly here as the most rigid advocate of the purest orthodoxy.

Thus in the great controversy agitated at the present day in the General Assembly branch of the Presbyterian church; this is the mode by which the advocates of the new divinity are endeavoring to win their way to power. "We are also as ye are," say they to their old school brethren, there is no difference between us, we only use different language in explaining the same thing. Why then, it may be asked, fill the church of Christ with discord and strife?—drop your explanations and unite with your brethren in maintaining the doctrines of the *Confession*. But no, they have no such intention; their design is like that of the old prophet to persuade their brethren to go back with them. Others again, who adopt a human psalmody in the praises of God, throw out to us the same idea; "we are all one," say they, "we can sing *your* psalms just as well as our own, and like them just as well." Why then, it may be asked, pursue a practice calculated to perpetuate division and strife in the church of Christ? Do we engage in contention for no purpose, but to make ourselves the sport of the world, and afford to the infidel matter of reproach against our holy religion? If you are all one with us on this subject, cast away the useless cause of strife, and unite with us in the use of a scriptural psalmody, and give the world ground to say: "Behold how good and how pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in unity."—But no, very far from it. They profess *sameness* with us for the same purpose as the old prophet of Bethel—that we may be induced to go back with them.

But there is a certain quarter, from whence we most frequently hear this wily language, it seems indeed chiefly depended upon, for drawing away our people from their testimony, and in numerous instances, it has been successful for this purpose, with the weak and unstable. "We are all one," say they, "seceders as well as you, there is no difference." Now we will endeavor in the spirit of that charity which thinketh no evil, to believe that many who use this language, do not intend to deceive, yet we cannot help thinking that between this language and their practice, there is a glaring inconsistency. They tell us that we are all one. Well, may we not reply, brethren, if this is so, why did you separate from our communion? Are separations to be made where no difference exists? Time was that we were all seceders, few in number, it is true, but we presented a united front against the enemy; *you* forsook us for a new connection, *you* erected a separate communion; if this took place while we were all one, it presents one of the most inexcusable rents that ever has been made in the church of Christ. But we will not go back so far: perhaps there was some little difference *then*, but after-reflection and examination have brought our brethren to see with us eye to eye. Well, if this is so, you can have no objection

surely, to take up our testimony which contains an exhibition of the truth, and a pointed condemnation of prevailing errors and corruptions in religion. If, as you say, we are all the same, to withhold your aid from such a testimony, at such a time as this, is to weaken the hands of its friends and harden its enemies in opposition, and keep up divisions in the church of Christ without cause—sins of no ordinary magnitude. And finally if we are all the same, why such efforts to draw away our members, to disturb our congregations, to denounce our covenant engagements as breaches of the second commandment, to ridicule our testimony as unreasonably strict, and hold up our people to the world as uncharitable bigots? Most assuredly, brethren, when we witness all this, you must presume much upon our credulity or simplicity, to expect we should receive your professions of being all the same. We cannot help thinking, you are practising the same acts upon us as the old prophet of Bethel, and with the same design, that we may be induced to turn back with you, and renounce that explicit, pointed profession which we are endeavoring to maintain, for one which experience testifies can be modified to suit time and place.

Let those who are endeavoring to bear testimony for God and his truth at the present day, then, be upon their guard against the man who says to them, "I am also as thou art." Let them take warning from the melancholy end of the man of God from Judah, not to turn back with him. Rather say to him, if this is so, "Come with us, and we will do thee good." Take your stand here, and you will soon be eased of his importunity, and find out, that after all, he considers there is some little difference between you and him. R.

### ART. III. *An Answer to the Query in relation to Debarrances.*

MR. EDITOR.—Somebody in your March No. styling himself a Seceder, and not a "young one," solicits an answer to the following question—"Has the practice of the Reformed Churches of debarring the profane, the wicked and hypocritical from the Lord's Table, any warrant or authority from the word of God?"

I think, Sir, that things must have come to a strange pass, when a Seceder finds it needful to ask such a question. Because it seemeth to me, that it must be either ignorance of the Scriptures and of that holy ordinance in particular, or a verging towards open communion, or most culpable carelessness in solemn duty, that has laid the ground for his complaint and his question, and I am afraid that which ever of these it may be, it is an incurable disease, and that answering his question will do but little good. However, to state the truth is desirable for its own sake, and it is peculiarly pleasant in these shaking times to perceive how firmly every part of our Religious profession and allowed practices, is built on the word of God.

My answer to the question is affirmative. There is authority and warrant from the word of God for the practice in question. First: There is nothing in common with this holy ordinance, and the wicked, profane and hypocritical. It makes no provision—affords no protection to them in these sins. It differs *toto celo* from them. It de-

signs destruction to the least and last remnant of these vices. Therefore, persons characterized by them, cannot partake really and truly of this ordinance. They cannot on their principles and with their frame of heart show forth the Lord's death, or answer in any respect its design. It cannot benefit them, they can only eat the bread and drink the wine, that is all. Reason therefore says that it is useless and unsuitable for them to go there.

Second. The word expressly declares that persons of this description are unsuitable. Let the reader turn to Gal. v. 19—21, a passage which has been often read before dispensing the Lord's Supper, and let him candidly answer what the Apostle can mean when he says, verse 23 "against such"—viz, love, joy, peace, long suffering, &c., "there is *no law*," if it is not that—against "adultery, fornication," &c. there is *a law*. The same inference is warranted from 1 Corinth. v. 8. "Therefore let us keep the feast, not with old leaven, neither with the leaven of malice and wickedness, but with the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth." Can these words be tortured into an admission that a person though fermenting with malice and wickedness, or insincerity, yet may keep the feast? Malice, wickedness and insincerity, are ingredients in the cup of devils, but the Apostle says, Ch. x. 21. "Ye cannot drink of the cup of the Lord and the cup of Devils, ye cannot be partakers of the Lord's table and of the table of Devils." The 15th Psalm both asks and answers the question of the querist, "Who is the person that shall abide in God's tabernacle—come to the table of the Lord—he who walketh uprightly, and worketh righteousness, and speaketh the truth *in his heart*, &c., he that doeth these things shall never be moved." It is fair to infer that he that doeth *not* these things *shall* be moved, viz, from his name and seat in the visible fellowship of God's tabernacle, supposing that he had, by speaking the truth with his *mouth*, got in there. Perhaps some may be disposed to restrict what is here said to the heavenly state, but that would not help the matter while the fellowship of the Lord's table, as it is taught in the word, and as wrought by the Spirit, is as pure as heaven: but I ask, how can the heavenly state be fitly represented by a tabernacle?—a tent that is pitched to be taken down again? where is it so represented? How would the church be likely to take this psalm at the time that it was penned? would she be likely to conclude that it did not lay down terms of admission into the courts of the tabernacle which David pitched on the holy hill? this right appears inadmissible and therefore this Psalm is full to the point.

Third. When the fact of profanity, wickedness or hypocrisy is susceptible of proof, the Apostle lays down express authority, 1 Corinth. v. for excluding, by a judicial sentence, the person or persons guilty, from the communion of the church, and therefore from the Lord's table, (see verses 3, 4, 5.) Surely none can have a doubt that such ought to be excluded, else what end would church government serve, or how could she be distinguished from the world lying in wickedness? Each of these considerations might lead any sober thinking person to expect, that doctrinal debarring had authority from the word. If the above passages with many others, are applicable to rule the fellowship of the church, and the Lord's table in particular; and if we have a warrant to explain and apply them to the conscience, we have a warrant to debar—and to say, "if your character is of this description, this ordinance is not for you, we discharge you in God's name from coming in such a character." If it be warrantable from the word to declare such and such

characters as admissible to the fellowship of the church, can it be unwarrantable to declare them inadmissible to the Lord's Table? If it is warrantable and commanded to refuse them or reject them (as the case may be) when known, judicially, can it be unwarrantable to do the same thing doctrinally, although personally unknown. Is it not to pass the same judgment upon the same grounds, though the manner be different.

Fourth. But I consider that 1 Corinth. ii. 27,—29, amounts to an express warrant, "Wherefore, whosoever shall eat this bread and drink this cup of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord; but let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of that bread and drink of that cup: for he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation to himself, not discerning the Lord's body." There are many things that would render our eating and drinking unworthy of that holy ordinance. They are either implied or expressed, in each of the texts quoted above, and in many others; and we have authority as above inferred to explain and apply them to the conscience before communicating, as well as at any other time. But we have authority direct from this passage to say to them, "If your conscience accuse you of these things, you will 'eat and drink unworthily.' Your heart and life will not be suitable to or becoming this holy ordinance, but dishonoring and degrading to it. If you eat and drink this bread and cup of the Lord in your present condition, you will commit a great sin, you will be 'guilty of the body and blood of the Lord.' Your conduct in this matter would imply (although you may not formally intend it,) that his body and blood was an 'unholy thing' and that he was no better or more worthy than the Jews thought him to be, when they crucified him, if indeed he is one spirit with such a character as you. And remember, that though your wickedness and deceit may escape detection by men, you expose yourselves to the judgments of the Lord, whom you cannot deceive or escape. We warn you of this danger, it is at your peril to come in your present state of heart, mind or life, as the case may be. We charge you not to commit this great sin.—Guilty of such things and continuing still in them you can be reputed no better than dogs, and we are forbid to 'give that which is holy to dogs.' When the king comes in to see the guests, will he not say to you, 'Friend, (you profess to be my friend and my people's, and the friend of my doctrine, and finished work,) but how is it, that you have come in hither, not having on a wedding garment.' 'But let a man examine himself'—'of his knowledge to discern the Lord's body, of his faith to feed upon him, of his repentance, love and new obedience,' and if he is really possessed of these gracious attainments, although very weak, 'let him eat of that bread, and drink of that cup,' but if he is not, let him stand back."

If the reader does not think that I have strained the passage, and I am convinced that he cannot think so fairly, he will readily perceive that it gives full and express authority for the practice in question, and is itself an example of it.

Fifth. There are sundry good reasons for pressing intending communicants to heart-searching, and for bringing them up to the touch-stone if possible on such a solemn occasion. 1. The nature and design of this holy ordinance. It embraces the whole system of gospel truth because it seals the covenant "ordered in all things and sure." It sets forth whole Christ, his person, his offices, his work, his love; it exhibits the whole counsel of God for salvation. 2. There must on account of what the ordinance is in itself, be a peculiar

necessity for having all the graces in lively exercise. If our heart be not right there will be *nothing* in our exercise at the table answerable to the ordinance. Although the principle of grace be in the heart, yet if it be not called forth into right exercise, there will still be an unsuitableness. 3. There is a solemn profession made and weighty obligations incurred at the Lord's table. 4. The benefit of this ordinance to believers is exceeding great, and will be in some measure according to the honest and painful diligence of ministers and people to have their mind and heart right with it. 5. There is a peculiar degree of dishonor cast upon Christ and the covenant of grace by neglecting any means, through the word, to bring the heart to agreement with this ordinance. Since he and the covenant is in a peculiar manner set forth in it. 6. The more fully and impressively that this ordinance sets forth spiritual and heavenly blessings, calling for a corresponding measure of spiritual mind in the communicant, by so much will the unbelief, pride and legal principles of the heart be more provoked forth to act on such an occasion. 7. It may be expected too that satan will be peculiarly active at such a time in emboldening hypocrites to presume, and driving true believers into misapprehensions and groundless fear. And very frequently he, together with some cursed lust among professors, succeeds in raising up some kind of external trouble at these times, which often causes great distraction of mind. 8. It brings down more than an ordinary measure of contempt and reproach from the enemies on the name and cause of Christ, when either the wicked, the profane, or hypocritical, or those guilty of some scandal not as yet known, come to this ordinance. For they soon discover themselves.

On account of each of these things, and much more all of them together, it becomes indispensibly necessary to be at great pains in setting the ordinance in a clear light before the people; in pointing out what is requisite in heart, exercise and life to worthily communicating, and in warning them of the sin and danger of coming without it. It would seem to me that any minister of the word who neglects this, assumes a fearful amount of responsibility. He is set there as a sentinel and watchman. And if God's holy ordinance be profanely cast to dogs; if the wicked and profane be fearfully hardened in their wickedness; and the children of God be made to stumble and fall through his neglect of faithful and close dealing with the conscience, how much has he to answer for. Perhaps some may take their excuse by saying that they discuss such points at other times. But this is not enough, we ought to "be instant *in season*." The memory may not serve the people with what has been said before. The spiritual impression dies away and needs to be renewed daily. If it is reasonable at other times, it must be doubly so before the communion. Perhaps it may be thought by others that the case of Judas forms a precedent to go by. It is however by no means clear that he was at the first supper, but admitting that he was, it will give no sanction to the admission of unfit persons, or to the neglect of doctrinal debarring. That he was a wicked man is certain, but there is no evidence that this was known to the officers of the church, or even to his fellow disciples, but only to Christ who can search the heart.

For aught that appears to the contrary, the utmost strictness may have been used with him, and he may have been admitted to the temple, and the passover in the regular way. Christ who knew him, no doubt could have shut him out, but as it could not have been done upon



such evidence as could come before men, so the doing of it could *not* be a precedent, Outwardly Judas appeared all fair, very friendly and zealous for the poor; there was therefore no access for the exercise of church discipline in his case; yet he was a wicked man, unsuitable to be at the sacramental table either of the old or new Testament, and the Redeemer repeatedly and solemnly warns him of his unfit condition and awful danger, and especially before the communion of the Lord's supper, Matt. xxvi. 21. "And as they did eat, he said verily I say unto you, one of you shall betray me, and they were exceeding sorrowful, and began every one to say unto him, Lord is it I. And he answered and said, he that dippeth his hand with me in the dish, the same shall betray me. The son of man goeth as it is written of him, but woe unto that man by whom the son of man is betrayed. It had been good for that man if he had not been born. Then Judas which betrayed him, answered and said master is it I. He said unto him, thou hast said." And two days before this in the house of Simon the Leper, Jesus said in his hearing, John xiii. 11. 12. "And ye are clean," a term well understood at that time to signify suitable and fit to be admitted by the porters into the courts of God's house, "but not all, for he knew who should betray him." If these solemn warnings do not amount to all that is pled for, it would be hard to say what would do so. For to say that a man was not clean at that time, was to declare that he was forbidden by the word to touch holy things.

If then the case of Judas attentively considered, does any thing more than another, it distinctly serves as a precedent for solemnly warning the wicked of every sort of their unfitness for the Lord's table, and that they ought not to think, that they have any right, or warrant from the word to come.

The warrantableness of the practice might be inferred from many passages, but I shall mention only one more. Heb. x. 22. "Let us draw near with a true heart in the full assurance of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and our bodies washed with pure water." The Apostle by expressly stating how we ought to draw near, does as evidently imply, that if it is otherwise with any, they ought not. He would have said for the same reasons, let no man draw near *without a true heart*, viz. with a hypocritical or insincere heart, let no man come disbelieving God's promise, Christ's all sufficiency, &c. Let none come with sin lying upon his conscience, unrelinquished, unconfessed. Let none come with any visible stain or blot upon his character. If any has the ability to separate the Apostle's expressed injunction from this *implied* one, he can also take the shadow away from the body.

Sixth. There is need for great faithfulness in this work at this very time. There is so much superficial thinking among professors respecting communion, and so many loose notions and inconsistent schemes preached and published about it, among other denominations. that ministers cannot be too pointed and painful or frequent in stating what it is, and what is required of them that would partake worthily, and also the hardening of heart, and the dismal consequences that may follow unworthy communicating. And besides this, there is so great a deadness upon the generality of christians, so much of a carnal frame in present times, that they have need of every scriptural means to arouse and quicken them if it be possible. And after all that can be done in that way, there is too much evidence to believe that it is nothing but a piece of formality with many.

**Seventh.** There ought also to be great prudence and tenderness used in this matter, lest the weak in faith be discouraged, lest the strong be puffed up with spiritual pride and the awakened sinner driven to despair.

Suppose one that has received a token and is in regular standing should by means of debarring become convinced that he was acting a hypocritical part, or that the root of the matter was not in him, I do not think, that because he ought to be discharged from coming in *that state*, that standing back is his only alternative, there is another and more excellent way before him, and that is, to come presently to the blood of sprinkling by faith, making a hearty confession in the ear of God and renouncing all his known sin, and in this way to come to the table. Suppose one in regular standing and a believer truly, yet several things may be in his case that ought to hinder him. For instance, if he is guilty of some scandal that must eventually come abroad, although secret at the communion. I do not think that he ought to come forward, however deeply sensible of his fault, and however penitent before God, because the church can have no evidence that such is the case, while his guilt at that same time must after appear. Other cases might be drawn out, but these will show the need there is for prudence and tenderness.

I know not who "Seceder" is, who makes the query, but I would say to him in conclusion, that he need not expect that all other peculiar excellencies of the reformation are to be despised and the practice in his question duly regarded. The spirit of degeneracy will keep due proportion through all the parts. This indeed is a lamentation, and will be for a lamentation. Whoever he may be, I trust and pray that no change of circumstances or of men will ever occur to lessen his esteem for, and watchfulness over, a loop or tach pertaining to God's tabernacle.

EGO.

---

#### ART. IV. *The Unveiling of Theology.\**

(Continued from page 497.)

The BELGIC CONFSSION was first written in French, A. D. 1561, to show the doctrine for which the Lowlanders were suffering, as those who were evangelic in France had suffered, from A. D. 1525. In a Synod of Belgium confirmed, it was written in Belgic, [Low Dutch,] A. D. 1579. But translated and published in Latin A. D. 1581. And again in the famous Synod of Dordt A. D. 1619, it was revised, examined, and approved. The Belgic, that is, the Dordrecht Confession, speaks nobly of the Holy Scriptures—"For since in these the whole ratio of divine worship which God exacts, is described very copiously, it is impiety for any man, even an apostle, to teach otherwise than we have long since been taught in the sacred letters, yea although he should be an angel from heaven, as saith the apostle Paul." Of governors of the church they say—"We believe in the mean time, that although it be useful and good that governors of the church should institute and

---

\* In our simplicity we thought the title, "A Comparison of Creeds," was appropriate to the nature and design of this Essay; but "Seceder" insists that *The Unveiling of Theology* is the proper title, and desires that it may be resumed; in this also he shall be gratified.—(ED. REL. MOV.)

establish some certain order among themselves for the preservation of the body the church; yet they ought studiously to be on their guard lest they decline from those [rules of order] which Christ our *only* Master has instituted. Wherefore, we reject all human inventions, and all laws which [*pro cultu Dei*] in the place of the worship of God, may by any one, be introduced, that the consciences are in any way to be bound down and restricted by them.\* This only therefore we regard [*suspicius, provide for*] which is suitable for preserving and cherishing concord and truth, and for holding all in the obedience of God."

In the xxxvi, Article, which is the last but one, we read—"We believe that our God on account of the depravity of the human race, has constituted kings, princes, and magistrates; and wills that the world be governed by laws and a settled polity, for coercing the confusion of men, and that all things among men may be conducted in right order. To this end he has committed to the magistrate the sword, for punishing indeed the wicked, but for defending the good. Furthermore, their office is, not only to exercise a care and to apply themselves with vigilance for the preservation of the established polity, but also to guard the sacred ministry, and to displace and overturn all idolatry and adultery from the worship of God, to throw down the kingdom of Antichrist, but to promote the kingdom of Christ, and to bestow labor, that the word of the gospel be every where preached, by which God may be honored and worshiped by every one, according as he exacts in his word."

The CONFESSION of faith used in the ENGLISH CONGREGATION at GENEVA, received and approved by the church of Scotland in the beginning of the Reformation, has these words—"And besides this ecclesiastical discipline, I acknowledge to belong to the church a politic magistrate, and as Moses and Hezekiah, Josiah, and other godly rulers purged the church of God from sin, superstition and idolatry; so the defence of Christ's church appertaineth to the magistrates, against all idolators and heretics, as papists, anabaptists, with such like limbs of antichrist, to root out all doctrines of devils and men, as the mass, purgatory, *limbus patrum*, prayers to saints and for the dead, free will, distinction of meats, apparel and days, vows of single life, presence at idol service, man's merits with such like."

The CONFESSION of the Faith and Doctrine believed and professed by the Protestants of SCOTLAND [was] exhibited to the estates of the same in Parliament, and by their public votes authorized, as a doctrine grounded upon the infallible word of God, August 1560. And [it was] ratified and established by act of Parliament 1567, as the public and avowed confession of faith of the CHURCH of SCOTLAND. "Of the temporal estate, only gave their votes on the contrary, the earl of Athol, the lords Somervell and Borthwick; and yet for their dissenting, they produced no better reason, but, we will believe as our fathers believed." †

The Article xx, Of General Councils, it is proper the reader should have here entire—"As we do not rashly condemn that which godly men assembled together in general councils, lawfully gathered, have approved unto us; so, without just examination, dare we not receive whatsoever is obtruded unto men, under the name of General Councils;

\* This is a difficult clause of Latin to translate. I regret that I have no Gallic copy, nor authorised English version bo.

† Knox's History of the Ref.

for plain it is, that, as they were men, so have some of them manifestly erred, and that in matters of great weight and importance. So far then as the council proveth the determination that it giveth, by the plain word of God, so far do we reverence and embrace the same: but if men, under the name of a council, pretend to forge unto us new articles of our faith, or to make constitutions repugnant to the word of God, then utterly we may refuse the same, as the doctrine of devils, which draweth our souls from the voice of our only God, to follow the doctrines and constitutions of men. The cause then why general councils convened, was neither to make any perpetual laws (which God before had not made,) neither yet to forge new articles of our belief, neither to give the word of God authority, much less to make that to be his word, or yet the true interpretation of the same, which was not before by his holy will expressed in his word: but the cause of councils (we mean of such as merited the name of councils) was partly for confutation of heresies and for giving public confession of their faith to the posterities following; which both they did, by the authority of God's written word, and not by any opinion or prerogative that they could not err, by reason of their general assembly. And this we judge to have been the chief cause of general councils. The other was for good policy and order, to be constituted and observed in the church, in which, as in the house of God, it becometh all things to be done decently and in order; not that we think that one policy, and one order in ceremonies, can be appointed for all ages, times, and places; for as ceremonies, such as men have devised, are but temporal, so may and ought they to be changed, when they rather foster superstition, than that they edify the church using the same."

Of the civil magistrate, in Article xxiv. on sentence, which is enough for our present purpose, runs thus—"To kings, moreover, princes, rulers and magistrates, we affirm, that chiefly and most principally the reformation and purgation of religion appertaineth; so that not only they are appointed for civil policy, but also for maintenance of the true religion, and for suppressing of idolatry and superstition whatsoever; as in David, Jehosaphat, Hezekias, Josias, and others, highly commended for their zeal in the cause, may be espied." The historian and reformer observes—"After the voting and ratification of this our Confession by the whole body of the [Scots] parliament, there were also pronounced two acts, the one against the mass, and the abuse of the sacraments; and the other against the supremacy of the pope; the tenor whereof followeth—"In the parliament holden at Edinburgh the 10th of July, the year of God 1560, &c.—upon the 24th day of August, it is decreed and ordained in this present parliament, that no manner of person or persons, in any time coming, administrate any of the sacraments secretly in any manner of way, but they that are admitted, and having power to that effect; nor say mass, nor yet hear mass, nor be present thereat, under the pain of confiscation of all their goods, and punishing of their bodies at the discretion of the magistrates, within whose jurisdiction such persons happen to be apprehended, for the first fault; banishing out of the realm, for the second fault; and chastising by death for the third fault." The same parliament the same day and place—"hath decreed and ordained, that the bishop of Rome, hath no jurisdiction nor authority in this realm in times coming; and that none of our said sovereign's subjects claim, and desire in any time hereafter, title or right by the said bishop

of Rome, or his sect, to any thing within this realm, under the *pains* of baratry, that is to say, proscription, banishment, and never to *bruiik* and enjoy honor, office, nor dignity, within this realm; and the *con-*traveners hereof to be called before the justice, or his deputies, or before the lords of session, and punished therefore, conform to the laws of this realm; and the furnishers of them by fines; and purchasers of their title of right, or maintainers or defenders of them, shall incur the same pains; and that no bishop, nor other prelate, of this realm, use any jurisdiction in time to come, by the said bishop of Rome's authority, under the pain aforesaid."

The quotations above given are from the *Corpus et Syntaxis Confessionum*, the edition published at Geneva 1654; from *Knox's History of the Reformation*, the Edinburgh edition of 1790: and from the *collection of Confessions*, printed at Glasgow, in the year 1764. In the act against the mass, instead of the words in Knox's History—"chastising by death," we have in the Collection of Confessions, where the Scots' dialect and orthography are retained these words—"justifying to the death," which express the same idea in a less absurd style.

My reader will please to recollect here the position to be proved. It is this. The secession church has made an advance or two in reformation, beyond the attainments of other reformed churches. He will permit me too to explain myself further, by saying that of the ancient and early churches of the reformation, the English Puritans, Neal's history of whom I would, earnestly recommend to those who have not seen it, are an exception to the position now taken; and that on one point at least, to be treated of in this place there is no dissent, that I know of, between us and our brethren of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian church and of the Associate Reformed Church, in the United States. The point to which I have reference at this time is—the power of the magistrate in relation to things sacred. It is very far from the writer's intention and desire, to think, and much less to *speak*, or write invidiously of the great and good men, who first drew up and adopted those venerated forms, from which we have made the above extracts. The articles selected, we do not offer as presenting in themselves by any means a full character of the churches from whose creeds they are selected. Of the subordinate standards and the organization of some of the American churches, the lineal branches, or legitimate descendants of several of those European churches, I must here profess my ignorance; and disavow all design of any odious comparison in relation to them.

Two points of doctrine, two articles of faith, are treated of directly, in the selections above offered—the power of the magistrate in relation to things sacred—the power of the ecclesiastic rulers in relation to traditions. The Scotie and the Belgic Confessions are those to which I shall have most special recourse in proof of the position assumed; and that for two good reasons—These two creeds are, on the points now under consideration, more nearly coincident with our own, than any of those from which we have given specimens. And the title page of this Religious Monitor affords another apology for the preference yielded the Scotie and Belgic formularies.

The CREED and CONFESSIONS of the reformed churches do concede to the civil magistrate, that is, the political ruler, the power of prohibiting and punishing idolatry, blasphemy in doctrine, heresy, by pains of body, forfeiture of civil and politic privileges, of goods, of liberty,

and of life. According to those creeds "they are appointed, not only for civil policy, but also for suppressing of idolatry and superstition whatsoever." They are "not only to exercise a care, and to apply themselves with diligence for the preservation of the established polity, but also to displace and overthrow all idolatry and adultery from the worship of God, to throw down the kingdom of antichrist." This last is mentioned in the Belgic Confession in immediate connection with the declaration foregoing—that God 'has committed to the magistrate the sword, for punishing indeed the wicked, but for defending the good.' I shall not resort to the history of Van Armin, and the troubles arising out of his controversy in the States of Holland. I shall not relate the well known fate of Servetus in the Republic of Geneva, in whose condemnation, all Christendom, Catholics, Lutherans, Calvinists, Reformed, both High Dutch and Low Dutch, English Episcopalians, and Scotch Presbyterians, all concurred and acquiesced sentimentally, as from the extracts of their creeds above written plainly appears—excepting still the English Puritans and those German Anabaptists who attempted to throw off all politic government. I will here admit that creeds are to be interpreted according to the plain import of the language in which they are couched, independently of any mal-administration resulting from them, or arising under them. But here is the fact. These creeds present before our eyes a man with the sword which God has put into his hands. This sword we may understand from the history of the times was not a light one. "The two handed sword" which cardinal Beaton drew in the castle of St. Andrews, was perhaps in those days not peculiar to the Scotch and Dutch. This sword of God the magistrate is "to draw against all evil-doers, seditious persons, robbers or homicides, oppressors, *blasphemous persons*"—*Let him draw* [stringat unsheath] is the word. *Let him coerce the heretics, who are truly heretics, incorrigible, &c.* Thus the Helvetic creed. "God wills," say the Saxons, "that by the voice of the magistrates, first supreme and immutable laws be proposed, prohibiting the *worship of idols, blasphemies.*" Further they say—"Let the magistrate be the custos, the warden, in punishing all who violate these laws." The Gallic creed says—"God hath delivered the sword into the magistrate's hands for repressing crimes, committed *not only against the second, but also against the first table.*" These terms have become technical in the controversies between the brethren of the Reformed Synod *technically* so called, and the Seceders in Scotland. One distinguishing tenet of the former is—The magistrate, possessed of scriptural qualifications, institution, constitution, investiture, *et cetera*, is the *custos utriusque tabulae*, the warden of both tables. And here, permit me, reader, by the way, to express my humble sentiment, that the Reformed Brethren, upon this one point—the power of the civil magistrate in relation to sacred things, are, what they solemnly aver themselves to be—the *old thing*. And in my judgment, Seceders are in all conscience of candor, veracity, and manliness, bound to concede this to be the fact. I should forfeit my right to the signature, under which this essay is published, were I not to say this much.

I will here admit that creeds presently in form, are to be interpreted according to the plain and obvious import of the language in which they are written, independent of any mal-administration resulting from them. And further, if any clause of a humanly composed creed, is ambiguous in its own terms, those terms are to be construed in that

sense which renders the creed most consonant to Holy scriptures—without regard to the design and intention of the composers and framers. But we are now enquiring what were the religious tenets and sentiments of the several Reformed churches at the period of the Reformation, on a certain point—the magistrate's power in relation to things sacred. And in such an enquiry, nothing can be more relevant or appropriate, than to observe the tenor and spirit of the political constitutions and civil laws of the people, composing those churches, at the time they adopted those creeds. On the 24th of August 1560, the day on which the Scotie Confession was adopted by parliament, the same parliament enacted—That none of our said sovereign's subjects, in any time hereafter, suit or desire title or right, of the said bishop of Rome, or his sect, to any thing within this realm, under the pains of barratry." And—"That no manner of person or persons say mass, nor yet hear mass, nor be present thereat, under the pain—for the third fault, of justifying to the death." All the great churches of the Reformation, which Seceders are accustomed to look upon as most orderly and pure, and to look up to as most exemplary, were unanimous in attributing to the civil magistrate this power in things sacred. And in connection with this power, or rather as one component part of it, they held the doctrine of civil establishments. For the defence of all this power, they use one argument that cannot be readily mistaken, howmuchsoever Seceders believe it to be misapplied. This power was held and exercised by godly magistrates, under the Old Testament—"By Moses, by David, Jehoshaphat, Hezekiah, Josiah, and others." Magistrates are appointed "for the maintenance of the true religion. In executing his office more fully, *pro civili*, occupies the first place the *pure* and free preaching of the divine word, the right and sedulous institution, and just discipline of the citizens, and of schools, a solicitous care for the liberal support of the ministers of the church, and of the poor." Thus the Helvetic Confession. "That he may protect the ministry—may bestow pains that the word of the gospel be every where preached." Thus the Belgic, that is, the Dordrecht Confession.—Seceders have one apology for the fact hereafter to be proved, that they have declined from the traditions of the fathers, in relation to the magistrate's power. It is that they discard the authority of all human traditions. Let us, in the mean time, acknowledge that some traditions which we discard, did exist in the churches of the Reformation, and do still exist. Let us admit these traditions to be ancient. In the Body and Syntax of Confessions, we find prefixed an edict of the August Emperors of Constantinople, Gratian, Valentinian, and Theodosius, dated *the third before the calends of March*, in the year of their joint consulship, at Thessalonica. In this edict is read, what may be Anglicized thus—"We will that all peoples, whom this empire of our clemency governs, be employed in that religion, which, Saint Peter the Apostle delivered to the Romans, [as] the religion till this day, insinuated by himself, declares, and which it is clear that the Pontiff Damascus follows, and Peter, Bishop of Alexandria, a man of apostolic sanctity: that is, that according to the apostolic and evangelic doctrine, we believe the one Deity, under equal majesty, and under holy Trinity, of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit. We order those who follow this law, to embrace the name of catholic christians; but judging others too demented and insane [we order them] to sustain the infamy of *heretic dogma* [heretical doctrine] who are to

be punished, first, by divine vengeance, afterwards also by a penalty [ultione] according to the motion of our mind, which we shall have received from the celestial WILL." Another document still more ancient we have in sacred writ—"Therefore I make a decree, that every people, nation, and language, which speak any thing amiss against the God of Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego, shall be cut to pieces, and their houses be made a dunghill." "In the days of Constantine, or in the time of Pope Sylvester, who was made bishop of Rome, the next year after Constantine's establishment of Christianity, and survived about twenty years, all this new Antichristian form of church was completed: Then, as a late historian of those times observes—"The ecclesiastical hierarchy was first formed, in the manner in which it continues to this day."\* It is not my design here to constitute ADAM GIB Pontiff, no more than to make the Greek emperors, or Nebuchadnezzar, or any other man, the standard of my faith. But this quotation merely shows *in passing*, what were the sentiments, on this point, of one acknowledged Seceder.

The WESTMINSTER CONFSSION, is in the hands, or within the reach of all my readers. See the acts of Assembly and of Parliament, prefixed thereto; and the Articles xxiii. and xxxi. to which *in toto*, in what I conceive to be the true and proper sense of them, I never did, and cannot now assent; and yet take the liberty to subscribe myself

SECEDER.

---

ART. V. *Analysis of Prophetic Times*, by JAMES ADAMS, Xenia, Ohio, 1836—7.

MR. EDITOR,—One very important use of public journals, is to introduce to public notice, such publications, and especially recent ones, as may be interesting to community, whether scientific, political or religious. It is befitting the character of a religious periodical, to notice works on religious subjects, and a department in the Religious Monitor appropriated to this object, would, we trust, not only be very useful, but very acceptable to your readers. [we take this opportunity to make the suggestion.]

I have not observed any notice of the work, whose title is placed at the head of this communication, in any of the religious periodicals of the day. This, however, it is but just to remark may have happened not from negligence, or any want of attention on the part of the Editors of these Journals; but rather from the peculiar circumstances under which, Mr. Adams has been compelled to usher his publication before community. From a regard, probably, to economy and convenience of circulation, Mr. A. has adopted the periodical mode of publication—a mode peculiarly unsuitable to a work of the nature and character of the *Analysis of Prophetic Times*. In the treatment of his subject, Mr. A. follows the *plan* of J. Mede, one of the most profoundly learned and pious men of his age—That is, not to explain the prophecies verse by verse—but to collect together all the events coincident in respect of time, and prove their coincidence by characters legible on the face of

---

\* *Rise and Progress of Antichrist*, by ADAM GIB.



the prophecy itself; and then to show the connecting points between the different clusters of prophecies, thus arranged. This plan, though decidedly the best, and, indeed, the only right one of unfolding the important truths contained in the prophetic parts of the Book of God, is ill-suited to be interrupted, by parcelling out in periodical numbers. Another disadvantage which has attended the publication of the Analysis, was a long interruption in the appearance of the numbers, occasioned by the protracted bodily indisposition of the author. Thus many who would have taken a lively interest in the subject, and in Mr. Adams' discussion of it too, if they had had the opportunity of following up the discussion without interruption, were prevented from becoming interested in the investigation, or if an interest was excited, it was immediately lost by the frequent interruptions.

Such was, in some measure, the case with the writer of this notice. He had seen the 1st and 2d Nos. shortly after they were published, but not together, and consequently had not an opportunity of getting any hold of the author's plan, or sentiments. He has very recently obtained and read with the deepest interest, the first ten numbers.

It is not the design of the writer at present to attempt a review of the work; this would be premature; as it is not yet completed. This notice is only intended to apprise the christian community, or that portion of them who receive information through the pages of the Religious Monitor, that such a work as the Analysis of Prophetic Times is in the progress of publication; and to assure them that it is one which will richly repay for a careful and an attentive perusal. The writer has no disposition to become the eulogist of Mr. A. or any other man; were he now reviewing the work, he could specify divers things which he deems defects in the work; these, however, chiefly respect what may be called *the manner of the book*, such as some things in the style, the division of the chapters, &c. In particular, I fear "he will be a barbarian" to the great body of his readers, on account of the many foreign terms, which he introduces. In many things Mr. A. has not adapted his book to the prevailing taste of the reading community of the present age; but the subject is of the deepest importance and must ere long, whatever be the present apathy, penetrate the whole christian community with the most intense and solemn interest. The subject is no other than that salvation, "of which the prophets have inquired and searched dilligently, who prophesied of the grace that should come, searching what manner of *time* the Spirit of Christ did signify, when it testified before hand the sufferings of Christ, and the glory that should follow."\* Angels desire to look into this subject. God has promised salvation to his church from all her enemies, and he has fixed a *set or appointed time* for this deliverance. † And that deliverance shall be succeeded by a long and uninterrupted period of great glory to the church of Christ, and during which the vissible church shall be the principal and prevailing society upon earth. When will this set, appointed time arrive? God has revealed it with as much precision, as He revealed to the Old Testament Church, the time that Mesiah, the Prince, should appear; or should be cut off. Daniel understood by books the number of the years, whereof the word of the Lord came to Jeremiah, the prophet, that he would accomplish seventy years in the desolations of Jerusalem.‡ This excited him to look to

\* 1. Pet. 10.

† Ps. 102, 13.

‡ Dan. ix. 2.

the Lord God, and seek by prayer and supplication, accompanied with the most solemn acts of humility, for a more distinct understanding of the Divine mind, respecting the future condition of the church. And God rewarded his diligence, with a new and more distinct revelation of his will concerning the church, the advent and cutting off of the Messiah, than had been made to any of his predecessors. We are not now to look for any new revelations. Divine revelation is completed. But we are to look for a fuller and more definite understanding of what is revealed. And the hand of the diligent here will receive a rich reward, as well as in other things. "If we apply our hearts to understanding, and cry after knowledge; if we seek it, as silver, and search for it as for hidden treasures, then shall we find the knowledge of God." For this, God's truth and faithfulness are pledged. But we must not forget the object of our communication.

Mr. Adams has evidently applied himself, to the investigation of his subject with arduous, persevering and successful industry. He has collected, from an extensive range of reading, especially historical, a large assemblage of facts, which he has brought directly to bear on his subject. He has judiciously but not servilely availed himself of the labors of the most valuable writers, who have written on the subject before him, and as necessarily connected with the subject, he frequently discusses practical questions, bearing in a very important manner on the present duty of the church. In fine, the writer of this notice, does not hesitate to give it as his opinion, that so far as Mr. A. has progressed, he has given the most satisfactory view of the *times and events* referred to in the prophecies, that has yet been laid before the christian community. And he has supported his views with an amount and weight of testimony, which one would think can scarcely fail to carry conviction to the mind of the candid, reflecting reader.

It may, however, not be amiss to apprise the reader who has yet to take up the book, that he may be in danger, while reading the minute description of Ezekiel's and John's visions, of concluding, the work is wholly a flight of the imagination; and we may also notice, to prevent disappointment and consequently disgust, that those, who are accustomed to think, only, in the beaten track, may sometimes be startled with what at first sight, may appear new and strange doctrines. But, whoever may enter upon the book, we would advise not to desist, until they have carefully read and considered the first two or three chapters.

J. P. M.

---

#### ART. VI. *A Time to Dance.*

MR. EDITOR,—The following correspondence between a minister of the gospel and "a true christian, but no hypocrite," is taken from the December No. of the *Christian Gleaner*, published in London in 1822. The reply of the former to the request and demand of the latter, is in my opinion, admirable, and would be interesting and profitable to, at least, some of your readers. I send it to you with the request, that if you think it worthy of it, you would give it a place in your valuable periodical.

W.

A worthy clergyman who had been suspected of having improperly

interfered in influencing some of the young people under his pastoral charge, to absent themselves from a ball that took place in the parish, received in consequence, the following anonymous note.

‘Sir,—Obey the voice of holy scripture. Take the following for your text, and contradict it. Show in what consists the evil of that innocent amusement of dancing.—Eccles. iii. 4. ‘A time to weep, and a time to laugh; a time to mourn and a time to dance.’

*A True Christian, but no Hypocrite.”*

The minister immediately wrote the following admirable reply, which he inserted in the American Spectator.

My Dear Sir, [or Madam,]—Your request that I would preach from Eccles. iii. 4, I cannot comply with at present, since there are some christian duties more important than dancing, which a part of my people seem disposed to neglect. Whenever I perceive, however, that the duty of dancing is too much neglected, I shall not fail to raise a warning voice against so dangerous an omission. In the mean time, there are certain difficulties in the text which you commend to my notice, the solution of which I should receive with gratitude from a “True Christian.”

My first difficulty respects the *time* for dancing; for although the text declares that there is a time to dance, yet *when* that time is, it does not determine. Now this point I wish to ascertain exactly, before I preach upon the subject; for it would be as criminal, I conclude, to dance at the wrong time, as to neglect to dance at the right time. I have been able to satisfy myself in some particulars, when it is *not* “a time to dance.” We shall agree, I presume, that on the Sabbath day, or at a funeral, or during the prevalence of a pestilence, or the rocking of an earthquake, or the roaring of a thunder-storm, it would be no time to dance. If we were condemned to die, and were waiting in prison the day of execution, this would be no time for dancing; and if our feet stood on a slippery place beside a precipice, we should not dare to dance.

But suppose the very day to be ascertained; is the whole day, or only a part, to be devoted to this amusement? And if a part of the day only, then which part is the “time to dance?” From the notoriously pernicious effects of “*night meetings*,” in all ages, both upon morals and health, no one will pretend that the *evening* is the “time to dance,” and perhaps it may be immaterial which portion of the day-light is devoted to that “innocent amusement. But allowing the *time* to be ascertained, there is still an obscurity in the text. Is it a *command* to dance, or only a *permission*? Or is it merely a declaration of the fact, that, as men are constituted, there is a time when all the events alluded to in the text as in the providence of God come to pass? If the text be a *command*, is it of universal obligation; and must “old men and maidens, young men and children,” dance obedience? If a *permission*, does it imply permission also to refrain from dancing, if any are disposed? Or if the text be merely a declaration, that there is a time when men do dance, as there is a time when they die, then I might as well be requested to take the first eight verses of the chapter, and “show in what consists the evil of those innocent practices” of hating, and making war, and killing men, for which, it seems, there is “a time,” as well as for dancing.

There is still another difficulty in the text, which just now occurs to me. What *kind* of dancing does the text intend? for it is certainly a

matter of no small consequence to "a true christian," to dance in a scriptural manner, as well as at the scriptural time.

Now, to avoid mistakes on a point of such importance, I have consulted every passage in the bible which speaks of dancing, the most important of which permit me to submit to your inspection.

Exod. xv. 20: "And Miriam the prophetess, the sister of Aaron, took a timbrel in her hand, and all the women went out after her, with timbrels and with dances." This was on account of the overthrow of the Egyptians in the Red Sea.

Judges xi. 34. The daughter of Jephthah "came out to meet him with timbrels and with dances." This also was on account of a victory over the enemies of Israel.

Jud. xxi. 21: The yearly feast in Shiloh, was a feast unto the Lord, in which the daughters of Shiloh went forth in dances. This was done as an act of religious worship.

2 Sam. vi. 14 and 20: "And David danced before the Lord with all his might." But the irreligious Michael "came out to meet David, and said, how glorious was the King of Israel to-day, who uncovered himself to-day in the eyes of the handmaids of his servants, as one of the vain fellows shamelessly uncovereth himself!" Dancing it seems, was a sacred rite, and was usually performed by women. At that day, it was perverted from its sacred use by none but "vain fellows," destitute of shame. David vindicates himself from her irony, by saying, "it was before the Lord," admitting that had this *not* been the case, her rebuke would have been merited.

1. Sam. xviii. 6: On account of the victory of Saul and David over the Philistines, the "women came out of all the cities of Israel singing and dancing."

Psalms cxlix—3: "Let them praise his name in the dance." Psalm xxx—11. "Thou hast turned for me my mourning into dancing." The deliverance here spoken of, was a recovery from sickness, and the dancing an expression of religious gratitude and joy.

Exod. xxii. 19. "As soon as he came nigh unto the camp, he saw the calf and the dancing." From this, it appears that dancing was a part also of idol worship.

Jer. xxxi. 4: "Oh virgin of Israel, thou shalt again be adorned with thy tabrets, and go forth in the dances of them that make merry." This passage predicts the return from captivity, and the restoration of the divine power, with the consequent expression of religious joy.

Math. xi. 17: "We have piped unto you, and ye have not danced; we have mourned unto you, and ye have not lamented." That is, neither the judgments nor the mercies of God, produce any effect upon this incorrigible generation. They neither mourn when called to mourning by his providence; nor rejoice with the usual tokens of religious joy, when his mercies demand their gratitude.

Luke xv. 25: "Now his elder son was in the field; and as he came, and drew nigh unto the house, he heard music and dancing;" The return of the prodigal was a joyful event, for which the grateful father, according to the usages of the Jewish church, and the exhortation of the Psalmist, "praised the Lord in the dance."

Eccle. iii. 4: "A time to mourn and a time to dance." Since the Jewish church knew nothing of dancing, except as a religious ceremony, or as an expression of gratitude and praise, the text is a declaration

that the providence of God sometimes demands mourning, and sometimes gladness and gratitude.

Math. xiv. 6. "But when Herod's birth-day was kept, the daughter of Herodias danced before them, and pleased Herod." In this case, dancing was perverted from its original object, to purposes of vanity and ostentation.

Job xxi. 7: "Wherefore do the wicked live, become old, yea, are mighty in power?" Verse 11: "They send forth their little ones, like a flock, and their children dance. They spend their days in wealth and in a moment go down to the grave. Therefore they say unto God, depart from us, for we desire not the knowledge of thy ways. What is the Almighty, that we should serve him; and what profit shall we have if we pray unto him?" Their wealth and dancing are assigned as the reason of their saying unto God, "Depart from us," and of their not desiring the knowledge of his ways, or of serving him or praying to him.

From the preceding questions, it will sufficiently appear—

1. That dancing was a religious act, both of the true and also of idol worship.

2. That it was practised exclusively on joyful occasions, such as national festivals or great victories.

3. That it was performed by maidens only.

4. That it was performed usually in the day-time, in the open air, in high-ways, fields or groves.

5. That men who perverted dancing from a sacred use to purposes of amusement, were deemed infamous.

6. That no instances of dancing are found upon record in the Bible, in which the two sexes united in the exercise, either as an act of worship or amusement.

7. That there is no instance upon record, of social dancing for amusement, except that of the "*vain fellows*," devoid of shame; of the irreligious families described by Job, which produced increased impiety, and ended in destruction; and of Herodias, which terminated in the rash vow of Herod, and the murder of John the Baptist.

I congratulate you, sir, on the assured hope which you seem to have attained, that you are "a true christian," and on the meekness and modesty with which you have been able to express it; and most sincerely do I join with you in the condemnation of all "hypocrites."

I am affectionately yours,

H.

#### ART. VII. *The Imputation of Faith.*

[Our correspondent in the following remarks corrects a mistake into which Professor Hodge has fallen, in his late Commentary on the epistle to the Romans.—ED. REL. MON.]

In Rom. iv. 3, it is said, "Abraham believed God, and it was counted to him for righteousness." Not a few understand faith in this place as simply denoting the act of believing, which, they say, is reckoned to us for righteousness, or instead of the perfect fulfilment of the law. If this interpretation were correct, the righteousness of Christ is excluded, as not properly pertaining to the ground of our justification; it ceases to be true that by the deeds of the law no flesh can be justified; God imputes to us a character not belonging to us;—he reckons to us a righteousness neither performed by us nor by any other being, but merely

ideal; which seems at least more inconsistent than reckoning to us a righteousness actually performed by Jesus Christ. Besides, if faith be now the righteousness required of us instead of the perfect obedience of the law, as he that goes beyond the law is a transgressor, he that has more than faith, that is, more than the righteousness now demanded, is convicted of sin. If faith itself be counted righteousness, we should be very careful not to add knowledge, virtue, meekness, temperance, godliness, brotherly kindness and charity, for in this case whatsoever is more than faith is sin. If faith be righteousness then the doctrine of supererogation is not so groundless as many suppose, and the Papists are not so absurd in supposing an excess of merits in some to be imputed to others, to whom notwithstanding they regard it as so absurd to impute the righteousness of Jesus Christ.

However, the purpose of this communication is not particularly to oppose this corruption of the true gospel, but to advert to another opinion espoused by some who oppose the one just mentioned. They object to that interpretation of the above passage, which supposes faith to include its object, that is, Christ the Lord our righteousness; and say, that faith itself is intended, and that righteousness is used for justification. According to them, the import of the words is, that "Faith is imputed for justification." This opinion appears not very remote from that which they oppose. If I understand it aright, it still refers our justification to faith itself, not as a perfect righteousness, but as one deed of the law. The question seems not to be so much about what justifies us, as in what light it is to be viewed. Both opinions concur in making "faith itself" that by which we are justified, only the one regards it as a simple deed of the law, the other as the very righteousness of the law in the divine estimation.

It seems to me that interpreters have sometimes adopted such explanations through a mistaken estimate of the difficulties attending an explanation more agreeable to the analogy of faith, and when fairly understood more natural and consistent with the common use of words. It is true that when we say the faith which is imputed, is to be understood as including its object, the language must be viewed as highly figurative, yet such figures are quite common. We are constantly in the habit of putting the instrument, or means, in the place of the end or object. We say that fraud has enriched a man, when we do not mean that fraud itself is his wealth, but only the means of it; and, if more agreeably to the words of the apostle, we should even say, Fraud is his wealth, we would be understood as meaning the same thing. So if we should say a man is enriched by his credit or faithfulness, or his credit or faithfulness is his wealth, it would be at once understood as referring to these as the means, and not as themselves constituting his wealth. If we say of one accused, that he was justified by a lie, we do not mean that the lie itself was his justification, but only the means of it. So when we are said to be justified by faith, the expression must be understood in the same way. In like manner when a debtor presents a satisfactory bond, we would say that his giving it procured his release, while our meaning is not that the act of giving it is imputed as payment, but only the property to which the bond gives a claim. Thus faith is as the giving of the bond, it embraces and presents the righteousness of the surety. It is not itself the payment of our debt, but presenting that which pays it, it procures our discharge and is therefore accounted our righteousness.

T. B.

## ART. VIII. Q's Explanations.

MR. EDITOR—I observe that your correspondent A. H. has indeed condescended to reply to my queries, in your last Number; but I am sorry that it is so much in “the spirit of the bitter and hasty nation,” as completely disappoints the hope of satisfaction, on the points inquired into. It is very evident, that irritation would not allow him to take a candid view of any point presented in the queries, or to answer in the meekness of wisdom; but hurried him into the very faults, which he would rebuke in the Querist, “not putting the most favorable construction on the words of a brother that they bear,” “and insinuating against the motives and designs”—charging him with “spleen against Miami Presbytery, designing to injure them,” &c. If Q. deserves a rebuke from A. H., what does A. H. deserve, for committing the same faults more grossly at the same time? Irascibility has sometimes formed a trait in the character of great and good men, but it was only as one of their great failings; it is now less common than in former times, unless when words may touch upon unpleasant truths. It is properly a mark of the untutored. “He that is slow to wrath is of great understanding; but he that is hasty of spirit exalteth folly.” In my humble opinion, my friend needs to be reminded of those divine maxims, “The wrath of man worketh not the righteousness of God”—“He that is slow to anger is better than the mighty; and he that ruleth his own spirit than he that taketh a city,”—and of the apostolical requisite in a bishop, “not soon angry.” &c. Innumerable other considerations might also be brought forward to the same purpose. There was nothing in the Queries to ruffle any well disciplined mind, for my friend might at least have considered, that “there can never be any error in a *question*, as long as the answer is correct.” I do not intend at present to review his communication, so much as to explain my own, and therefore shall not farther remark on this topic, but proceed.

1. It was far from my design “to injure Miami Presbytery, or hold them up to public gaze, as a body of unprincipled men.” I cannot think that any candid reader of the queries, will find any thing in them to warrant such a harsh imputation. But an attentive observer may discover this in them, that the writer thought, the spirit and style of the Resolutions to which he adverted, resembled that of men who feel straitened by the narrow policy of the Secession Church, and uneasy in her obscurity; longing to figure in the more liberal and celebrated operations of the day, though it might be at the expense of some of the peculiarities of our profession. Yet on the other hand, from personal knowledge and esteem of a majority of the members of that Presbytery, he could not believe such to be *their* views and feelings; this created the hesitation as to the resolutions being actually the deed of the court, (which so greatly provokes the wrath of your correspondent,) and gave to the whole piece the form of inquiry. This one explanation, if applied, will be found a perfect key to the motives and designs of the Querist throughout.

2. I did not “suspect the Resolutions to be a base forgery, and that A. H. had affixed his signature to a statement, which he could not but know was false.” Every one knows, that in a Presbytery so widely scattered as that of Miami, there may be many meetings, which, legally speaking, are regular and regularly called, and yet scarce more than a quorum actually meet; that in such cases, if one or two wish to push a favorite measure, it is easily done; that their decision is *technically*

the deed of Presbytery, yet we may hesitate to consider it as *actually* such. This was the point on which I had any doubt, never questioning the formality. I have now, however, to thank another of your correspondents, for relieving my scruple on the whole matter, viz: J. W. who, in your January Number, gives us the circumstances of the case, in a spirit of christian meekness and candor, that A. H. would have done well to imitate. He informs us that the Resolutions were passed by a small majority; and at the semi-annual meeting, (which we learn took place the day following,) Presbytery being full, there were so many dissents entered, as made a majority of the whole. Now how must we speak of the transaction? *A deed of Presbytery from which the majority dissents!* It is not my intention to criticize the Presbytery's manner of doing business. But now let the candid judge, whether my hesitation was unreasonable or not? and considering, that A. H. *knew* the above facts, to which it most naturally led, let them judge, whether his angry distortion of it, into a charge of "forgery and falsehood" against him, be according to "that christian spirit which puts the most favorable construction on the words of a brother that they will bear?" I love plain open dealing, but his way of managing I do not love: if he did not choose to state all the circumstances, (to which he was under no obligation) it was a point he might easily have passed over in silence, and been fully exonerated, as he himself remarks. I had noticed the want of Presbyterial authority for the publication of the Resolutions, as strengthening my opinion, that the measure had been carried in the manner, that we now know it was: because though presbyteries do not seek to conceal, it is not usual for them to allow individuals to *print*, when, and what of their minutes, they may see fit; this is done by special vote; therefore the quotation of the political bluster, concerning "responsibility" by way of reply, is not at all to the point, nor very dignified in itself.

3. The point to which the queries were directed respecting the Bible Society Resolution, seems a very plain one; but I cannot perceive the bearing of the reply on it, more or less. It is well known that the American Bible Society *will not* print the Psalms in metre, nor aid in printing them, in any manner, either directly or indirectly;\* that the institution is wholly, and strenuously opposed to them; and that through its mighty influence they would soon utterly disappear in this country, unless means were taken to prevent it. The Associate Synod rightly considers their preservation, a precious and important point of their profession, and they are left almost alone in the maintainance of it.

Now how is it to be maintained? By preaching and writing on the subject? Retaining the doctrine in our printed standards? and still casting in our contribution, to strengthen the hand that is actually putting them down? This is the way that too many maintain the peculiarities of the profession; but the inconsistency, the unfaithfulness of it, is plain without argument. We rejoice in all the good effected by the

---

\* The writer witnessed an authentic computation, from indisputable documents, by which it was proved, that in the course of about ten years, the members of our church within the bounds of one Presbytery, had contributed to the funds of a County Society, a sum, more than sufficient to have purchased stereotype plates for the Bible with the Psalms. Yet these same people could not have from, nor through that same Society, a number of Bibles printed with the Psalms for their special accommodation, no, nor even *purchase* the Bibles in sheets to bind them up with the Psalms at their own expense. But it might be shown from Reports, that they make remittances to aid foreign Societies, who print the *Apocrypha*. The wisdom and consistency of Seceders clinging to this popular institution may easily be inferred.



American Bible Society, and believe it to be, to an immense amount; but in this we rejoice not. There can be no doubt but the Synod's act on the subject, was designed, as it ought to be, in opposition to the American Bible Society, in this, and other specified points; though A.H. challenges any one to say so, on pain of *slunder*. How the term at all applies to the case, I know not. What less what else could Synod do, in faithfulness to their own testimony, than withdraw from that institution, and unite all their members in opposing, not its main and proper object, of disseminating the scriptures; but the evils incident to the manner in which it is done? Which is only in other words to say, that it was their duty to call on their people to unite, in making a practical defence of some points of their profession which were in a corresponding manner opposed. This is precisely what they did, by forming themselves into a Bible Society, (if any choose to call it so,) for the special purpose of having the Psalms circulated with the Bible. Now any discerning person will see, that this is the work that lies most directly to our hand, and a work requiring the united strength of the whole church; and if so engaged in, would be productive of the most beneficial effects. But many are shamefully careless, many slow to apprehend their own interest and duty in the matter; and what is no better, some seem so much attracted by the splendor of doing the work on the largest scale, that they cannot be confined to such small business; they dispise their proper place and employment, and reason like the members, in Paul's metaphor, the foot saying, because I am not the head, I am not of the body. Because we cannot from the first, publish our proceedings at our *Anniversary meetings, our lists of officers, managers, and secretaries for foreign correspondence, the donations and disbursements, the editions printed, and the thousands of bibles circulated in various languages, &c. &c.* we are not engaged in the *great Bible cause at all*. By such means, we are weakening instead of strengthening our own hands in our own work. The private acts of private individuals, we do not rigorously inquire after; but when a course is resolved upon, by a body, and published to the whole church, under the sanction of Presbyterian authority, it ought to be noticed, and in this case it ought to be exposed; if not as designed, yet as manifestly tending to defeat the Synod's purpose, by disuniting and discouraging the people from engaging in it. And I do not see that A. H. has disproved the inconsistency, or shown it to be duly respectful to the decisions of the supreme court.

4. There are several other points of minor importance, that may be dismissed with a word or two of explanation. In one place I am found stating what was "not altogether the fact," in saying, that all the members of Miami Presbytery, who were present, acquiesced in a certain deed of Synod. "True, (says A. H.) none of them either dissented or protested, —" It must be some new position in ecclesiastical discussion, in which members of court take their stand, so as *neither to acquiesce, nor dissent, nor protest!* If I misstated the matter, by employing an improper term, it is because our books of order not knowing of this position, furnish no specific appellation for it. To an interrogatory, I would answer in a word, that I do not think the business of missions belongs to Synod exclusive of Presbyteries; and no such inference can be fairly drawn from my remarks. I never thought, nor in the most distant manner insinuated, "That the Secession Testimony, or our Covenant Bond, is inimical to the dissemination of gospel light, &c."

I shall not at present say more on it, either in the way of explanation, or complaint of unfairness.

Finally, I am far from being opposed to Foreign Missions, or intending any "covert attack on that whole business;" but as I have already been too long on this part of the subject, I shall reserve my remarks on that interesting topic till an after day.

Farewell,

Q.

#### ART. IX. *Voluntary contributions on the Sabbath.*

The following is but a part of "Egomet's" communication. The rejected part, we regard, as entirely too *political* to be admitted into our pages; and besides, the design of "Ego's strictures" has been wholly misunderstood. In relation to one sentiment contained in the following we would remark, that our vacancies do and will increase in equal proportion to the number of laborers sent forth into the vineyard.—ED. REL. MON.

It is proper, when this subject is introduced, that instead of wasting words in unnecessary strictures, there should be an application of exhortation to those who are remiss in the duty. If "God winked at," or overlooked, the time of heathen ignorance, leaving all nations to walk in their own way, while the eye of his grace was fixed on Canaan alone, but, in due time, mercifully regarded the condition of the world, in proclaiming the general message of the gospel by the preaching of the apostles; so it may be said, that now it is time, as indicated by providence, that we should bestir ourselves in all commanded duty; and, in particular, from the facilities at present offered, endeavour to revive the long neglected duty of regular weekly collections on the Sabbath. It is well known, that, amidst greater difficulties than those that are now experienced, those, that, in former times, were anxious for the performance of this duty, succeeded. It is recorded of one of the fathers of our church in this land, the late Mr. Clarkson, whose congregation is well known to have been in a poorer part of the country than many, that now neglect this, that he would not consent to accept of the charge of a congregation where it was not practiced, so much conscience had he in the observance of one of the despised ordinances of Christ. Were such a feeling unanimous among our ministers, we might soon hope for a return to "the good old way" in this respect, the want of which is doubtless one of the causes, why the former days were better than these; for we never can expect the prosperity of a church, that continues in the wilful and contemptuous omission of any divine ordinance.

When, therefore, this subject is once more before the public, let it be allowed to the writer of this article to suggest, that whatever may be said of *things indifferent* in other cases, here we have to do with a *different thing*. If Finis has proved any thing, it is, that this duty has been considered scriptural and authoritative by our wisest and best divines; that it is incumbent upon us, by our own standards; that now there are facilities for the practice of it not formerly afforded; and that the urgent necessity for it is still the same. What might not our

church, under God, hope to accomplish, if means were afforded for the extension of our missionary exertions? We, no more than *Fris*, advocate any attempt at foreign missions, in our ignorance of the proper state of distant lands, and our want of means of preparing missionaries to be useful in such stations, but we see the necessity of effort at home. The time was when we were in want of labourers. At our present rate of supply, it requires no prophetic view to evince, that we will soon have more than we can employ in the regular vacancies of the church. Amidst the general ignorance and error which prevail around us, shall we not arouse ourselves? If money is "the nerves and sinews of war," let us remember, that it is to that which we are called. Christ was honored in the days of his flesh by the ministration of such supplies, and not only did he commend the tribute of the widow's mites, but accepted the gold of the wise men of the East, which they offered to him as a king, as well as the presents of those women who ministered unto him. He still requires to be honored with our substance, and in the manner of his own appointment. Let, then, that false modesty which would shrink from the mention of the word money, in the pulpit be driven from it, and let our ministers declare the whole counsel of God and keep nothing back, and lift their voice like a trumpet, since called to summon to a war, for which supplies must be raised. Perhaps it will be found that there is a people prepared for this, yea, zealous for it, but hitherto lacking opportunity. Instead of approving of the ostentatious charity of this age, many of ours shrink from it. Let them have an opportunity of honoring God in his own way, and let this tribute be paid to him in holy worshipping assemblies, and, it may be hoped, that, by his blessing, our fruits of righteousness shall more and more abound. Offerings of certain kinds, (see Deut. xxiii. 18.) were inadmissible under the ancient law. The church of Rome is well known to receive great revenues from one of these sources thus anciently condemned. Were we continuing in the practice of all commanded duty, it would show a distrust of providence, to fear the efforts of that corrupt church against us; but, neglecting any, we are exposing ourselves to danger and provoking God to withdraw the defence. While, therefore, we acknowledge all our own efforts to be vain in counteracting error and propogating truth, let us rely upon His aid, doing what He commands, and we may hope for promised success. "Who, then, is willing to consecrate his service this day unto the Lord?"

EGOMET.

---

**ART. X.** *Respecting the Treatment of our Colored Population.*

**MR. EDITOR.**—It cannot be concealed that the subject of slavery in these United States is approaching a fearful crisis. No person who regards the words of divine truth as emanating from the Judge of all the earth, but must tremble for the fate of his country; and it becomes all, as they value their peace, both as individual persons, and as members of associate bodies, to wash their hands of this crying sin. It will be vain for us to cry out and abuse our brethren for holding their fellow men in bondage, if we manifest by *our acts* that we are governed by as unhallowed principles as they. Let us examine ourselves, let us can-

didly scrutinize our conduct as in the presence of a heart-searching God, and see whether we have cast the beam out of our own eye, that we may see clearly to pick the mote out of our brother's eye. It is abundantly evident that many persons living in what we complacently term *free states*, regard themselves as free from the guilt of slavery, provided they furnish a *quantum sufficit* of railing and reproach against those states which still continue to tolerate the evil, without once examining whether they themselves are not equally guilty when viewed by the omniscient eye, as those upon whom they heap such unmeasured, and doubtless, often such unmerited reproach.

I know not the statutory regulations of all the free states, but is it not a fact that most if not all of those states which border on the slave-holding States, and which are consequently most deeply interested in the subject, have by solemn enactments in contravention of the federal compact denied the black man even the right to reside upon the soil. Have they not thrust him out as an abandoned outcast, unworthy of our protection, unworthy of our sympathy, unworthy to partake of the air we breathe. The pestilence that walketh in darkness, the moral diseases which spread desolation unseen wherever they approach, is not an object of greater dread, and abhorrence than is the poor descendent of the unfortunate African. Let me not be told that such enactments are inoperative, that the law tribunals of our country are open to the oppressed, and that the colored man has only to bring his case before them to secure redress. I say nay. Such indeed may be the case in theory, but such *it is not in fact*. So deep is our detestation, so implacable our hatred of the colored race, that we hesitate not to bid defiance to the authority of Heaven, and trample under our feet the most sacred institutions of man, that we may rid ourselves of these monsters in human shape. The aged, the infirm, the sorrowing mother, the weeping babe, the pious christian, the trembling fugitive, find in us—relentless tigers—biting serpents.

Tell me not, the picture is overdrawn. I say it is not; and well might the face of every man crimson with ingenuous shame, who countenances this reproaching of the South, while such are the laws, such the state of public sentiment amongst ourselves. Nor need we lay the 'flattering unction to our souls,' that because we have not been in the halls of legislation, and said yea to the passage of these laws, nor aided the mob to thrust from amongst us our unoffending fellow being, therefore, we are *guiltless*. How much better suppose ye is the man who will not attempt when he has opportunity to raise the innocent when thrown down, than the man who casts him down? In the present case, where are our pleadings in behalf of the oppressed, where our memorials and remonstrances to our respective state legislatures, where our pious appeals, our earnest entreaties, and continued wrestling with a christian community, that these unfortunate beings might be permitted to enjoy some of their rights, share some of our sympathies, and enjoy christian fellowship amongst us? On the contrary, I fear when the secrets of our hearts are made manifest, on the great day, it will be found that we have been inwardly rejoicing, that other hands than ours have performed the work, and that we are consoling ourselves that we have been freed from the intrusion of these noxious beings, without incurring the guilt of thrusting them out.

But it is said if we suffer the dregs of the slave holding states to be thrown amongst us, they will corrupt our morals, prey upon our pro-

perty and endanger our institutions. 'O shame where is thy blush!' If such would be the consequences resulting from the interspersion of a few blacks amongst us, what in the name of truth, what in the name of consistency, would be the consequences resulting from granting freedom to the whole slave population of the south? Consistency, like so many of the virtues, I fear has fled from our land, and we are practically saying to the distressed, 'be ye fed, be ye clothed,' but we move not one of our fingers, that a brother may obtain even the slightest mitigation of his sufferings. Fellow professing christians, ought these things to be so? How can we, how dare we, on bended knees before the Eternal Jehovah, confess that by nature we are the vilest of the vile, and that if we now differ from others it is because of free and sovereign grace? I say how can we, how dare we do this, and the next moment turn to a fellow sinner as good by nature as we, and perhaps by practice better, and say, Depart, this land must not be contaminated by such as you.

Brethren what shall be done? It is obvious our present position cannot be maintained with any prospect of doing good. On the contrary, we are continually subjecting ourselves to merited rebuke, and to every effort which we make to rid our land of the monster, *slavery*, the sarcastic reply will be made, 'Physician heal thyself.'

I did not commence this article with a view of discussing at this time the important enquiry, *what shall be done?* on the contrary, I only wish to awaken clearer heads and abler pens than my own. The subject is one of vital importance, of much difficulty, and withal not a little delicate. Unless much knowledge, much wisdom, sound judgment, much discretion, and above all abundance of candor and forbearance be put in requisition, harm instead of benefit will be done. Notwithstanding it may be difficult to determine definitely what ought to be done, it may not be difficult to determine some things that ought not to be done. It is *surely* manifestly clear that as christians and good citizens, the position ought to be assumed and maintained, that *all persons who are legally entitled to freedom ought to be at liberty to go where they please, follow what occupations they please, and enjoy the fruits of their industry without molestation.* Unless we do this, with what face can we say to our southern fellow citizens, ye do wrong in holding the black man in bondage? But shall they be permitted immediately to enjoy full political rights and social privileges? I think not. The doctrine that levels the whole human family and puts them on a footing of equality is rather too Utopian for the writer of this article. In fact it is a doctrine known neither to the Bible nor to common sense. It is true, the Bible is the *magna charta* of the whole of Adam's race, and if its doctrines be preached, and its precepts practised as they ought to be, it will finally elevate the condition and secure the rights of all; but that it was ever intended to secure to all, the full exercise of what we sometimes hear called natural political rights, no matter whether they be ignorant cannibals who never thought of a right, save to tear the prey out of the hand of a weaker antagonist, or whether they be highly cultivated members of civil society, is the merest nonsense that ever passed through the brain of a moon-struck madman.

If we allow this portion of our population the full enjoyment of political rights, with what face can we deny them the full enjoyment of social rights? If we allow them to sit in our halls of legislation, exercise high executive functions, and vote at our elections, how can we deny them access to our parlors, to our tables, to our beds, or even to our

daughters. I know that many are in favor of conferring upon them full political rights, who would almost fall into an ague-fit at the mention of investing them with full social privileges. It would be well for such to examine their bibles, and see if they can find any disqualification for social intercourse on account of color. If my memory cheats me not, the only injunction laid upon professing christians in forming the most intimate relation known to the sons and daughters of our great progenitor, is that they do it in the Lord. Let it be observed, however, this is a question which I pretend not to settle. We all regard ourselves as masters of our own houses—as a kind of monarchs in our own families, and of course will exercise our authority, that our houses be visited by such, and our daughters connected only with such, as are to our liking.

A. R.

---

#### ART. XI. *Luther's Posterity.*

It is generally known to the reading portion of the public, that this illustrious Reformer had several children, and this would justify the presumption that his family has not become extinct. Hence the interrogatory has often been propounded:—What has become of his posterity? are there no survivors who bear his honored name, and may be traced in direct ascent up to this venerated champion of religious light and liberty? Until very recently, no certain reply could be furnished to this interesting question. “Shadows, clouds and darkness” continued to hang around and check every effort to obtain a satisfactory solution. But we are happy at length to have it in our power to communicate full and complete intelligence on this subject.—To the efforts of the *Rev. Doctor von Reinthaler*, of Erfurt, in Prussia, whom we have the honor to claim as our especial and personal friend, and in whose hospitable domicil and delightful family we passed one of our happiest weeks in Europe, the church is indebted for the discovery of the only remaining lineal descendant of Luther.

The *Rev. Dr. Demme* and *Mr. Peixoto*, of Philadelphia, have favored the public with a published extract of a work originally issued in Germany, containing a brief narrative of the life and benevolent achievements of the celebrated *Falk*—sometimes yecept *John of the Baltic*,—as also of the admirable and blessed institution for the education of orphans, founded and superintended in Erfurt by that excellent and pious man just named, *Dr. von Reinthaler*. We are indebted to the politeness of *Dr. Demme* for a copy of this publication, and from it we have extracted and translated the following account of Luther's posterity, which, interspersed with our own remarks, we are sure will be perused with interest and secure the gratitude of all our readers.

It will be perceived in the sequel that an appeal is made to American christians, especially to those of the German Churches, for pecuniary aid to defray the expenses of educating and rearing the few remaining descendants of Luther; not that the Christians of Germany are either unable or unwilling of themselves to furnish such aid; but it is believed that the whole protestant world, or at least the whole Lutheran Church throughout the world, should have the privilege of bearing a part in

this honorable, and we might add, enviable work. And hence an opportunity is offered.

Having so many duties of our own to attend to, we had resolved some time ago to decline acting as agent in all such matters, but on an occasion so rare and interesting we must be permitted to break through that resolution, and herewith declare our willingness to comply with the request to receive and remit to the proper person all donations that may be transmitted to us in furtherance of so good a cause. Of course, as contributions to this noble purpose will probably become general, we do not think it necessary that individuals should make those contributions large.

Dr. Demme, of Philadelphia, is also willing to take charge of donations for the same purpose.

MARTIN LUTHER left at his death a widow and five children, viz: three sons and two daughters. The widow died in straitened circumstances in Torgan, and after her departure the children were scattered. Several of the branches survived, in obscurity, until the middle of the last century. About that period the family of the third son, (Paul,) resident at Dresden, in Saxony, became extinct, and with its extinction the whole stock seemed to be lost. In the meanwhile, however, the last branch of Luther's lineage still continued to live in poverty and want in the town of Erfurt.

In the year 1825 an ancient genealogical tree was forwarded as a present to the "Martin's Institute," in Erfurt by a clockmaker, (Mr. Ulrich) of the same place, who was the second husband of the widow of Dr. (Med.) *Bernhard Mariann Florianus Luther*, who had died anno 1793. This family record included the Dr. Luther just named and his four sisters.

And now, possessed of this interesting *Stammbaum*, the mind of the excellent and truly benevolent *Dr. von Reinthaler*, Founder and Director of the aforementioned philanthropic Institute, was anxiously exercised with the following reflections: "Is it not possible that on this very spot where 300 years ago Martin Luther dwelt as a monk, a scion may yet bloom forth from the very same trunk? Who knows but that some poor member of Luther's posterity may yet receive the same assistance from the friends of Christ, which was formerly extended to the poor miner's son in Eisennach, by *Madam Cotta*, of blessed memory, and that too within the walls of this hallowed place (the Augustinian Monastery\*) where once the great Reformer sought and found peace, and whence God wonderfully called him into his service?"

Meditations like these, while they absorbed the mind of Reinthaler, led him with the aid of the genealogical register just mentioned, to institute an investigation respecting Luther's neglected posterity. And lo! far in the distant recesses of Bohemia, the last remaining branch of the family was found, rapidly wasting away in a state of intellectual and domestic degradation.

JOSEPH CHARLES LUTHER, born in Erfurt, Nov. 11th, 1792, the only surviving son of Dr. (Med.) John Michael Luther, (born the 20th August 1763, and who had left Erfurt, anno 1801,) was found settled at *Stecken*, in Bohemia, as the father of a family, in distressing indigence, and was discovered to have descended in a direct line from the illustri-

---

\* The Martin's Institute is located in this ancient pile, a part of which has been voted by the municipal authority to Mr. R. for the accommodation of the Institute.

ous Reformer. But the reader will probably be astounded to learn that he had become a—*Roman Catholic!* Want and wretchedness, and domestic and political relations had constrained the stranger who had wandered away from his former home and his brethren in the faith, to throw himself into the all-grasping embraces of Mother Church. *Five living children*, two sons and three daughters, dwelt together under his humble roof, in penury and wretchedness.

The father readily consented, in order to diminish his domestic cares, to transfer his eldest son, *Anthony Luther*, (born January 13th 1821,) to the Martin's Institute to be educated. Accordingly, on the 16th of May, 1830, amid the prayers and greetings of hundreds of Christians, the poor child passed through the gates of the ancient Augustinian Cloister, and was located in an apartment adjoining the famous cell occupied three hundred and twenty-five years ago by his celebrated progenitor, where it was determined every effort should be made to rescue him from moral degradation, and give him a religious and intellectual education worthy his great ancestor.

To *Mr. H. Holzschuer* was assigned the duty of conveying the lad to Erfurt. He describes the scene he beheld in Bohemia in the following language: "In the paternal house, I beheld the children but partially covered with foul rags, lying on the huge earthen stove as in a nest, in a room whose walls had become black with smoke. This stove was their bed, their table, and the theatre of their pitiful gambols."\* Little Anthony accompanied his conductor with a smiling countenance and a cheerful disposition. On the journey he was every where kindly welcomed and participated in the prompt and active sympathy of Christian friends, who provided abundance of apparel for him, and eagerly contributed money for his future support. An appeal for pecuniary aid was made to a small circle of brethren, which produced immediate fruits, and when the child was presented to the Crown Prince of Prussia and his consort, they both subscribed their names, obligating themselves for an annual contribution.

Safely introduced into the family of Reinthaler, little Luther was soon domiciliated, and gradually developed a bland, submissive and plastic character, but we are sorry to add—not a single evidence of superior mental capacity. Thus during the last five years he has been improving in a physical and moral point of view, but intellectually he has made too little progress to warrant the belief that he is susceptible of scientific discipline. It has therefore been concluded to bind him out to learn the carpenter business, confident that he will become a pious and useful mechanic.

In the mean time his father *Joseph Charles Luther*, died suddenly the 20th Oct. 1834, leaving his widow and the four remaining children in great distress in Bohemia. These children are: Maria and Ann born 1819; John born 1826; and Theresia, born 1831. The mother then addressed herself to Reinthaler and implored "the Martin's Institute for God's sake to have compassion on her four helpless orphans, and to educate and provide for them as it had done for Anthony."

It was impossible for the benevolent Reinthaler to resist this request. Indeed he had previously, anno 1834, proposed to the father to take charge of John. Accordingly this philanthropist, exercising entire con-

\* Those who have seen the old fashioned immense earthen stoves, still in vogue in some parts, especially in the north of Europe, will be at no loss to conceive how such a stove might be applied to these various purposes.



fidence in the kind providence of God, and the characteristic cheerfulness of the noble-hearted Germans to aid in every work of benevolence, again threw wide open the portals of his institution to the rest of the children. They passed through the old cloister-door on *Alexus-day*, the 17th of July, the very day on which 390 years before, their distinguished ancestor had entered the same edifice, through the same door as a monk.

It is not doubted that God will provide means to defray the expenses of their education. Thousands of Christians, not only of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, but of the Protestant world, will rejoice and thank God for this Providential rescue of the almost extinct race of the hero of our evangelical faith. In contributing to this noble purpose, we shall evince our gratitude, and do honor to ourselves and to our Protestant principles. Verily this is a work of philanthropy, in which every enlightened Christian should be anxious to bear a part; it is a common cause, a cause entitled to the support not only of the Germans in Europe, but also in this country.

Where is the Protestant Christian who will not esteem it a high privilege to contribute his mite to this delightful charity? Who among us does not owe an incalculable amount of debt to Luther, and who can resist the opportunity of co-operating in the erection of this living monument of honor to his lineal descendants?—*Lutheran Observer*.

ART. XII. *A paper written by the late Rev. William Logan, of the Associate Reformed Church.*

A respected correspondent has been somewhat misinformed relative to the above paper. It has been published only *in part* by the late Dr. Anderson, in his "Alexander and Rufus, or Dialogues on Church Communion." The part published relates to the subject of covenanting, and is contained in a *note* found at the bottom of *page 319* of the work just mentioned, which note we will here publish entire. It is as follows:

"To the same purpose, with what is here advanced on the continuing obligation of the covenants of our ancestors, and on the manner of renewing them in a bond adapted to our present circumstances, are the words of an excellent paper, said to have been written by the Rev. William Logan, in the year 1806, a little before his death; and intended to have been communicated to the Associate Reformed Synod. Whether it has ever been communicated to that reverend body, is unknown to the writer of these Dialogues; but as he received it through a channel, which leaves him no room to doubt of its genuineness; as it is the testimony of a pious and judicious minister, given at the close of life, to a very important article of the cause of God; and as the publication of it is both honorable to that minister, and agreeable to his intention; it is hoped, that the candid reader will be gratified by the following extract.

"My bodily infirmities not permitting me to attend the meeting of synod, I thought proper to signify my views to the rev. synod, relative to their minute on the head of public covenanting at New-York, 1802, in which it is asserted, *That it is not possible to make these covenants, as they stand, part of the church's testimony in America. To be at all applicable to the circumstances of this church, they must undergo a variety*

of alterations ; but the moment that any alteration is introduced into an instrument of solemn compact, it ceases to be the same instrument. Concerning this, it may be observed, that in a civil contract, indeed, if one party give up with or break the compact, the other party is freed from the obligation :—But these solemn covenants of our ancestors or predecessors in the church, were engagements to the Most High God, as well as to one another ; in which the party vowing or swearing, came under an obligation to all the duties, they owed to God and man.

“ These are the terms of the national covenant of Scotland, as renewed in the year 1638 ; and also of the solemn league. That God was the Great Party sworn to was evident from the nature of these covenants, and the terms in which they were expressed. Mr. Case, in his first sermon at the taking of the solemn league, says, *The parties striking this covenant, are God and his people. What is it then, think ye ; when a king, yea, kingdoms on one side, and the great God on the other, swear mutually to one another ?* Again : *Beloved Christians, this is the end of covenants and oaths between God and his people, viz. to unite and secure the one to the other.* Covenants of that kind descend, in their obligation, to posterity ; which is acknowledged by synod, as to the religious parts of these covenants : and Mr. Case further says, concerning the solemn league, *There is nothing in the body of this covenant, which is not either purely religious, or has a tendency to religion, conducing to the securing and promoting thereof.* Such covenants are obligatory on the posterity of them who entered into them, wherever scattered over the world, even in virtue of the solemn public oaths of their ancestors ; that is, to the discharge of all the moral duties contained in them, according to the calls of word and Providence, and the opportunities laid to their hand. If there are duties mentioned in these covenants, which in our situation and circumstances (such as those respecting the king and parliament) we have not a call or opportunity of discharging, in that case, we are not bound : these relations are now dead to us in America ; and when the relation ceases, the duties formerly due to that relation cease. The law of God binds no farther than to the duties of the relation and circumstances in which a man is placed. But though we are not to consider ourselves bound by these covenants to some of the things mentioned, for the reason just now given, this cannot annul the obligation we are under, by virtue of these covenants to promote the reformation cause in the doctrine, worship, discipline, and government of the Presbyterian church, of which we are a branch. These covenants, by a very small explication, might easily apply to the case of the church in America. To modify them in this manner, I would suppose, is not to destroy them ; but to reduce them to practice. The substance of explicit church covenanting, is the avouching of the Lord to be our God and the God of our seed, solemnly devoting ourselves and our posterity to him, promising and solemnly swearing in the strength of his grace to walk in his ways, to keep his commandments, and to hearken to his voice ; and at the same time explicitly promising the discharge of the duties which are in a special manner called for at our hand, and testifying against the errors and corruptions which may be most prevalent, and from which we may be in the greatest danger. It would, indeed, be dreadful in us to swear these covenants in the same terms in which they were expressed in the time of our ancestors ; this would be to swear to the discharge of the duties of the time past ; of the duties which are not required at our hand ; and for which we have

‘neither grace promised, nor opportunity of performing. When we covenant with God and with one another, we ought to engage to the discharge of the duties of our own situation and circumstances; and in so doing, it may well enough be said, that we are renewing covenant with God; because it would be an application of a former engagement, or our acting upon the obligation we are already under, of acknowledging the Lord to be our God, and promising the discharge of the duties we are already bound to perform, by virtue of the solemn oath of our ancestors or predecessors in the church; as, on this account, we are not in the same situation with a people, who neither in their own persons, nor in the loins of their ancestors are, in this explicit manner, under an obligation to this effect. For proof, that this was the sense in which our ancestors understood the work of covenanting among them, we need only refer to their acts and deeds in relation to it. President Edwards expresses himself to the same purpose, concerning the Jews in the time of Nehemiah. *After this, says he, having separated themselves from all strangers, they solemnly observed a fast by hearing the word of God, confessing their sins, and renewing their covenant with God. A church in this situation, supposed covenanting with God, a recognising the obligation, they were previously under, to obedience.* For my part, I cannot view the matter in any other light, without endeavoring to deny or conceal the former obligation. The form of the covenant, in respect of the words, may be called another; but not in respect of the substance: for the substance of the church’s testimony is the same in all periods of it. *Ye are my witnesses, saith the Lord, that I am God.* Mr. Calamy, on this head, expresses himself to the same purpose, in his sermon at the taking of the solemn league. He observes, *that the Israelites had not only a covenant of circumcision, but renewed a covenant at Horeb and at Moub; and again and again bound themselves to the Lord by vow and covenant. And thus, in the church of Christ, christians, besides their vow in baptism, have many national and personal engagements to perform unto God by covenant; which is nothing else but the renovation and particular application of the first vow in baptism. Their after covenanting must be a renovation of their former covenanting, though expressed in words accommodated to their present situation and circumstances.*

“If the obligation of the covenants of our ancestors cannot be owned for substance, when the situation of the church and particular church members are such that they have not an opportunity of discharging some duties in them through a change of circumstances; what must have been the state of the martyrs under Charles the second and James the second, when they became persecutors and tyrants? Numbers of those heroic confessors of the truth disowned the authority of these persecutors and tyrants; and at the same time owned the obligation of their covenants for reformation, and sealed their testimony with their blood: though they declared, that they were not under an obligation from these covenants to defend the king or to maintain the privileges of parliament, when both were prostituting the power, they claimed, to the destruction of true religion, and of the liberty of the subject.’

“Mr. Logan, having thus shewn how the covenants of our ancestors or predecessors in the church ought to be renewed, gives it as his judgment, that the practice of public covenanting is seasonable at present, and confirms this judgment by various weighty reasons.

“‘I confess,’ says he, ‘I cannot give a satisfactory answer to such as

'inquire why the synod does not proceed to public, explicit covenanting  
 'with God. Public covenanting is a duty suited to every generation of  
 'church members. *Vow and pay unto the Lord*, is an express precept.  
 'But if this duty is to be omitted, except in very singular emergencies of  
 'the church, or what church officers deem to be such; it may not be at-  
 'tended to for many generations; though still confessed to be a moral  
 'duty. Public covenanting has been eminently countenanced by God,  
 'and been a singular mean of bringing about a revival in the churches.  
 'It was the glory of the British and of the Irish Presbyterian churches.  
 'It is a duty which many professors of religion seem industriously to  
 'shun. But, in so doing, they are far from being suitably exercised. It  
 'is a duty as really belonging to the church as baptism and the Lord's  
 'supper; and bears a special reference to the covenant of grace. Deut.  
 'xxvi. 17. *Thou hast avouched the Lord this day to be thy God, and to walk*  
 '*in his ways, and to keep his statutes, and his commandments, and his*  
 '*judgments, and to hearken to his voice.* We ought to avouch the Lord  
 'to be our God, with all the solemnity possible; even with the solemnity  
 'of an oath. This appears from precepts, promises and prophecies of  
 'scripture, and from reason. That it is seasonable at this time, appears  
 'from various considerations. Temptations are many and strong,  
 'whereby professors of religion are in hazard. Infidelity and irreligion are  
 'prevalent. Heresies and delusions abound, whereby the doctrines of the  
 'gospel are clouded. There appears to be a general restraint of the in-  
 'fluences of the Holy Spirit. The Lord has been justly displeased: we,  
 'with our fathers, have sinned; therefore, we ought to turn unto the  
 'Lord. They shall ask the way to Zion with their faces thitherward,  
 'saying, Come, and let us join ourselves to the Lord in a perpetual cov-  
 'enant that shall not be forgotten. If it be objected, that we profess the  
 'truth at large in our systems of truth; to this it may be answered, that  
 'we do not confess in as explicit a manner as we are warranted to do,  
 'even with the solemnity of an oath: nor are we giving others that assu-  
 'rance which we have in our power to do: an oath for confirmation is  
 'to men an end of all strife: nor do we honour God so explicitly as we  
 'might by solemn explicit covenanting, in confessing the being, the per-  
 'fections, the cause and interest of the living God.'

"From this extract it appears, that this pious minister died a hearty  
 friend to a testimony for the obligation of the covenants of our fore-  
 fathers on posterity, and for the seasonableness of public covenanting in  
 the present day. To this case, the words of the poet are applicable:

"A death bed 's a detector of the heart.—YOUNG."

### ART. XIII. *Intelligence from Java.*

Letters have been received from our missionaries at Batavia, as late  
 as the 5th of December, at which time they were all in good health, and  
 devoting themselves to the preparation for their missionary work. We  
 subjoin extracts from a letter from Rev. Mr. Youngblood to Rev. Dr. De  
 Witt of this city, dated November 27, 1836.—*Ch. Ia.*

"On the 5th of October we had a short interview with the Governor  
 General of the Netherlands, India, at his palace in the city, and were as  
 well received as we had reason to expect. His Secretary, who speaks

tolerably good English, acted as interpreter on the occasion. Shortly after waiting upon the Governor, we presented a petition to the government for leave of residence in the vicinity of Batavia, and for permission to travel at some future time to other parts of Java and on other islands under the Dutch government, in order to select, in the providence of God, the most promising field for the permanent location of our mission. We have not yet received an answer to our petition, but are daily looking for it with considerable anxiety; especially as some of our friends, who are better acquainted with the policy of the government than ourselves, are under some apprehensions that we will not obtain permission to remain for any length of time upon the island. But if leave of residence is not granted us, and we are obliged to leave within a few months, we trust it will be overruled to His glory, without whose will a sparrow cannot fall to the ground, and to whom we desire to commit our way and our all.

“The policy of government, as it respects missionary operations, is the same or nearly the same that it has been for several years past. Missionaries are permitted to labor among the Chinese and Malays in and about the large cities under the eye of the government; but are entirely excluded from laboring for the spiritual good of the native Javanese, who constitute the great mass of the population in the interior of the island; and who are represented by those who have travelled among them, and on whose veracity we can rely, as an inquisitive people, quick of perception, very desirous of instruction, and far from being bigoted Mahomedans.

“As it respects the adult Chinese and Malay population by whom we are surrounded, all efforts for their conversion to Christianity, in human view, seem to be hopeless. The great mass of the Chinese appear to be wholly intent upon gain. They will lie, defraud, and descend to almost any menial arts to accomplish their object. At the same time they are wedded to their idols and superstition. A short time since I visited one of their temples, which I will not pretend to describe,—suffice it to say that it contained gods many, and lords many. The Malays differ from the Chinese in almost every respect. They appear to have no desire for the acquisition of wealth. If they can procure rice for their subsistence; the beetle-nut, sere, and tobacco to chew; and a turban or two, with a few thin garments to wear; they appear to be content. This I say is true with regard to the mass; there are, as you may suppose exceptions. There is one trait in the Malay character which is highly commendable, and ought to put many professing Christians to the blush. Although the professed followers of one who delighted in war and murder, they are remarkably gentle and peaceable in their disposition. Since our arrival, which is now between two and three months, I have seen hundreds and sometimes thousands daily; but I have not seen an individual strike another, neither have I heard any angry words between any. The children both of the Chinese and Malays are very interesting, and I am fully persuaded, as capable of receiving instruction as children in Christian countries. I have been surprised at the proficiency of some Malay boys here in writing and arithmetic. Schools might be established for the instruction of Chinese children, to almost any extent. The greater part of the Malays are unwilling to have their children taught in schools where Christian books are used, or where they suspect they will be used. If proper and continued efforts were used, however, I think schools might be established among them, the expense of a school annually con-

taining 25 or 30 children, is about 300 rupees copper, about \$100, of which the teacher receives more than two thirds.

"We have not received any interesting or important intelligence from any of the missionary stations on the island or on the continent recently. Mr. Tracy, at Singapore, who was dangerously ill, has nearly, if not entirely recovered. The Rev. Mr. Barnstein, with whose name you must be somewhat familiar, and three other German Missionaries left us on 28th of September for Surabaya, and from thence they intended to sail, as soon as practicable, for Borneo, to establish missions among the Dyaks. A letter was recently received from Mr. B. stating that they were soon to leave Surabaya; and that, since their arrival, they had preached frequently, and that large numbers had flocked to hear them. Recent accounts from Mr. Armes, on Borneo, mention that the state of things there as regards missionary operations do not wear as encouraging an aspect as some time previous, still there was much to induce missionaries to go forward.

"On the 6th inst, we welcomed the missionary brethren, Mr. Travalli, Mr. Robbins, Dr. Tracy, and their wives, and Dr. Hope, to these shores. Their society, while with us, was refreshing, and I trust a heavenly savor of it still remains. On the 24th they left us for Singapore in the English ship *Bencoolen*.

"The health of all the members of our mission family is tolerably good at present. We are all engaged in the study of the Malay language, and some of our number intend soon to commence the Chinese. The health of Batavia is very good at present. I do not believe that there have been fewer deaths in any city of the same size in the United States than there have been in this for the last three months. But notwithstanding all this, the climate is debilitating, and we must be careful to avoid exposure to the sun. The thermometer has not stood higher than 86 in the room we occupy—generally from 78 to 83. It is my intention, at some future time, to send some extracts of my journal, if deemed sufficiently interesting, to the Society, which has so generously appointed me their missionary to the heathen."

---

#### ART. XIV. *Miscellany.*

STATE OF RELIGION IN HALLE, &c. IN GERMANY.—PARIS, March 1, 1836,—“Our next resting place was Halle, where we were obliged to stop rather longer than we at first intended, as, on entering the town, our carriage broke down. As soon as I had made arrangements about the carriage, and got a little refreshment, I waited on my old friend Professor Tholuck, and met him at his door, going to spend the evening with some pious friends. He carried me along with him without ceremony. You may guess my surprise, when on entering the house, I found I was the guest of an old friend, or minister from the neighborhood of London, whose ill health had obliged him to leave his church, and, accompanied by his sister, repair to the Continent for a season. I was happy to learn that good Professor Tholuck, has by perseverance, prudence, and sterling talent, lived down that opposition made against him when he first took his place at this Neologian University. With few exceptions, the Professors are as determined enemies to the pure gospel as ever; but

Tholuck's talents and consistent conduct are appreciated by the young men, so that he is the best attended of any of them. As a preacher, *he* is, perhaps, one of the most popular in Germany. Crowds flock to hear him. This has excited the jealousy of the rationalist clergy in Halle, so that they have entered into a compact to prevent his preaching in their churches. He has been the means of reviving the cause of religion among the inhabitants of the Town, and among the Students he has many spiritual children, many of whom are laboring in the vineyard of our Lord with much success, and at present there are about fifty pious Students attending the University, who, I hope, will go forth in due time in the fulness of the blessing of the gospel of Christ.

"Dr. Guericke, one of the Professors, and a pious, talented man, has lately declared himself a dissenter from the new national church, has adopted the cause of the persecuted Lutherans, formed a little church of the adherents of Lutheranism in the town and neighborhood, and been ordained by Dr. Soehnel as their pastor. This has given great offence to the powers that be. He has been dismissed from the University as a non-conformist, and he and his poor people are hunted down as if they were the worst of heretics. It is unaccountable that a government, which, I believe, wishes to promote the cause of true religion, should suffer men who are decided enemies to the Gospel, and who, from the Professors' chair, hold up the Bible to open ridicule, to instil their pernicious principles into the minds of youth, and yet will not suffer a man who only adheres to the doctrines and practices of Luther, the great reformer, to retain and propagate his opinions. But it has always been so. Non-conformity in matters of religion, has always been looked upon by the supporters of State churches as the worst of crimes. Only conform to the religion of the State, and you may entertain and propagate the most heterodox of opinions. I have no doubt but the present opposition to the poor Lutherans, will be, one means in the hand of God, of leading many in Germany to remember whence they have fallen, and to repent, and do their first works.

"Even in Leipsic, in Saxony, where all are professedly Lutheran, a number have separated themselves from the State church, because of its corruptions, and declared themselves the genuine disciples of the Saxon Reformers. They are taking the same ground in regard to the National churches, as the Scotch Seceders did a hundred years ago; and may we not hope it may lead to the same results? Indeed some of them already perceive that all connection between the church and state is unscriptural, and is the cause of the awful departure from the truth which has taken place in the churches of Germany. On the other hand, the German princes, great and small, seem determined to exert their power over the church to its utmost extent, and to make the church the creature of the State, and entirely subservient to its purposes. Thus, instead of one head, the Protestant church has as many heads as there are sovereign princes, and what is remarkable, is most independent where the sovereign is Catholic."—[*Christian Guardian.*]

A SOLEMN THOUGHT.—"There will be a time when it shall be asked of you and me, 'Where is he? and the answer shall be, 'He is dead;—he died last year, or five years ago.' When you come to die—it is a truism, I know, but it is one which we perpetually want more deeply impressed on our hearts—when you come to die, it will matter nothing how long you have lived, how long the time once appeared before you, or how

long it may seem, as you look back upon it ; it is gone, effectually gone. Then why, let me earnestly and affectionately ask you, why live now as if you were to live here for ever ?

**ORIGIN OF BALLS.**—What virtuous male or female will be willing to give countenance to the amusements of the ball room when they seriously consider the origin and tendency of this species of merriment. Its origin is made known in the following extract, and its tendency to licentiousness of thought and feeling and action, is too obvious to need proof :

The origin of balls is marked by facts and features of the most startling depravity. In the early ages of heathenism, when the sublimated wisdom of a world in wickedness, worshipped a centurian's band of stupid idols, when polluted Jove and bloody Mars, and cruel Juno, and lascivious Venus, were fabulously allowed to preside over the destinies and affections of mankind ; when vice in her meretricious ornaments, ministered as the lovely priestess of virtue, the exercise of dancing was introduced as a healthy, invigorating amusement, and balls soon became one of the fashionable sports of those idolatrous pleasure-lusting times. They derive their exalted ancestry from the festive celebrations of the mad rights of the heathen goddess Venus, where abandoned prostitutes, and their polluted paramours, danced together in a state of perfect nakedness, to promote their virtue, by familiarizing themselves, with lust. There the lascivious passions enjoyed a free and most luxuriant exercise, and in those vestibules of hell, the most debasing vice was worshipped as the tutelar divinities of the orgies that were held. From this prolific parentage has sprung the numerous offspring of the present balls, and their proud pedigree is still to be traced in every moral feature of their character. The bold pride of the parent vitiater, has however been successfully equalled by the apt enterprise of the offspring ; and the Palais Royale, but a few years since was honored with balls, conducted exclusively by intermingled throngs of naked male and female dancers. The present advocates of balls are welcome to all the honor of their origin and ancestry, and none but the incorrigible devotees of the amusement have a right to pluck the contaminated chaplet from their brow.

Such then are balls, with all their glory and disgrace ; and such they stand, the abhorrence of heaven and the joy of hell. In the grand arsenal of Satan, there are no more formidable armor, for the destruction of the souls of young and unsuspecting females ; and in the dread solemnities of the judgment day, the ruined votaries of balls, will stand in trooping multitudes, before the throne of the Eternal, cursing their own destructive folly, and calling on the crumbling universe, to conceal their shame and guilt, while the wailings of their endless woe, will swell the undying tortures of eternity.—*Adv. of Moral Reform.*

**GOVERNMENT SUPPORT OF IDOLATRY IN INDIA.**—The friends of Christianity in India, says the London Missionary Magazine for February, who have long regarded with deep regret the system pursued by the rulers of that country, in reference to the support they have given to the idolatrous worship of the people, and deeply lamented the evils to which it has given rise, will be glad to learn that active measures are now in progress, to put an end to the ruinous and anti-Christian policy, which has been so long followed. At a Meeting of the General Court of Pro-



prietors, in the East India House, on the 21st of Dec. ult., Mr. Poynder brought forward a Resolution, the object of which was to recommend to the Court of Directors, to take more decided steps for abolishing the pilgrim tax, and for discontinuing the support afforded by the Indian government to the idolatry of that country. Mr. Poynder's proposition, enforced in an excellent speech, and supported by Messrs Marriott, Hankey, and other proprietors, was carried by an unanimous vote of the Court. It is therefore to be expected that this unholy source of revenue to the Indian Exchequer will be speedily closed up, and the sinful connexion between the British authorities and the priests, and the temples of Hindoo Idolatry, presenting as it has hitherto done, a formidable obstacle to the progress of the Gospel in India, will soon entirely cease.

---

**ESTEEM YOUR MINISTER.**—“*Know them which labour among you, and are over you in the Lord, and esteem them very highly in love, for their work's sake.*” 1 Thess. v. 12, 13.

Where a minister is properly esteemed and loved, there will be the greatest deference for his opinions, the most delicate attention to his comfort, a scrupulous respect for his character. Some people treat their minister as if he could feel nothing but blows. They are rude and uncourteous. Instead of this, let him see the most studious and constant care to promote his happiness and usefulness.—When he is in sickness, visit him; in trouble, sympathize with him; when absent from home, take a kind interest in his family; when he returns, greet him with a smile. Let him see that his prayers, and solicitude, and sermons, render him dear to the hearts of his flock. It is astonishing what an influence is sometimes produced upon a minister's mind and comfort, even by the least expression of his people's regard.—*Rev. J. A. James.*

---

**ATHEISM.**—One day, that D'Alembert and Condorcet were dining with Voltaire, they proposed to converse on atheism, but Voltaire stopped them at once. “Wait,” said he, “till my servants have withdrawn, I do not wish to have my throat cut to-night.”

---

### *The Greatest Problem.*

A young man who had taken his degree in college, and was celebrated for his attainments particularly in mathematical learning, settled in a village where a worthy clergyman resided. It was not long before the clergyman met him in one of his walks, and after some conversation, as they were about to part, he said to him, I hear you have distinguished yourself for your mathematical attainments. I have a problem which I wish you would solve. What is it, eagerly enquired the youth? The pastor replied, “What shall it profit a man, if he shall gain the whole world and lose his own soul? Or, What shall a man give in exchange for his soul?” The student said nothing, but smiled at the old man's solemnity. But the problem stuck to him, and in vain he attempted to shake it off. In pleasure, in business, and even in his most favorite studies, this problem would recur, and he had no peace of mind until he had solved it by the word of God.—[*Communicated.*]

ART. XV. *Queries.*

If Slavery, which is acknowledged a sin on all hands, be retained in the church, what may we say as to the church's faithfulness?

If iniquity be established by law—can this clear the church from the guilt of the sin thus established by law? X.

*To the Editor of the Religious Monitor.*

SIR,—Does not the *Unveiler of Theology*, who, in the March No. of the Monitor, subscribes himself "Seceder," directly or indirectly deny that there is any warrant from the word of God for the office of *Ruling Elder*, in the church, as distinct from that of *Teaching Elder*? And if so, should not some of your able correspondents examine his doctrine, and ascertain whether the name "Seceder" truly belongs to him, or is assumed? Y.

The question is often asked, What is the difference between the Seceders, and the Associate Reformed? The answer has been industriously circulated, and even expressed from the pulpit, by individuals connected with the latter Association, that "there is no difference;" sometimes this disingenuous assertion is added—"except this, the Seceders are bound by their Covenant Engagements, never to give up their present avowed principles, or join another denomination, even should they be convicted of error." Now, although it might not be deemed necessary to intimate to the intelligent and candid, that there is a "difference," and that our covenant obligations bind us to embrace and maintain the truth wherever, and whenever discovered, and to give up our principles now maintained, whenever convicted of error; yet might not the cause of truth, and general satisfaction be promoted, if some correspondent would, through the Monitor, briefly and plainly state the specific *difference*? And will the writer be pleased to add a few observations, showing the propriety of maintaining a separate communion, though this difference be comparatively small, now considered unimportant?

According to the established order of presbyterial church courts, a candidate for the Ministry is licensed to preach a certain length of time before ordination. Is he then to be considered a true and proper minister of Christ, and as such commissioned to "go and teach all nations, baptizing them," Mat. xxviii, 19? If he be not in the full sense of the word, a Minister of Christ, wherein does his essay to preach the gospel differ from a student's probationary exercises? Is a call from the people indispensably requisite, as the ground upon which the church judicatory proceeds to ordain? If so, how can they ordain some for Missionary, or particular purposes, before such calls are received, as is often done? But if it be urged that such a testimonial from the people is necessary, is more than one call demanded as an evidence that the probationer is possessed of such qualifications as will render him an acceptable and useful teacher among the people? If one call be sufficient, as has been generally thought, then should not the court of Christ's house immediately proceed to ordain the probationer, upon his presenting the requisite evidence of his fitness to discharge all the official duties of an ambassador of Christ? And would not the interests of the church be thus greatly promoted, especially in new places, where often he is called upon to admi-

nister baptism, and desired to dispense the sacrament, organize new vacancies, &c.?

If an individual, ordained to the eldership of one congregation having changed locations should be chosen a ruling elder in another, must his ordination vows be imposed upon him again? QUIRENDO.

### ART. XVI. Poetry.

#### FOR THE RELIGIOUS MONITOR.

The following lines were written on seeing the representation of a lamb burning on the altar,—as offered up in the temple of old; underneath which was inscribed

“IL BRULE POUR VOUS.”

*It burns for you.*

It burns for you, its blood is shed;  
To save from sin, this Lamb is dead:  
It burns a type,—by mercy given,  
Of Him who died to give us Heav'n.

Yes, but a type, its blood may flow,  
But never quench the flames of wo,  
Never save from sin and wrath,  
Heirs of Hell and endless death.

The tide of burning wrath to turn,  
Though beasts of forest all should burn,  
Though angels leave their thrones to die,  
Is hopeless:—lost and helpless man must lie.

But see from Heav'n's throne descend  
God Himself, the sinner's friend:  
“Lo I come,”—the Saviour cries,  
The Lord of life, a sacrifice.

*He burns for you*, the Holy One  
Bears the wrath of God alone,  
Buys your pardon with His blood;  
Behold, and love the Incarnate God.

He burns for you, the Eternal Son,  
His soul is pierc'd, your cause is won;  
His blood has quench'd the flames of wrath,  
The Lord has saved you by His death.

He burns for you:—let burning love  
Your deep devoted reverence prove:  
Burn O my heart, an altar be  
Quenchless as Eternity.

MAXTON.

# CONTENTS.

	<i>Page.</i>		<i>Page.</i>
<b>A</b>		<b>D</b>	
Abraham, Reflections on the life of, &c.	9	Dr. McCrie, Obituary of	89
Albany, Report of Presbytery of	24	Decrease of Population in Heathen Nations,	173
Alleghany, Report of Presbytery of	31	Dependence on the Holy Spirit,	240
Act for a Fast,	39	Departure of Missionaries,	237
Appointments, Scale of	42	Dancing,	330
Anniversaries, London,	135	Druze, Acquittal of a	373
Anniversaries in Paris,	134	Denmark,	427
Assembly's Narrative,	138	Dialogue between two Devils respecting Popery,	407
Answers to Reasons of Protest in case of Mr. Barnes,	141	Duty, What is present	531
Associate Synod's Bible Society,	142	Debarrances, Answer to Query respecting	538
Antient Lease, Clause in	192	Dance, A Time to	551
Associate Presbytery of Pennsylvania,	209	<b>E</b>	
American Board of Foreign Missions,	240	Erratum,	96, 144
Associate Reformed Synod of New-York,	288, 475	Europe, vices of, flooding America,	141
Act of Associate Synod in Scotland, respecting the Presbytery of Pennsylvania,	311	Expositions of Important Texts,	165, 216, 337, 398
Attempts at evangelization in Spain and Portugal	322	English Unitarians,	175
Anti-Slavery Movements,	335	Ecclesiastical Record,	192, 226, 429
A Protestant's Resolutions,	340, 416	Emancipation, Negro	210
A Case of Affliction,	364	Erskine, Rev. Ralph, Letter of	229
Attractions of Heaven,	36	Emancipation Society of Glasgow,	314
Acquittal of a Druze,	373	Explanations of Q.,	556
Advice to Clergymen,	380	Esteem your minister,	574
Advertisement,	386	<b>F</b>	
Adherence to a Scriptural Profession,	387	Fast, act for	30
Almsgiving, Scriptural manner of	391, 556	France, Romanism in	186
Andrew Melville,	403	France,	326
Answers of A. H. to the Queries of Q.	423	Faith, Imputation of	554
A Comparison of Creeds,	450, 492	<b>G</b>	
A Precedent,	481	Geneva Presbytery on Instrumental Music,	192
A Dialogue between two Devils,	497	Glasgow Emancipation Society,	314
A Memorial addressed to the Associate Synod,	513	Greece,	327
A Letter to Memorialists,	515	General Assembly of Church of Scotland,	326
A caution against a common mode of deception,	535	Germany, Central	370
Answer to Query respecting Debarrences,	538	German States on the Lower Rhine,	373
Analysis of Prophetic Times,	540	Government support of Idolatry in India,	373
A Time to Dance,	561	<b>H</b>	
A solemn thought,	572	Holland, Church in	136, 478
Athelam, anecdote of Voltaire,	574	" Religious state of	230, 370
<b>B</b>		" Intolerance in	286
Bible Society, Report of Treasurer of	44	Harems in the east, breaking up of	239
" Resolution on subject of	44	Holy Spirit, dependence on	240
Barnes, Mr., Case of	48, 91, 141	Haldane, Robert, Letter of	301
Bunyan, John, and the Bishop,	130	Heaven's Attractions,	367
Bible Society, Associate Synod's,	142	Hearers, Inattentive	360
Brief Expositions of Important Texts, 165, 216, 337, 398	142	Home affairs,	384
Baptists, Scotch,	186	<b>I</b>	
British Idolatry,	190	Interesting Circumstance,	140
Barnes' Notes on the Romans,	227	Intelligence, Religious	184, 230, 293, 322, 360, 427
Breaking up of the Harems in the east,	239	Ireland, converts from Popery in	189
Brooza,	327	Instrumental Music, Geneva Presbytery on	192
Breckenridge's Letter, Mr.	341, 385	Importance of studying Church History,	336
Belgium,	373	Inattentive Hearers,	380
Bible above all price,	434	Influence of Woman,	478
Baptism, Pophish,	476	Imputation of Faith,	554
Balls, origin of	573	Intelligence from Java,	569
<b>C</b>		Idolatry in India, government support of	573
Cambridge, Report of Presbytery of	18	Idolatry, British	190
Charlteris, Report of Presbytery of	22	Increase of Romanism,	225
Christian World Unmasked,	73, 167, 220, 273, 332	Irish Presbyterians,	283
Church in Holland,	462, 505	Il brule pour vous, (poetry,)	576
Circumstance, Interesting	138	<b>J</b>	
Catholic Priests, more,	140	John ii. 2, Remarks on	3
China,	141	John Bunyan and the Bishop,	130
Congregational Union of Scotland,	184, 432	<b>L</b>	
Converts from Popery in Ireland,	158	London Anniversaries,	186
Clause in an antient Lease,	189	Luther's, Martin, will	141
Communion, Catholic	192	Law, John, Obituary of	143
Confession, Westminster	281	Letter from Siam,	226
Church History, the importance of	282	Love of Novelty,	229
Clergymen, Important advice to	358	Letter of Ralph Erskine,	229
Catechising, Usher's habit of	380	Letter of Robert Haldane,	301
Choking the Word, Deceitfulness of riches	383	Lower Canada,	304
Correspondents,	384, 435	Life of Andrew Melville,	403
Comparison of Creeds,	450, 492	Liberty, Religious, in danger,	441
Caution against a common deception,	535	Letter addressed to Signers of Memorial,	516
Colored population, treatment of	560	Luther's posterity,	568
		<b>M</b>	
		Minutes of Synod,	16
		Miami, Report of Presbytery of	18

	Page.		Page.
Muskingum, Report of Pres. of	19	Report of the Presbytery of Alleghany,	31
McCrie, Rev. Dr.	82	" of the Board of Managers of Th. Sem'ry,	30
Mode of Baptism,	115	" of Treasurer,	26
Martin Luther's Will,	141	" of Assistant do.,	35
More Catholic Priests,	141	" of Act for a Fast,	30
Missions, news from	234	" of Treasurer of Bible Society,	44
Minute too late, one	239	Regulations respecting particular synods,	9
Missions, American Board of	240	Review of Secession from Established Church,	49, 97, 145, 193, 241
Ministers' Salaries,	279	Rechabites,	140
Missions in Russia, prohibition of	285	Remarks on the ancient mode of singing psalms,	103
Miami Presbytery,	264	Romanism in France,	186
Mode of worship in churches in Holland,	478	Russia, Missions in, prohibited,	265
Make or break,	481	Review of Haldane on the Romans,	267
Memorial and Remonstrance of A. Whyte and others,	513	Respecting the treatment of colored population,	500
Minister, esteem your	574	Religion in Halle, state of	571
<b>N</b>		<b>S</b>	
Notice,	86, 141, 288, 336	Synod, minutes of	16
Narrative of the Assembly,	138	Shenango, report of Presbytery of	26
Notes on Romans, Barnea,	234	Scale of appointments,	42
News from Missions,	343	Secession from church of Scotland, Review of	49, 97, 145, 193, 241
Negro Emancipation,	240	Sabbath, desecration of	59
Novelty, the love of	266	Scripture mode of baptism,	115
New Book,	335	Singing psalms, remarks on the ancient mode of	103
<b>O</b>		Scotland, Congregational Union of	189
Observations and Reflections on the life of Abraham and Sarah,	9	Scotch Baptists,	138
Ohio, Report of Presbytery of	22	Scriptures, wresting of	213, 453
Overture of Rules for a General Synod,	43	Siam, letter from	335
On the desecration of the Sabbath,	69	Salaries, ministers'	379
Obituary of John Law,	143	Smart men, churches, preachers,	266
One Minute too late,	239	Spain and Portugal,	223, 286
On Church History, the importance of	358	Slavery,	324
Our Correspondents,	434	Saxony,	369
Our Religious Liberty in danger,	441	Syria,	373
Origin of Balls,	573	Sabbath violation,	379
<b>P</b>		Seamen, temperance among	262
Philadelphia, Report of Presbytery of	28	Scriptural profession, adherence to	267
Particular Synods, Regulations concerning	43	Switzerland, Catholic	420
Popery, Warning against	71	Starting children in the world,	434
Paris, Anniversaries in	134	Strictures on remarks of Finis,	454
Priests, more Catholic	141	State of Religion in Halle, &c.. Germany,	571
Population, Decrease of, in Heathen Nations,	173	<b>T</b>	
Proceedings of the Ass. Pres. of Pennsylvania,	2, 9	Theological Seminary, report of managers of	30
Presbytery of Stamford, Associate	23	Treasurer, report of	26
Presbytery of Miami, Associate	238	" Assistant, report of	35
Presbyterians, Union of, Scotch and Irish	241	" of Bible Society, report of	44
Preachers, smart men	266	The Christian World unmasked, 73, 167, 220, 233, 262, 428, 505	35
Personal religion an indispensable qualification for the ministerial office,	306	The Rechabites,	140
Portugal and Spain,	323, 326	Texts, brief exposition of important, 165, 216, 337, 368	191
Persia,	323	Truth, relaxed views of	287
Proceedings of General Assembly of Church of Scotland,	285	The Sabbath,	267
Protestant's Resolutions why he cannot be a Papist,	319, 416	Temperance among seamen,	262
Presbyterians in sixteenth and seventeenth centuries,	403	The scriptural manner of almsgiving,	261, 335
Presbyterians in the seventeenth century,	456, 457	The deceitfulness of riches,	264, 425
Psalmody,	460	The unveiling of Theology,	446, 543
Polish Baptism,	478	The Ass. Ref. Synod and Rev. Mr. Stark,	475
Protestantism and Popery contrasted,	480	The great Question,	479
Popery and Protestantism contrasted,	480	The Imputation of Faith,	554
Precedent,	480	The Greatest Problem,	574
Prophetic Times, Analysis of	549	<b>U</b>	
Prosperity of Luther,	563	Unitarians, English,	175
Posthumous paper of Wm. Logan,	563	Union of Scotch and Irish Presbyterians,	240
<b>Q</b>		Usher's habit of catechising,	263
Queries to A. H. of Miami Presbytery,	295	Unveiling of Theology,	446, 543
Question, the great	479	<b>V</b>	
Query,	432	Vices of Europe flooding America,	141
Q's Explanations,	556	Views of Truth relaxed,	191
Queries,	575	Voluntary contributions on Sabbath,	261, 559
<b>R</b>		<b>W</b>	
Remarks on 1 John II. 2,	3	Warning against Popery,	71
Reflections on the life of Abraham and Sarah,	9	World christian, unmasked, 73, 167, 220, 373, 388, 463	192
Report of the Presbytery of Miami,	18	William Wirt and politics,	264
"    " Cambridge,	18	Wresting the Scriptures,	213, 453
"    " Muskingum	10	Westminster confession,	263
"    " Ohio,	22	Wardlaw, Dr Breckenridge's letter to	241
"    " Chartiers,	22	What I have heard,	264
"    " Philadelphia,	22	Women, Influence of	479
"    " Albany,	22	What is present duty,	531
"    " Shenango,	22	Wm Logan, posthumous paper of	563
	24	<b>Y</b>	
	24	Yale College,	262