

A 89011

UT AUSTIN - GEN LIBS WAREHOUSE



02444173

X

2109742800

285.05 C138 N.S. V.4 1849

A89011

285.05
C138
N.S.
V.4



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

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

THE
Calvinistic Magazine.

EDITED BY

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

LIBRARY
UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS

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

VOL. IV. — (NEW SERIES.) — 1849.

ABINGDON, VA:

COALE AND BARR.

146208

Digitized by Google

INDEX.

	PAGE.
A Sermon—preached at an Ordination of Deacons,	65
Agreeable Intelligence.— <i>American Missionary</i> ,	156
A Sermon—by Rev. G. S. WHITE,	289
Baptism.— <i>Presbyterian Record</i> ,	176
Blessings of the Righteous—by the late Rev. G. A. MATTHES,	333
“Calvinism Stained with Blood”—by Rev. J. McCHAIN,	1
Calvinism—its Gloom—its Fruits—by Rev. Dr. LAPSLEY,	152
Catechetical Instruction.— <i>Presbyterian Herald</i> ,	127
Calvin as a Reformer.— <i>Christian Observer</i> ,	301
Civilization and Missions.— <i>Biblical Repository</i> ,	315
Characteristics of Presbyterianism.— <i>Selected</i> ,	172
Divine Efficiency.— <i>Religious Herald</i> ,	375
Editorial Address,	33
“Embracing Both Sides”—by Rev. WM. MINNIS,	83
Emendation of the Bible—by A. G. F.,	321
First Declaration of Independence.— <i>Presbyterian</i> ,	77
Letter to Presbyterians—from F. A. Ross,	36
Missionary— <i>Missionary Herald</i> ,	157
“ “ “ “ “ “	218
Methodist Policy—by A. G. F.,	129
Mohammedanism and its Results.— <i>Selected</i> ,	192
Meeting of the A. B. C. F. M. at Pittsfield,	306
Notices of Ireland.— <i>N. Y. Observer</i> ,	25
Notice,	380
Obituary,	318
Oregon and California.— <i>Home Missionary</i> ,	186
Prayer.— <i>Presbyterian Herald</i> ,	180
Profession of Religion—by R. P. W.,	257
Perseverance of the Saints—by Rev. J. H. GASS,	225
Present Religious Condition of Great Britain.—Rev. Dr. Caruthers,	250
Presbyterianism and the Revolution,	317
Reminiscences of our Venerable Church—by M.,	18
“ “ “ “ “	142
“ “ “ “ “	193
Reminiscences of Dr. Witherspoon.— <i>Selected</i> ,	213
Reply to Rev. J. W. McFarland.— <i>Presbyterian Record</i> ,	243
Romanism in India.— <i>Selected</i> ,	256

71614

71614

	PAGE.
Scriptural Objections to Perseverance.— <i>Rev. H. H. Paine,</i>	- 30
Sermon of Chalmers in the Country.— <i>N. Brit. Review,</i>	- 184
Statistics of Presbyterianism.— <i>Edin. Christ. Witness,</i>	- 216
Silent Reproof.— <i>American Messenger,</i>	- 223
Statistics of Religion in France,	- 318
Support of the Ministry,	- 370
The Leading Features and Excellencies of the Westminster Standards.— <i>Selected,</i>	- 49
The Faith Delivered to the Saints—by J. M. HOFFMEISTER,	92
The Differences of Presbyterians,	- 116
The Returned Missionary.— <i>Salem Gazette,</i>	- 123
The Assembly's Shorter Catechism.— <i>Christ. Instructor,</i>	- 148
The Believer Possessor of all Things—A Sermon—by the late Rev. GEO. A. MATTHES,	- 161
The Mountain Herald—by Rev. L. R. MORRISON,	- 200
The Power of Kindness.— <i>American Messenger,</i>	- 224
The Episcopalian—Witness of the Spirit—by Rev. WM. MINNIS,	- 264
The Want of Missionaries.— <i>Central Watchman,</i>	- 310
The Synod of Tennessee,	- 344
The Posterity of Abraham.— <i>New York Observer,</i>	- 347
The Practical Tendencies of Calvinism.— <i>Rev. J. H. Eaton,</i>	353
The Scriptural and Liberal Character of Presbyterian Church Government.— <i>Rev. Joel Parker, D. D.</i>	- 377
Witness of the Spirit—by Rev. WM. MINNIS,	- 97
Western Reminiscences.— <i>Christian Observatory,</i>	- 279

THE
Calvinistic Magazine.

[NEW SERIES.]

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

Vol. IV.

January, 1849.

No. 1.

"Calvinism Stained with Blood."

BY THE REV. JAMES M'CHAIN.

"Calvinism is stained with blood," has been the stereotype and world-wide denunciation against Calvinists, for ages. Calvin burnt Servetus, the Calvinists of Holland butchered, imprisoned, and banished the innocent Arminians, the Puritans of England perpetrated untold horrors in the name of their creed, and the Puritans of New England burnt and hung the unfortunate witches, and maimed, and fined, and banished the poor Quakers and Baptists—is still the outcry, long and loud.

Yes, "Calvinism is stained with blood." Her garments are *died* with blood. The stains of blood upon her have been becoming deeper and broader, from the first century of the christian era down to the last. These stains of blood will, we believe, become deeper and broader before the world ends.—One Paul, the great expounder of the Calvinistic creed, was covered with this blood, in dying a martyr for the truth as it is in Jesus. The Waldenses, those venerable representatives of Calvinism and Presbyterianism, of a pure and simple christianity, during the darkness of three centuries, were deeply stained with this Calvinistic blood, as they were hunted and shot down for generations, and driven to the vallies and mountain fastnesses of Piedmont, because they would not renounce their religion. The Huguenots, those noble christians of France, were reeking with this blood, when time and again, for conscience' sake, they died on the scaffold, and were slain by the armies of their own country, and were gathered together and butchered in cold blood, by thousands, in the

horrible massacre of St. Bartholomew. Calvinistic Scotland too, has no small share in these blood-stains. Tens of thousands of her noblest sons and daughters were burnt at the stake, were shot down before their wives and little ones, and dyed many a heather plain of Caledonia, in their resistance to civil and religious despotism, and their establishment of civil and religious liberty. The Puritans of England, also, have a large portion in this bloody inheritance, in pulling down the English throne, and beheading the English king, in pouring out their blood like water in many a hard-fought battle, and thus giving to the English, according to Hume, "the whole freedom of their constitution." Nor must the Calvinists of our own land be excluded from the list of this blood-stained multitude. Our Presbyterian and Congregationalist forefathers poured out their blood for the civil and religious freedom of these American colonies, in every battle of the Revolution, from the first blood-shed at Lexington to the capture of Cornwallis, and in every battle-field, from Rhode Island to the Carolinas. Truly Calvinism is stained with blood. Truly her garments are dyed with blood—with the blood of her heroes and martyrs, for the truth as it is in Jesus—with the blood of her heroes and martyrs, poured out in rivers for civil and religious liberty.

We may now, with propriety, ask our opponents, if their *Arminianism* has never been stained with blood? Let *Roman Catholic* Arminianism answer, by pourtraying the horrors of its persecutions and slaughter of the noble Waldenses, for three centuries, on account of their Presbyterianism and Calvinism. Let the Arminianism of Rome farther reply, by narrating the murdering of thousands on thousands of the Calvinistic Huguenots of France, and especially by a recital of the massacre of 10,000 of their number on St. Bartholomew's day, and finally, in the history of the persecution of the Calvinistic Jansenists by the Arminian Jesuits. Let *English* Arminianism answer whether Arminianism is stained with blood, in the scaffolds, and stakes, and battle-fields where she slew multitudes of the noblest sons and daughters of Scotland, because they would not bow to her ecclesiastical tyranny. Let English Arminianism farther respond, by telling of the many thousands whose blood she shed for no other crime than op-

position to the tyranny of the church and state, the blood of those who gave the English "the whole freedom of their constitution." Truly *Arminianism* "is stained with blood." Her garments are DYED with blood—with the blood of the martyrs and heroes whom *she slew* because they chose death rather than give up the truth as it is in Jesus, rather than bow to civil and religious oppression.

Again we ask Arminianism, where are the blood-stains of *her own martyrs for gospel truth and freedom?* Tell us the names of your sons and daughters who have been witnesses for Christ and human liberty, *by their blood*. Show us the dungeons where they pined away. Show us the scaffolds where they were beheaded. Show us the stakes at which they burnt. Show us the battle-grounds on which they lay down in their own gore. Read to us the pages of history which record their heroic deeds and martyrdom, for pure christianity, and political and ecclesiastical freedom. You may point us to a few Arminians in Holland suffering for a time confiscation of property, and banishment, and some of them death, rather than recant their Arminianism. You may tell us of some honored names among our revolutionary patriots, while the great mass of Arminians in the Revolution were enemies to American independence, and abettors of British arms. Be it so. These are your only heroes and martyrs. We would not take them from you if we could. This is the sum total of your heroism and blood-shed in resisting religious tyranny. We would not rob you of it if we were able.

Oh! infinitely then do we prefer our blood-stains to yours. Charge against us, if you will, the blood of Servetus, the blood of the Arminians of Holland, the blood of King Charles of England, and the blood of the witches of New England. We will place over against this charge, the blood-stained garments of our hundreds of thousands of heroes and martyrs for truth and freedom, who poured out their blood in rivers, along the vallies of Piedmont, on the plains of France, among the mountains of Switzerland and the glens of Scotland, and on the soil of England and America. We will leave to Arminianism her bloody garments, dyed with the gore of hundreds of thousands of Calvinistic martyrs whom she slew, for the high crime of resistance to corruptions in religion, and to tyranny in church

and state. We will also leave her the few honorable marks of her own heroism and martyrdom for conscience and freedom, and respectfully suggest to her the propriety of being a little cautious how she again brings against Calvinism the charge—"stained with blood."

But *Methodist* Arminianism now comes up, and cries out, with confident air, "all this may be true, but it proves nothing against *us*. Show us the traces of blood on *our* garments.. Tell us the names of any whom we banished or slew. Point out to us the time when *Methodists* grasped after civil power, or sought a union of church and state." Let us first make a request of our brethren, before we notice what they thus say. Inform us, if you can, of any of your denomination who have died for the truth as it is in Jesus—any who have sealed in their blood their resistance to religious and political despotism. You reply—Methodism is too YOUNG to have MARTYRS. She did not live in the days which called the disciples to witness for Jesus unto the death. She has not had the *opportunity* to bear testimony in this way, for the Master. Be it so.

We now return to the point which we have just left. *Methodist* Arminianism has never stained her hands with the blood of religious persecution, simply because *she did not live in the age for it*, and *has not had the opportunity* to do it. She has not martyrs, because she lived not in the age for them. So, she has not taken the life of those who opposed her, because she has lived in a day too enlightened for this, and *could not* persecute unto death if she would.

We might here dwell upon what Methodists *have* done, to sustain civil and religious tyranny, and persecute her opposers. But we forbear. We only ask, if *these* things were done in the *green* tree, *what* would have been done in the *dry*? If Methodists, with Mr. Wesley at their head, in many respects a truly great and godly man, *have* done *these* things in the 18th and 19th centuries, *what* would they not *HAVE* done if they *could*, had they lived in the times of Calvin, when religious persecution was believed to be a *duty*, and civil liberty had just begun to dawn?

We might now dismiss the charge with which our article began. We feel disposed, however, as we have taken the matter in hand, to carry it a little farther.

Suppose now we admit all thus charged upon us. *What does it prove?* Why, it proves the novel and startling truth, that *very good men may do very bad things*. It proves *all that*. And is this the proposition which our adversaries desire to establish? Why then do they confine themselves to so limited a range of proof? Why make out the argument from *Calvinists alone?* Why not go back a little farther, and come down a little later? Why go not back to “*righteous*” Noah, and take away his title, because he was guilty of drunkenness? Why not go back to Abraham and deny him the honor of being the “*father of the faithful,*” because he practiced gross deception in calling Sarah his sister? Why not deprive Jacob of his name *Israel*, given him in consequence of *prevailing with God as a prince*, because he robbed his brother of his birthright, and told his father a lie? Why not divest Aaron of his high priest’s robe, because he made the golden calf? Why not take from David his title, “*the man after God’s heart,*” because he committed adultery and murder? Why not deny Peter his *apostleship*, because he denied his Lord? Why not come out from the Bible, and put in the same class with the New England witch-burners, *Sir Matthew Hale* and *John Wesley*, who believed in witchcraft, and who, therefore, would think it *a duty* to take the life of a witch, according to the command of God, “*thou shalt not suffer a witch to live?*” If, then, our Methodist brethren wish to prove by the charge of blood against us, *that very good men have done very bad things*, let them include Arminians as well as Calvinists, John Wesley as well as John Calvin, saints in the Bible and saints out of the Bible, and we are sure they can make out a perfect demonstration of their proposition.

“Calvinism is stained with blood.” Be it so. We again ask, *what does it prove!* It proves that *republics are very bad things*. It is the *very same argument* which the enemies of human freedom use to *sustain monarchy and put down republicanism*. The Englishman comes from monarchical England to republican America. He goes through the length and breadth of our land. He sees a mob at one time pull down a convent, at another burn a church, and now demolish private dwellings, and now hang men by “*Lynch law.*” He sees men cutting one another to pieces in the public streets, with Texas

bowie-knives and Arkansas tooth-picks. He sees the fierceness and malignity of our political parties, the tempestuous excitement, and corruption, and slander, of our presidential canvass, and the intemperance, and profanity, and riots on the day of the election. He reads of our deep injustice to our native Indian tribes. He goes home. He writes a book. He recounts all these *bad things*. He paints them out in all their horrors. Then he exclaims, "this is republicanism! This is republican America! Give me monarchy! Give me monarchical England!" So the enemies of Calvinism pourtray all the *bad things* it has done, and cry aloud, "this is Calvinism; these are its deeds—deeds of blood, religious persecutions, and grasping after political power. Is not this a horrible creed? Is it not the foe of freedom?" The Englishman *can* see and *will* see all the *bad things* about American liberty, with a magnifying glass of great power. But he *cannot* see, or *will not* see the *good things* which result from this freedom. He cannot or will not see, that the great mass of our people are able to read and write, are virtuous, religious, and industrious; are clothed with respectable apparel, and have bread enough and to spare. He cannot or will not see how the excitement of our elections arises from the love of our free institutions, the sincerity of our belief in our political principles, and the earnestness of our desire to carry them out in the nation. He cannot or will not see how every one among us sits under his own vine and fig tree, and worships God according to the dictates of his own conscience. He cannot or will not see how America is sending out a mighty influence to civilize and christianize the globe—is spreading civil and religious liberty over the earth, and had much to do with the late falling of thrones and flying of kings in Europe. The Englishman *cannot* or *will not* see these *good things*, but he *can* and *will* see those *bad things*, and exclaims, "republics are bad things! Give me monarchy." Just so the opposers of Calvinism magnify the evil her advocates have done, and see not, or keep out of view the good she has accomplished, and then call her the mother of tyranny and persecution. Her rivers of blood poured out for the truth as it is in Jesus,—her hundreds of thousands of sons and daughters offered on the altar of civil and religious freedom,—her mighty struggle, for ages, against civil and reli-

gious despotism,—her achievements in that conflict, the freedom of these ¹United States, the freedom of ²England, and the rapid spreading of freedom through Europe by the example and influence of America and England—all this vanishes into thin air, at the mention of the burning of Servetus, and the ³hanging of the witches. Thus this argument proves in just the same way, and with just the same force, *that republics and Calvinism are bad things.*

“Calvinism is stained with blood.” Let it be admitted. We again ask, *what does it prove?* It proves that CHRISTIANITY *is a bad thing.* The argument of our opponents is precisely the argument of infidels. It is as good against christians as against Calvinists. What says the skeptic?—“Look at your boasted christianity. See the undeniable evidences of its *divine* origin, in its history written in blood. See in the wars with which it has desolated the globe, what a blessing it has been to mankind. It has shed oceans of human gore. Christians have perpetrated the greatest enormities, in the name of their religion. Christians have waged against each other the bloodiest wars on record. Christian sects have fought one another in the fiercest controversies ever known. Christianity has been the foe of civil and religious freedom, the foe of human happiness. Then the Bible is not from above, cannot be of God.” This is precisely the reasoning of Arminians against Calvinism. Calvinists have committed these horrid deeds, then their creed cannot be true. Let the *infidel* prove that the horrors which he pours out *grew out of christianity herself*, out of her *nature*, her *principles*. Let him prove that these evils are NOT to be ascribed to the *short-sightedness and sinfulness of those who professed christianity*, and to the *times* in which they lived. Let him prove that the blessings which have followed christianity, since the grand Reformation under Luther, are NOT to be attributed to the christian religion, but to something else. Let the infidel do all this, and then he will have some good ground for his conclusion, that “the Bible is not from above, cannot be of God.” So let the Arminian show that, the horrors which he pours out, *grow out of Calvinism herself*, out of her *nature*, her *principles*. Let him show that these evils are NOT to be ascribed to *the short-sightedness*

¹ Bancroft.

² Hume & Macaulay.

³ See Note 1.

and sinfulness of those who professed Calvinism, and to the times in which they lived. Let him explain away the remarkable fact that all the leading reformers in the great Reformation of the 16th century, Luther and Melancthon in Germany, Zuingle in Switzerland, Calvin in Geneva, Farel and Viret in France, Knox in Scotland, Cranmer and Ridley in England,* were all Calvinists. Let him show, against Hume and Macaulay, that Calvinists did not give "to Englishmen the whole freedom of their constitution." Let him show, against all history, that Calvinists have not raised Scotland to her proud position among the nations. Let him show, against Bancroft, that Calvinists were not the principal agents in the achievement of American independence. Let him do all this, and his argument against us will have no little weight. When the Arminian has done this, he has put into the hands of the *infidel* the same terrible weapon to cut up CHRISTIANITY root and branch.

"Calvinism is stained with blood." We again say, be it so. We again ask, *what does it prove?* It proves that *noble men may be far in advance of their age in some of their principles*, and yet, in a measure, enveloped in *the darkness and error of their age*, in regard to *other principles*. Calvin established free institutions at Geneva, when civil freedom had begun to dawn nowhere else. The Calvinists, from the Reformation on through our own Revolution, fought, bled, and died for political liberty. The grand principle of *religious* liberty they did not so clearly see and fully apprehend. They approximated toward this, they were much in advance of their age in respect to the union of church and state, and persecution for religious belief. This union and this persecution, as they held them, were far more liberal and milder than had before prevailed. The entire separation of church and state, and the toleration of all religious sects by the state, were principles which they were approximating, but did not fully reach. Was it to be expected that just emerging as they were from the darkness of the night of a thousand years, they would at once see, and grasp, and establish, all those principles of civil and religious liberty which we have, in the noonday light of three centuries afterward? Is it not an amazing wonder, does it not

*See Note 2.

reflect upon these men the highest honor, does it not show that they were indeed great and good, that they grasped and held fast, and established, as they did, the grand principle of civil liberty, and approached as they did, the grand principles of the separation of church and state, and the toleration of all religions? Is it not black ingratitude, and crying guilt, when they went so far, when they did so much, to villify and abuse them, because they went no farther, and did no more; because they advanced not in ALL their principles, beyond their dark day, *three hundred years*, into the full light of the nineteenth century.*

We will close what we have to say, with a few questions and answers.

Who, for ages, suffered the confiscation of property, exile, imprisonment, and death; rather than renounce the truth as it is in Jesus? The Waldenses and Huguenots—those noble *Calvinists of France*.† Who were the great leaders of the Reformation of the 16th century? Luther and Melancthon, Zuingle, Calvin, Farel and Viret, Knox, Cranmer and Ridley—all *Calvinists*.‡ Who “*alone kindled the precious spark of liberty in England*,” and gave “*the English the whole freedom of their constitution*?” According to Hume, they were the *Puritans*, those reviled *Calvinists*. Who elevated Scotland to her high eminence among the nations? Her sturdy *Calvinists*. Who bore the most important part in our Revolutionary struggle? *Calvinists*, according to our distinguished historian Bancroft; himself an Unitarian. He says:—“We are proud of the free States that fringe the Atlantic. The Pilgrims of Plymouth were Calvinists; the best settlers of South Carolina came from the Calvinists of France; William Penn was the disciple of the Huguenots; the ships from Holland that first brought colonies to Manhattan, were filled with Calvinists. *He that will not honor the memory, and respect the influence of Calvin, knows but little of the origin of American liberty.*” Who first fully brought out *the principle of toleration for all religious sects*? Not *Lord Baltimore*, not *Thomas Jefferson*, but the *Presbyterians* of Virginia. Dr. Baird gives the facts and documents which conclusively prove this, in his “*History of religion in America.*”

*See Notes 1, 2.

†See Note 2.

‡See Notes 2, 3.

Again we ask, who banished, imprisoned, slaughtered tens of thousands of the Calvinistic Waldenses and Huguenots? *Roman Catholic Arminians*. Who persecuted the Calvinistic Jansenists? *Arminian Jesuits*. Who executed and slew with the sword, thousands on thousands of *Calvinistic Puritans*, for the high crime of resisting civil and religious tyranny? English *Arminians*. Who dyed many a dark glen, many a heather plain of Scotland, with the blood of Calvinists? English *Arminians*. Who, *as a body*, with many honorable exceptions, opposed the American Revolution? American *Arminians*. Who petitioned the General Assembly of Virginia AGAINST the petition of Calvinists for RELIGIOUS TOLERATION TO ALL SECTS?—*American Arminians*.*

We ask, then, *who* are "stained with blood?" *Who* have originated and promoted civil and religious liberty? *Who* have sustained civil and religious despotism? "By their fruits ye shall know them." We "speak as unto wise men, judge ye what we say."

We request the reader's careful attention to the notes appended to this article, as they furnish important proof on the points referred to.

BURNING THE WITCHES.—NOTE 1.

"Let us proceed to a still more common and favorite claim upon which Episcopacy is wont to vaunt itself. I refer to those reproaches, which are, in some quarters, perpetually cast upon the Puritan founders of New England, and upon their principles, viz: their austerity, their bigotry, "Blue Laws," persecution of the Quakers and Baptists, "hanging witches," and things of that sort.

Our Puritan Fathers were men. We freely confess, and lament, that they fell into some grievous errors, which, however, were not so peculiarly theirs, as the common errors of the times. Witches were hung at that day in Old England as well as in the New. If the Puritan inhabitants of New England did this, so did the great and good Sir Matthew Hale; yet the annals of human judicaries know no purer name.

Why do not those who insist upon these mournful errors, sometimes have the candor to say, that in this, not only did the

*D. Baird's "History of Religion in America."

Puritans err in common with the whole civilized world, but also to tell how large a minority of the magistrates and people of New England, grieved and were indignant at these things, at the time; how soon the magistracy themselves corrected their errors, how ingenuously they confessed, and how bitterly they mourned over these temporary delusions? Where else in the wide world was such an *amende* so speedily and so honorably given to right reason, and to truth?

The Puritans had some erroneous laws, which, in some instances, they put in execution. Yet even then, their code was liberal and tolerant beyond anything that had ever been known in Old England. All their persecutions were as a drop in the ocean, compared with those carried on at the same period, and long after, in their Father-land. It was a brief evil, soon corrected, and bitterly repented. A bare majority for a time carried these unhappy measures. Sorrow and indignation filled the hearts of an almost equal minority, till the good sense and better feelings of the people prevailed.

In one respect I am not sorry that such a soot and blackness should appear for a season upon the escutcheon of Puritanism, so recently borne out from the smoke and darkness of ancient systems of intolerance and abuse. It afforded an opportunity to show how soon the principles of Puritanism could purge that blackness off. The Old World has not yet seen an example of a single denomination holding an absolute and controlling power, and yet correcting her own errors by an entire toleration of foreign hostile sects. The nearest approach ever made to this in Old England, was under Cromwell, and during the ascendancy of the Independents. That is a glory to which the Church of England has never yet had the honor to attain.

But how early did liberal views and measures prevail among the Puritans of New England? Take some examples and proofs. The first Episcopal Church in Connecticut was established in 1723. It was only four years from this period, before a law of the colony provided, that whatever tax should be paid for the support of religion by any person belonging to, and worshipping with an Episcopal Church, it should be paid over to the clergyman of the Church of England, upon whose ministry such person should attend. Those who conformed to the Church of England, were authorized to tax themselves for

the support of their clergy, and were excused from all taxes for building meeting-houses, and for other purposes of the Churches of the prevailing denomination.

In 1729, the Quakers, a very few of whom lived in the parts adjacent to Rhode Island, were, by law, exempted from paying taxes for the support of Congregational ministers, and for building meeting-houses. In the same year the Baptists, who had two small congregations in the county of New London, received the same indulgence. At this time there were in Connecticut but two or three congregations of Episcopalians, and two of Baptists; all of which were small; and no congregation of Quakers in the colony.*

This relaxation in the laws, made so soon after dissent assumed a regular form, and probably on its first application to the Legislature for relief, shows that there prevailed in Connecticut, at the time, no serious disposition to persecute or oppress the people of other denominations.

Is it replied that they erred in making any ecclesiastical establishment at all: and that there should have been an entire equality of all denominations? Granted; that is undoubtedly the only correct system. But that principle was not at that period understood. It was yet to be brought forth, as the legitimate deduction from the great Puritan principle, that to every man belongs the right of entire freedom to worship God according to his own conscience; a principle which the Church of England, which still demands her tithes of all Dissenters, and still presses them down by numerous and intolerable disabilities—has yet to learn; a right, which she has yet to yield, or it will ere long be wrested from her unwilling hands."—*The Puritans and their principles, by E. Hall.*

THE WALDENSES AND REFORMERS CALVINISTS.

NOTE 2.

"The Waldenses, those far-famed witnesses of the truth, whom all Protestants profess to venerate, but whom few, alas! appear to understand and follow; not only adopted in substance, the whole Presbyterian government and discipline, as we have seen in a former page, but also, all the leading features of our system of doctrine. The following extract

*Professor Kingsley's Historical Discourse, p. 95.

from one of their confessions is conclusive. The eleveneth article is in these words: 'God saves from that corruption and condemnation into which all have fallen, those whom he has chosen from the foundation of the world, *not for any disposition, faith, or holiness which he foresaw in them, but of his mercy in Jesus Christ his Son; passing by all the rest, according to the irreprensible reason of his free will and justice.*' And in one of their ancient Catechisms, they tell us, that the real Church of Christ consists 'of the *elect of God*, from the beginning to the end of the world, by the grace of God, through the merit of Christ, gathered together by the Holy Spirit, and *foreordained to eternal life.*' [See Gilly's 'Narrative of Researches among the Waldenses,' Appendix. See, also, Sir Samuel Morland, p. 40, 48, &c. Milner, iii. p. 440, 441.]—The same general system was undoubtedly adopted by John Wickliffe, the 'morning star of the Reformation;' by John Huss and Jerome of Prague, his companion in faith, and in martyrdom. 'The distinguishing tenet of Wickliffe,' says Milner, 'was, undoubtedly, the election of grace.' And the same writer gives an account of Huss and Jerome, which precludes all doubt that, in their general system, they followed Wickliffe, who was a disciple of Augustine.

When we come down to the time of the Reformation, the same general fact continues to be unquestionable. It is notorious that Luther, long before Calvin was known as a Reformer, or even as a theological writer, publicly maintained the doctrines of the divine decrees, and human impotence, as thoroughly as Calvin ever did. The proof of this is so complete, that no one well informed in the history of those times will dare to deny it. Melancthon, the friend, coadjutor, and survivor of Luther, also held in substance the very same system. Those who read the statements, and the extracts from his writings, which appear in the pages of the Rev. Mr. Scott, the Episcopal continuator of Milner's Ecclesiastical History, can no longer doubt of this. Melancthon assured Calvin that he concurred with him in his creed; and Calvin, in his Preface to Melancthon's book of 'Common Places,' recommends the work as one, in the doctrines of which he concurred. Zuingli, the apostolic reformer of Switzerland, it is well known, adopted the same system. After all that has been alleged to the contrary, no-

thing is more certain than that he maintained the doctrines of the depravity and moral impotence of human nature, the sovereign election of grace, and the perseverance of the saints in holiness, as decisively, and zealously as any of his contemporaries. Yet Zuingli died before Calvin was ever heard of as a friend to the Reformation; and before he had published a sentence in reference to it. Of course, the Swiss reformer was indebted for no part of his creed, to the ministry or the writings of the illustrious pastor of Geneva. The same may be said of Bucer, of Peter Martyr, of Bullinger, of Bugenbagius, of Junius, and, in general, of all the leaders of the Reformation on the continent of Europe.

When we pass over to Great Britain precisely the same fact appears. Hamilton, Wishart, Archbishop Cranmer, Bishops Ridley, Hooper, and Latimer, Archbishops Grindal and Whitgift, John Knox, and, in short, *all* the Reformers of any name, both in North and South Britain, were *doctrinal Calvinists*. This fact, indeed, has been denied; but not by any candid, well informed man. The proof of it is complete. Let any one read the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England, especially the ninth, tenth, eleventh, and seventeenth,—let him particularly, ponder well the last mentioned article, which treats directly of the doctrine of Predestination, and ask, whether it is possible fairly to give it any other than a Calvinistic interpretation. I am not, indeed, ignorant that prejudice and bigotry have sometimes contended that this seventeenth article is decidedly Anti-calvinistic in its import; and as proof of this, the qualifying clause toward the end of it is cited as sufficient evidence. Now, it so happens, that that qualifying clause is nearly copied from Calvin's institutes; and the latter part of it is a literal translation of that Reformer's caution against the abuse of this doctrine? Again: let him who entertains a doubt on this subject, read the celebrated Catechism of Dr. Nowell, which was reviewed, corrected, formally approved, and ordered to be published, as containing a summary of true doctrine, by the same Convocation which formed and adopted the Thirty-nine Articles, and which is acknowledged by the bitterest enemies of Calvin to be decisively Calvinistic. Let him read the Lambeth Articles, drawn up and signed by Archbishop Whitgift, and also subscribed by the Archbishop

of York, and at least three other leading prelates, and by them transmitted to the University of Cambridge, as containing doctrines 'corresponding with those professed in the Church of England.' Let him recollect, that for more than half a century after the Reformation was established in England, Calvin's Body of Divinity, commonly styled his 'Institutes of the Christian Religion,' was publicly received and studied as a standard of orthodoxy in both the Universities; and that by a Convocation held at Oxford, the work was recommended to the general study of the nation."—*Dr. Miller on Presbyterianism.*

MORAL INFLUENCE OF CALVINISM.—NOTE 3.

"It is worthy of serious inquiry, whether *the moral influence of the Calvinistic system has not been found in all ages, more pure and happy than that of any other.* For this appeal no apology is necessary. That system which is ever found connected with larger measures of the spirit of prayer, and of humble, habitual, deep devotion; that system which is ever productive of more holy living, and more active christian benevolence than any other, we may confidently say, without presumption, is most agreeable to Scripture, and, of course, most worthy of being embraced. This allegation, it is presumed, will not be denied. For, although the opponents of this system, at one time, charge it with having a tendency to promote licentiousness; yet much more frequently and unanimously they charge it with being austere, over strict in its abstinence from worldly pleasures, and standing unnecessarily aloof from the various forms of public amusement. Is it not notorious that the followers of *Augustine*, of the Paulicians, of *Claudius of Turin*, of the Waldenses, and of *Wickliffe*, *Huss*, and *Jerome*, in the dark ages, were far more pure in their morals, devout in their habits, and separated from a corrupt and idolatrous world, than any of their contemporaries? Will it not be granted by every intelligent reader that, during the first half century after the Reformation was established in England, when no one doubts that nineteenth twentieths of the Protestant clergy in that kingdom, were avowed Calvinists, the state both of piety and of morals was unspeakably better, than during the latter half of the seventeenth century, when Armini-

anism had, among the majority, taken its place? What was the character of the two thousand 'ejected ministers,' in the reign of Charles II. who were almost to a man Calvinists? Were they not, characteristically, as a body, the most pious, pure, diligent, and exemplary servants of Christ, that England ever saw? Is it not universally admitted, that the state of piety and of morals has ever been far more pure in Scotland than in England, and pre-eminently, in those districts and congregations in Scotland, in which Calvinism has maintained a steady reign? And can any part of the world be named, in which, for nearly a hundred years after its settlement, purer morals reigned than in New England, in which, as every one knows, during the greater part of that period, a Calvinistic creed almost universally prevailed?

The following remarks by a distinguished divine of the Church of England, who professes not to be a Calvinist, are as just as they are striking:

'Does not this opinion (of the immoral tendency of Calvinism,) in a great measure originate from a mistaken conception of what Calvinism is? Those who would impute all these practical evils to the operation of Calvinism, appear to suppose that the belief of the Calvinist, by which he admits the doctrine of personal election, necessarily includes also an assumption of his own election. The Calvinist, *properly so called*, is no enthusiast. He believes, indeed, in the eternal purposes of God, as to the salvation of the elect; but as to the hopes of his own salvation, and of his individual interest in those purposes, he professes to obtain it by the evidences which he possesses of his being himself in a renewed and justified state. He knows from the word of God that the saints are 'chosen to salvation through sanctification of the Spirit,' no less than 'the belief of the truth,' that they are 'predestinated to be conformed to the image of Christ,' and 'created in Christ Jesus unto good works, which God hath before ordained that they should walk in them.' And hence he feels that it is only so long as he experiences the sanctifying influences of the Spirit in his own heart, so long as he himself in some degree reflects the image of Christ, and walks imperfectly indeed, but yet sincerely, in good works, that he can have any scriptural grounds for concluding that he is one of God's elect

and will have his portion with the saints. This is true Calvinism. And where is the tendency of this doctrine to make its followers slothful or confident, negligent of the means of grace, or inattentive to moral and religious duties? While the practical evils which Calvinism is charged with producing, are so prominently and studiously exhibited to view by many of its opponents; let us not omit on the other hand, to do justice to this calumniated system, nor forget the abundant good which it is not only capable of accomplishing, but which it actually does accomplish. I have no doubt, but that some of the sublimest feelings of pure and spiritual delight which are ever experienced on earth, are those of which the Calvinist partakes, when in his secret retirement with his God, 'the Spirit bearing witness with his spirit,' and shining on his own gracious operation on the heart, he meditates on the wonderful and unspeakable privileges to which, through Christ, he sees himself entitled; and resolving all the blessings which have been already received, or are prepared for him hereafter, into the eternal purpose, and electing love of God, his Father, and absorbed in a holy contemplation of the divine counsels and perfections, he lies prostrate before the throne of grace, in deep humiliation, and with overwhelming joy. I do not say that others have not their peculiar feelings of spiritual delight; but these are his. And does he rise from such communion with his God, without enlarged desires and resolutions of more seriously devoting himself to the divine favor, of more decidedly overcoming the flesh and the world, and of more faithfully doing the will, and advancing the glory of his Lord and Saviour? Facts and experience reply to this inquiry. Among no denomination or description of professing christians, is there to be found a larger portion of humble, pious, and devoted servants of God, persons of a truly christian spirit, zealous of good works, and exemplary in every duty and relation of life, than among those who hold the Calvinistic tenets. I am sure that your observation and your candor will fully justify this statement. And, therefore, so far as this system is to be judged of by its actual effects, I think that, on a candid reconsideration of the subject, you will be induced to abandon your objection, and to admit that it was founded on an erroneous and partial view of the subject."—*Rev. Edward Cooper.*

In the same general strain, Bishop Burnet, who was avowedly, a moderate Arminian, expresses the following opinion as to the practical advantages of Calvinism. "A Calvinist is taught by his opinions to think meanly of himself, and to ascribe the honor of all to God; which lays in him a deep foundation for humility: he is also much inclined to secret prayer, and to a fixed dependence on God."

A very able and learned foreign lawyer, the author of the article *Predestination*, in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, though he is evidently no friend to Calvinism, makes the following declaration: "there is one remark which we feel ourselves bound in justice to make, although it appears to us somewhat singular. It is this: that, from the earliest ages down to our own days, if we consider the character of the ancient Stoics, the Jewish Essenes, the modern Calvinists and Jansenists, when compared with that of their antagonists, the Epicureans, the Sadducees, the Arminians, and the Jesuits, we shall find that they have excelled, in no small degree, in the practice of the most rigid and respectable virtues; and have been the highest honour of their own ages, and the best models for imitation to every age succeeding. At the same time, it must be confessed, that their virtues have in general been rendered unamiable by a tinge of gloomy and severe austerity.'"—*Dr. Miller on Presbyterianism*.

Reminiscences of our Venerable Church.

SIGNING OF THE COVENANT.

EDINBURGH, if it has been justly styled the Athens of Great Britain, for its enlightened and intellectual society, is in other respects not less distinguished. That beautiful capitol is very strikingly interesting for its local situation; its fascinating views of hill and dale, of mountain and valley, of sea and shore, of wild and cultivated country; for its tall grey houses, for its splendid buildings, public and private, its narrow, dark streets and closes in the Old Town, and its elegant squares, crescents and terraces in the New; for its handsome gardens, its magnificent bridges, and its monuments to the great and glorious dead. Who can visit Edinburgh, and fail to be de-

lighted, especially if his mind is well filled with historical recollections of its many past scenes, so momentous and exciting? Modern improvements, modern innovations, have done much to alter and change the appearance of this city; but such is its situation, such are the landmarks, natural and artificial—its Arthur's seat, its castle, its most picturesque Calton hill—that none, after having once seen this city, can ever forget it. The wandering native may return after a score of year's rambling, and yet feel himself at home, there in the place of his birth.

To the warm-hearted Scotchman, there are favorite haunts in this interesting capitol;—places, towards which his footsteps involuntarily turn when he has just been meditating in the Book of Books, and thinking of his much-loved church. He leaves his beautiful dwelling in the New Town, he passes by gardens, large and well kept, from which the breeze is ever wafting the aroma of the wild-rose and the mignonette; he leaves the homes of learned and elegant leisure, and enters the places of merchandise. On he goes, towards those lofty houses, darkened with the smoke of many centuries. In the crowded mart, he finds himself in the shadow of St. Giles'; and he pauses, and thinks of the time, when the "Scottish Elijah" thundered from its pulpit; or of a less dignified, though not less earnest period, when a poor woman, by the might of her own arm, maintained the right of Scotch men and Scotch women to worship God according to the dictates of their own consciences, and gave voice to the pent-up feelings of thousands, that no Liturgy, whether of Rome or of London, would be acceptable in this northern land. Yes, he lingers by St. Giles', and other spots rich with historic recollections; but, ere long, he is crossing one of those magnificent bridges that span the southern valley, and soon he is in that hallowed sanctuary of the dead, the churchyard of the Greyfriars.

This cemetery, only a few acres in size, is rich with sacred associations; for the martyr's tomb is here; and here lie many, whose memories are hallowed in every pious Scottish heart. In the centre and under one roof are two churches, called the Old and New Greyfriars. These thick-walled buildings, with names so popish, have, ever since the Reformation, been Presbyterian parish kirks; and the congregations meet from Sabbath to Sabbath, with but few thoughts in connection with the

hooded men of old, who slid stealthily along the aisles and corridors to and from confession.

The pious stranger, who now wanders thoughtfully along the well-kept gravel walks, and stops occasionally to read the ancient sculptured monument, feels a melancholy happiness in sending his thoughts back into the past centuries, and wondering, adoring, and praising, as he thinks of what God has done for that beloved church, which is dearer to him than life. He stands in the massive Gothic door-way, and he remembers the time when the name "John Knox," uttered by a trembling monk, sent such terror into the hearts of a guilty concave of priests, that they rushed panic-stricken from its entrance. He remembers, also, when beneath that turf, and at the pedestal of that plain massive tomb, the ashes, and the scattered dust of thousands of martyrs, were brought here, and solemnly deposited until the resurrection morning. He remembers, when imprisoned hundreds were tyrannically shut up within these high walls, till they could be conveniently sent far away from their country and friends, because they would not, they durst not, disobey an enlightened conscience, and sin against God. He remembers the period, and his heart bounds with the remembrance when 60,000 true-hearted Presbyterians met in that grave-yard, to renew their covenant with their God and Saviour!

Let us dwell for a few moments on this "Reminiscence;" and, while we do so, may our own hearts be lifted up, and may our souls be blessed.

For introduction, we must go back to about the year 1634, when we find the Church of Scotland on the eve of grievous troubles. Charles I., whose spiritual despotism, bolstered up as it was by flattering prelates, every historian admits, held, as being king, that his will was superior to all law, civil or ecclesiastical; and therefore, determined to reduce the Scottish church to a conformity with that of England; and, if possible, ruin Presbyterianism—too free in its principles for his despotic purposes. To this end bishops were instructed to frame the prayer-book for the use of Scotland, and write canons for the government of this branch of the church. This being known, the people of course became intensely agitated, and the public voice was raised against this unjust innovation. Nevertheless,

the stubborn king, misled by the fanatics around him, went forward with his plans, without consent either of Parliament or of General Assembly. The consequence was, that the church was compelled again to give "not a passive but an active testimony."

It was on the 23d of July, 1637, that a grand attempt was made to compel the Scottish people to *pray in the precise words and manner prescribed by a king and his bishops*, simultaneously in the churches of St. Giles and Greyfriars. Crowds attended at both, but the former was the most densely crowded. It was in this place, after an ominous, sullen silence, that old Janet Geddes, a woman in the lowest ranks of life, with nerves strung to the utmost tension, and feelings boiling over with indignation at the gross insult which tyranny offered to her church, started from her little stool, and whirled it at the head of the astonished bishop. The whole congregation was soon in an uproar, and the bishop, and the dean who accompanied him, were literally chased from the church by women! This tumult in St. Giles' was the beginning of many troubles in the church and state. As a church, the Presbyterians were determined to recognize no law-giver but God; and their purity of worship, and freedom of government, they were also determined to maintain. A crisis they felt to be at hand; and so, the leading ministers called together all the most influential Presbyterians in the nation, and unitedly sent up their prayers to God for direction. They proclaimed a fast—they humbled themselves—they searched their own hearts, and felt that the rod was needed: but, they felt also, that it was the chastening of a Father that was upon them, who in merciful severity was urging them to remember their past covenant vows; and to confess that these had been but too often broken, and always held too lightly. Reflections of this description were not the thoughts of only a few individuals; but they were the *upward breathings of contrite thousands*.

After mature deliberation, the 28th of February, 1638, was appointed, to hold a meeting in the church of the Greyfriars, for the solemn renewing of a covenant with the Lord God.

Let us now go back in imagination more than two hundred years. Let us stand by the great gate of the cemetery, and let us see as they pass on towards the church, these 60,000 seri-

ous men. The costume is striking,—the short cloak, the broad white collar lying smoothly over, the capacious boot of the soldier, the tight stocking and shoe of the citizen, the classical black gown of the minister, the bonnet or cap, and the bearded chin, tell of days gone by. But let us now read the beautiful account given by Hetherington of this solemn scene; the truthful sublimity of which, we would not mar by any words of ours.

“At length the important day, the 28th of February, dawned, in which Scotland was to resume her solemn covenant union with her God. All were fully aware, that on the great transaction of the day, and on the blessing of God upon it, would depend the welfare or the woe of the church and kingdom for generations to come.

* * * * *

As the hour drew near, people from all quarters flocked to the spot, and before the commissioners appeared, the church and churchyard were densely filled with the gravest, the wisest and the best of Scotland's pious sons and daughters. With the hour approached the men; Rothers, Loudon, Henderson, Dickson, and Johnston, appeared, bearing a copy of the covenant ready for signature. The meeting was then constituted by Henderson, in a prayer of very remarkable power, earnestness, and spirituality of tone and feeling. The dense multitude listened with breathless reverence and awe, as if each man felt himself alone in the presence of the Hearer of prayer. When he concluded, the Earl of Loudon stood forth, addressed the meeting, and stated, explained, and vindicated the object for which they were assembled. He very judiciously directed their attention to the covenants of other days, when their venerated fathers had publicly joined themselves to the Lord, and had obtained support under their trials, and deliverance from every danger; pointed out the similarity of their position; and the consequent propriety and duty of fleeing to the same high tower of Almighty strength; and concluded by an appeal to the searcher of hearts, that nothing disloyal or treasonable was meant. Johnston then unrolled the vast sheet of parchment, and in a clear and steady voice read the covenant aloud. He finished, and stood silent. A solemn stillness followed, deep, unbroken, sacred. Men felt the near

presence of that dread Majesty to whom they were about to vow allegiance; and bowed their souls before Him, in the breathless awe of silent spiritual adoration.

Rothers at length, with subdued tone broke the silence, stating that if any had still objections to offer, they should repair, if from the south or west parts of the kingdom, to the west door of the church, where their doubts would be heard and resolved by Loudon and Dickson; if from the north and east, to the east door, where the same would be done by Henderson and himself. 'Few came, proposed but few doubts, and these few were soon resolved.' Again a deep and solemn pause ensued; not the pause of irresolution, but of modest diffidence, each thinking every other more worthy than himself to place the first name upon the sacred bond. An aged nobleman, the venerable Earl of Sutherland, at last stepped slowly and reverentially forward, and with throbbing heart and trembling hand subscribed Scotland's covenant with God. All hesitation in a moment disappeared. Name followed name in swift succession, till all within the church had given their signatures. It was then removed into the churchyard, and spread out on a level grave-stone, to obtain the subscription of the assembled multitude. Here the scene became if possible still more impressive. The intense emotions of many became irrepressible. Some wept aloud; some burst into a shout of exultation; some, after their names, added the words, *till death*; and some, opening a vein, subscribed with their own warm blood. As the space became filled, they wrote their names in a contracted form, limiting themselves at last to the initial letters, till not a spot remained on which another letter could be inscribed. There was another pause. The nation had framed a covenant in former days, and had violated its engagements; hence the calamities in which it had been and was involved. If they too should break this sacred bond, how deep would be their guilt! Such seem to have been their thoughts during this period of silent communing with their own hearts; for, as if moved by one spirit,—and doubtless they were moved by the One Eternal Spirit,—with low heart-wrung groans, and faces bathed in tears, they lifted up their right hands to heaven, avowing, by this sublime appeal, that they had now joined

themselves to the Lord in an everlasting covenant, that shall not be forgotten.'

Never, except among God's peculiar people, the Jews, did any national transaction equal in moral and religious sublimity that which was displayed by Scotland on the great day of her national covenant. Although it was computed that there could not be less than 60,000 people assembled at that time in Edinburgh, there was not the slightest appearance of confusion or tumult; and in the evening of that solemn day, after hours of the deepest and most intense emotion, when every chord of the heart and every faculty of the mind had been excited to the utmost pitch of possible endurance, the mighty multitude melted quietly and peacefully away, each to his own abode—their souls filled with holy awe and spiritual elevation by the power of the sacred pledge which they had mutually given, to be faithful to their country and their God. What but the Spirit of God could have thus moved an entire people to the formation of such a bond, in which every worldly consideration was thrown aside, every personal interest trampled under foot, every kind of peril calmly confronted, solely for the maintenance of religious truth, purity and freedom? Worldly politicians might well stand amazed; selfish and ambitious prelates might be confounded and appalled; and a despotic sovereign and his flatterers might cherish fierce resentment, when they heard of the wonderful transaction; and men of similar views, characters and feelings, may still pour forth their virulent invectives against Scotland's Covenant, and the men who framed and signed it, but we do not hesitate to state our opinion, that the sublime deed of that great day will ever, by all who can understand and value it, be regarded as the deed which marks the day of Scotland's greatest national glory."

We make no apology for this long extract; a reminiscence in the words of one so justly celebrated as a historian, must be welcome to every reader of taste, as well as to every lover of his church. M.

Good nature is the very air of a good mind, the sign of a large and generous soul, and the peculiar soil in which virtue prospers.

From the New York Observer.

Notices of Ireland.

BY THE REV. DR. DILL AND THE REV. JONATHAN SIMPSON,
OF THE IRISH DELEGATION.

WE proceed to fulfil the promise of our last paper, and to show that **POPERY IS THE GRAND CAUSE OF IRELAND'S WRETCHEDNESS**. We have said, and repeat, that minor causes there doubtless are, some political, and many social—instance, in particular, the wretched landlord system. But our position is that popery is the *master evil*, compared to which all others are as the drop in the bucket, and that even these are owing chiefly to the moral disorder produced by popery, and therefore would cease with its destruction;—that they are the mere symptom-spots on the surface, which only wait the cure of the internal malady in order to their speedy disappearance.

In entering on the proof of a charge so grave, we will here assume what elsewhere we would prove at length, that the gospel is God's best blessing to men, and that wherever it comes, a new state of things soon appears, the very desert rejoices, the wolf becomes a lamb, and ten thousand blessings are diffused around. And there is neither mystery nor magic in this, as sceptical worldlings seem to imagine. The gospel is God's own remedy for the multiplied ills of man; and it contains those truths which only need to be universally received in order to universal felicity. Proceeding on the only rational principles of cure—that sin and misery are to each other as cause and effect—it aims to remove the misery by destroying the sin. Hence, wherever it comes, its influence is truly surprising. It is like the sun rising on the arctic regions—it fills the moral atmosphere with life and warmth, and ten thousand seeds of improvement that else had lain buried forever, are instantly quickened and spring up, clothing with moral beauty the dreariest scenes of desolation. If, therefore, the gospel is man's greatest blessing, then must the system that aims to neutralize or destroy it be man's greatest curse—for it steps in between the human race and all that would bless them for time and eternity, and thus commits a crime so monstrous that in comparison it were mere innocence to stop or to poison the wells of the burning desert.

To prove that popery is stained with this dreadful crime, we need not advert to the times when it burned the blessed Bible by the hands of the common hangman, and massacred in thousands those who presumed to read it. We find proof sufficient in Ireland at this moment, and let those who imagine that "popery is changed" ponder well what is now adduced.

The late Dr. Doyle, the highest popish authority in Ireland, of his time, in speaking of Bible Societies, declares that "these Societies have produced more crimes in Ireland than the Whiteboys or Orangemen." And he praised on one occasion his servant for having buried in his garden a Bible which had been given him, as the most effectual means of protecting himself from its contaminating influence. A few years ago, a sermon was preached in Connemara before Dr. McHale and several of his priests, by a friar named Jennings, for which it seems he received no censure from the archbishop, and in which, according to the Protestant Penny Magazine, the following sentiments were uttered:—"As the poison of Bible information is fast spreading in this parish particularly, you ought by all means possible to put a stop to those heretics; for assuredly any person who practises the reading of the Bible will inevitably fall into everlasting destruction. I would therefore, my dear friends and followers, by the love that you bear to the Virgin Mary and the saints, and by the love that you bear to your dear priests, entreat you not to allow those Bible readers into your houses, not even to speak to them when you meet them on the roads, but put up your hands and bless yourselves, and pray to God and the Virgin to keep you from being contaminated with the poison of the Bible. Why would you admit persons who bring with them the worst of all pestilence, the infectious pestilence of the Bible, which would entail on yourselves and your children the everlasting ruin of your souls?"

Yet this awful blasphemy is not even the worst. Not satisfied with uttering this malediction from the altar, they take other characteristic methods of testifying their mortal enmity to the Bible. It has frequently occurred that when a priest has heard of any of his people having a Bible, he has gone to his house and with his own hands searched the chests, the presses, the very bed-straw, and having found the book, taken

it up in the tongs lest it should pollute his fingers, carried it to the door and there burned it to ashes. And a short time since, a priest in the county of Cork met a colporter with a parcel of Bibles, and instantly sprung from his horse, and, without the shadow of provocation, attacked the man with the loaded handle of his horsewhip. The man, on receiving a severe wound in the head, dropped the parcel and fled for his life. The parcel never was heard of, and when the man sought justice for the wanton outrage, the jury being popish, he could not obtain it; for let a priest behave however atrociously, no popish jury will venture to convict him.

Similar treatment has been experienced at our schools and stations. A priest in Ballycastle, Co. Mayo, knocked a man down with his stick and kicked him brutally as he lay on the ground, for having gone once to hear Mr. Branigan preach the gospel. Our schools have been repeatedly entered by the priests, and the scholars shockingly abused by their horsewhips, because they would come to be instructed. One of the writers when visiting the school of Killbride, found the female teacher ill of fever brought on by a fright from a priest having thus rushed in on her scholars, and savagely beat a number of them. Yet there is no redress, and these are the men who call themselves the sons of liberty, and cry out against the tyranny of English laws, while setting all law at defiance and converting into a dreadful curse one of the very bulwarks of justice and liberty—trial by jury.

These poor children are simply taught the ordinary branches of an English education, the Scriptures, and several branches of industry to enable them to earn their own bread. Their parents, seeing the value of such instructions, now send them to our schools in defiance of the priests. Yet rather than see them thus raised from the barbarism into which they have sunk them, they commit outrages on the public peace which would be disgraceful to the meanest peasant, secure in the conviction that any jury of their people will rather perjure *themselves* than convict *them*. And "so exceedingly mad" against the truth are they, that when in one case a christian lady of wealth and influence, established lately a number of schools in Roscommon, under care of our mission, not venturing to annoy *her* in any *other* way, they had threatening letters

left at her door, and had her grazing fields sown with *pins* in order to choke her cattle.

Does any one exclaim with astonishment, Can those things be so? Our mournful reply is, that the half has not been told, and it is our painful duty to show them "still greater abominations than these." Some may imagine that all this enmity is shown simply to Protestants and the Protestant Bible, and that their own Douay version they circulate and its doctrines they teach. Alas! it is altogether the reverse. It is common for the priests when they see any quarrelling in the markets to gallop into the crowd and disperse them with the horsewhip. A priest in Tipperary actually complained to a pious Protestant lady that his arm was aching from having flogged a number of men the previous day. The lady mildly replied—"Could you not preach the gospel to them, and try what that would do to improve their behavior?" "Preach the gospel to those fellows, ma'am!" was the answer—"cock them up with the gospel indeed!" Nay so ignorant are the Irish Priesthood generally even of their own Bible, and so little is this ignorance regarded, that one of them was heard to boast that he never had read a word of it in his life. Hence no one need wonder much at the following case, for the correctness of which our missionary Mr. Chestnut pledges himself. A priest whom he well knows, asked a friend of his in the freedom of private conversation, "Do you know what religion I am of?" "To be sure," replied the gentleman, "I know you are a Roman Catholic priest." "O yes," said he, "*nominally*—but I am really a Mahommedan." "A Mahommedan!" replied the other. "Yes," said the priest, "I believe there is as much truth in Mahommedanism as in Christianity, and I think Mahomet was as good a teacher as Christ and a great deal more *successful*. Mahomet, when moral means failed to convince the ignorant multitude, tried the sword; and as a last resort it is the best weapon to spread morals and civilization."

Our paper is already too long, and yet we have but entered on *one branch* of our proof—we must reserve to future ones the full treatment of the subject. Meanwhile we ask our readers who know the blessed influence of the Bible—how can they wonder at Ireland being a proverb for darkness and degradation, when cursed by such a system as this? The world

stands amazed when reading the black list of its crimes and miseries, and is apt to count it a land of barbarism. But what can any one expect when it is swarming in every corner with such men as we have been describing, who shut up the kingdom of heaven against their misguided followers, and neither enter in themselves nor suffer those who would to enter in? When not only is the fountain of living waters shut up from the people, but in addition the country is drenched and deluged by floods of the deadliest moral poison. And when Satan has not only bereft of all their vital power *the pulpit*, the *ministry*, and all the machinery of the church, devised with infinite skill for the dissemination of saving truth, but has also converted them into the most terrible engines for the diffusion of destructive error? What are all political and social evils, even though they *did* exist, in comparison to this? Even for *those* the gospel is the surest remedy, for it so elevates and expands the human soul, that sooner or later it rises above every depressing circumstance, and swelling beyond the measure of its chains, at length bursts them asunder. But what are all causes combined compared to that of a system well designated by Cécil as "Satan's masterpiece"—the offspring of ages of Satanic experience, and constructed on purpose to counterwork the blessed gospel and to poison the cup of salvation itself?

Reader! Is it so that "he that believeth not shall be damned?" that millions of our countrymen know not what to believe, and that they are hourly passing before the Judgment Throne, with no better plea than the merits of the Virgin Mary? O then can we profess to be *his* children, who, though he was rich, for *our* sakes became poor, and decline to aid in rescuing them from their fearful doom, or of our richly spread spiritual table, refuse at least the crumbs for those multitudes who are perishing of hunger, and who, despite their priests, are now anxious to be fed?

ROMANISM.—A young Roman Catholic priest, who was clandestinely married in Buenos Ayrés last summer to a lady of his own church, was arrested in August, and both of them shot by order of the popish government.

Scriptural Objections to Perseverance.

Here we might close the argument, and fearlessly challenge contradiction; but we cannot forbear, having *enthroned* this doctrine in all the majesty and power of scripture truth, to add a *crown*, which may serve not only as a diadem of beauty, but we would fondly hope, as a symbol of his triumph and its sway over the mistaken prejudices of men.

It will readily be admitted, that if believers really fall away and perish, that it must be, either because God is unwilling to keep them, or being willing, that he is unable to keep them; or that being both able and willing, that they are lost through divine carelessness and indifference.) we know not how else to express it.) But do christians apostatize and perish, on account of one or all these causes? Let the Holy Ghost give the answer:—Jude 21. “Now unto him that is *able to keep you from falling*, and to present you faultless before the presence of his glory with exceeding joy.” Here then it is expressly declared that God is *able*. But is he willing? Matt. 18: 14.—“It is *not the will* of your Father, which is in Heaven, that one of these little ones *should perish*.” John 6: 39.—“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*,” If then, my hearers, God is both able and willing to keep his people, as the above scriptures declare, the only question that can remain is—*Are they kept?* “*Who are kept,*” says the Apostle in our text, “through faith *unto salvation*.”

1. The first passage of scripture to which we would advert, and which is supposed to militate against the truth on which we have insisted, is contained in Heb. 6: 4—6. “For it is impossible for those who were once enlightened, and have tasted of the heavenly gift, and were made partakers of the Holy Ghost and have tasted the good word of God and the powers of the world to come, if they shall fall away, to renew them again to repentance.” Allowing that the Apostle is here speaking of true christians, yet he by no means asserts or even intimates, that they *will* fall away. As a warning against the commission of sin, he reminds them of the consequences of sin—if you sin you shall die—if you fall, you must perish. Who ever supposed that when Paul said, “If ye live after the flesh,

you shall die," that he meant to teach that a *true* believer *may* live after the flesh. Or when he says in another place, "Though we, or an angel from heaven should preach any other gospel unto you, &c.," that he really thought it *probable* that Gabriel would be sent on so wicked an embassy. No! my brethren, the import of such statements is simply this, that if one thing happen, another will follow, while it is not affirmed that either the one or the other can or will occur. That Paul did not mean to teach the final apostasy of believers in the above passage, is evident from what he says in the context—"But, beloved, we are *persuaded* better things of you, and things that accompany salvation, though we *thus speak*." But admit, for a moment, that here is a clear warrant for falling from grace; then it must inevitably follow, that all who fall, perish—for the Apostle says that, "It is *impossible* to renew them *again* to repentance." It is doubtful whether this view of the subject will *suit* the advocates of "falling," much better than final perseverance.

2. Another objection is deduced from what is said in *Ezekiel*, 18: 24.—"When the righteous turneth away from his righteousness and committeth iniquity and doeth according to all the abominations that the wicked man doeth, shall he live?" Now here, you will observe, as in the preceding objection, the proposition is hypothetical. "*When* the righteous turneth away from his righteousness." It is not asserted that he *does* or *will* turn away; but he is forewarned, in case he should turn, what must inevitably follow, and all this, to prevent his turning, or with the view of securing him against the awful consequences. But why attempt to explain a difficulty, which cannot be proved to exist. A little attention to the true design and scope of the chapter will show, that God has not the slightest reference in this passage, to either the true believer or the apostate. He is vindicating the rectitude of the divine administration, against the false charge made by the Israelites, that they were unjustly suffering for the sins of their fathers. He tells them, that though they might plead in extenuation of their sins, that they could not do otherwise, that they labored under an *hereditary* necessity to sin, that yet he meant to deal with them strictly on the ground of personal merit or demerit. The principle is announced in these terms: "If a man be just and do that which is lawful and right . . . he shall surely live. If he do not any of these duties . . . he shall surely die." He farther states that having once conformed to what was lawful and right, whilst they are now pursuing a course the reverse of this, cannot secure to them the reward of obedience, nor avert the punishment due to disobedience. And that on the other hand, having once engaged in an evil course, now that they have reformed, will not prevent them from receiving the merited reward of amendment. This is obviously what is meant by this

famous passage so often quoted, and so confidently relied on, as teaching that a believer may fall from grace and perish.— Besides we think it clear that the terms “live and die” in this chapter have reference only to the present world, and that if the prophet is speaking of the spiritual and eternal life of the soul, that then he teaches, as is manifest from the 21st and 22d verses, that justification is by the law, which is impossible.

3. Another text adduced, in the form of objection, is that contained in 1 Cor. 9: 27.—“I bring under my body, and bring it into subjection, lest that by any means, when I have preached to others, I myself should be a cast away.” Here it is said the Apostle plainly admits, that it was possible for him to fall from the high elevation even of an Apostle, and to perish. But will my hearers carefully note the fact, that Paul is not discoursing on the subject of apostacy, but is exhorting his brethren to increased diligence and perseverance as the only means of winning the prize. He tells them that he regarded his own salvation as inseparably connected with certain means, and that *if* these means were neglected that he might be a cast away. So it might be said with perfect propriety in regard to any christian—if you do not follow after holiness you shall not see the Lord. But Paul says that he is applying himself with diligence in this very work,—that he regards it as the means of his safety, and that he knows that if he relaxes his efforts or gives up the pursuit, that he must be lost. So far, therefore; from intimating a possibility of perishing, he intimates the very reverse, and says that he is doing what inevitably secures his salvation, and encourages his christian brethren to do the same. Indeed, he expresses in the preceding verse, not merely the strong confidence which he felt, but declares that he regarded his salvation as altogether *certain*. “I therefore run not as *uncertainly*, neither fight I as one that beateth the air.”

4. Another objection which we may briefly notice, is derived from the aggravated sins of David, Solomon, Peter and others. It is asked, were not these true saints, and did they not fall? Yes! they fell, but did they perish? As to the possibility of a believer sinning and falling, there can be no dispute, but the question is not as to the *decline*, but the *loss* of grace; not as to whether a christian may be *weak and sickly*, but whether life can become *totally* extinct. Now in regard to the persons alluded to, and so of all others, so far as we have any sufficient reason to believe that they ever were true saints, we find that though they stumbled and fell, they nevertheless afterwards recovered. And if an instance can be produced, where the circumstances afford no evidence of repentance and recovery, we will venture to affirm that in no such case can it be proved that spiritual life ever existed.—*Extract from a Sermon delivered by Rev. H. H. Paine.*

THE
Calvinistic Magazine.

[NEW SERIES.]

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

Vol. IV.

February, 1849.

No. 2.

Editorial Address.*

THE second series of our publication has now reached the commencement of its fourth year, with a history varying little from that of its predecessor, and with results apparently about the same. Like that, it set out to defend Presbyterianism, and expose the peculiar errors of Methodism. Judging from the approbation of the one party, and the loud complaints of the other, we are persuaded that both objects have been accomplished with some degree of success. There has been towards this publication a steady increase of patronage from its commencement—so considerable in the last year, as to induce the editors to suspend a plan they had in view of substituting in its place a weekly newspaper. This patronage is not confined to the limits of the Synod of Tennessee, as some would have it believed, but extends over several States. Yet its highest obligations are due to that Synod, and friends within its limits, for the noble support they have given it.

To all who have contributed to our magazine, by their subscriptions or contributions, whether within this Synod or without it, the editors would tender their unfeigned thanks; and, in entering upon another year, would express the hope that the same interest will be felt which has thus far been manifested, and the same friendly regard shown. This is the more necessary, as no publication has, perhaps, ever encountered more violent opposition, misrepresentation and abuse, than has the second series of the Calvinistic Magazine. The most unheard of means have been resorted to, by those opposed to it, to

*This address was prepared for the last No., but came to hand too late.

bring it into disrepute. It has been held up as a malicious and unprovoked attack upon a sister church—as vulgar and obscene in its style—as false and slanderous in its publications—as edited by men unworthy the christian name.

As to the commencement of this controversy, it has always existed—and long will exist. Its style has been approved by a class as refined as those who condemn it. For truth, it has appealed to facts and documents, in reach of all who chose to consult them. Of its editors it becomes us not to speak. Its simple aim has been, where Methodism was concerned, to exhibit its errors, and their evil tendency—admitting at all times that fundamental truths were held.

How have we been met? By fair and candid argument? Far from it. At the outset an attempt is made to separate its editors from their church, and hold them up as men attempting to found a new sect. Then followed their hue and cry of slander, calumny, falsehood, the vilest assaults upon private character that were ever made, closing with exclusion from the communion table—and denunciation at the ballot-box.

This course in our brethren we deeply deplore. We deplore it for their own sake, as unworthy of them—as unworthy the cause of truth which we are discussing; and worst of all—as so exciting the prejudices of their own people, as to prevent their hearing or understanding what has been done and said by us. This attempt to practice on the credulity of others must in the end recoil upon themselves. It is impossible that the great body of intelligent Methodists should continue long to believe that four ministers in full standing in the Presbyterian church—one of them venerable for his years and services—would dare to publish in the town of Abingdon, a filthy, scurrilous, obscene periodical—a mere vehicle of lies and slander—against a sister church, numerous and respectable, containing many of their own kindred and friends;—that the Synod of Tennessee should, by an official act, approve it, and recommend it to the patronage of those under their care;—that it should find a thousand subscribers, principally pious persons, scattered over several states, and that this support should be continued for four successive years. Had the editors all the malice and depravity necessary for such an enterprise, can it be believed that common sense and common prudence

would not deter them from carrying it out? Yet these charges have been made in every form—reiterated and reiterated—spoken, preached, and printed. It is, to say the least of it, an impudent and shameless attempt of the leaders to impose upon their too confiding followers,—and to prevent detection, they have made the impression very generally, that a Methodist man or woman must not read the magazine. It is too vile for them to see. They can all tell you, nevertheless, what is in it. Very few of the Methodist people, we have reason to believe, have ever read a page of the magazine, and when it is produced to them, in order to refute the wrong impressions they have about it, they, in many instances that we have heard of, refuse to hear it. What is the reason of this? Have the preachers told them they must not read it, see it, or hear it? It looks very much like it. Evidently all the information they have about it, they have derived from that source; and the fact that they are all of one opinion about it, is additional proof that they have not read and formed their own opinions. Every Methodist man will tell you the magazine has slandered his church. Among its thousand subscribers, not one, except he be a Methodist, has made any such discovery.

We close what we have now to say, with a word or two to the editor of the *Episcopalian*.

His proposition for an interchange of publications, is the only thing we can fix upon just now, that has even worn the semblance of fairness. But this is a mere cheat. He knows the thing to be impracticable, and must intend it to delude his people—who know not (for few have seen it) but that our magazine is as large as a “*New World*,” or a “*Brother Jonathan*.” He knows full well that our little monthly pamphlet would be utterly overwhelmed with his ponderous columns. His frequent allusion to his proposal, and the parade he makes over it, sometimes amuse us, and tempt us now, as the best answer we can give him, to tell him the story of a large boy, who had a pumpkin, disputing with a smaller one, who had a sugar-plum, about the quality of their fruit. By way of settling it, the larger one proposed to the smaller one—“you eat my pumpkin and I’ll eat your sugar-plum.” *It was a stumper*. The little fellow of course backed out. The larger one claimed a triumph.

Letter to Presbyterians.

FROM FRED. A. ROSS.

ISAIAH 21: 11, 12.—“*Watchmen what of the night? Watchman what of the night? The watchman said, the morning cometh and also the night: if ye will enquire, enquire ye: return, come.*”

DEAR BRETHREN:—In the No. of our work for January, 1847, p. 38, you will find this question—“What will be effected by the new series of the Calvinistic Magazine?” The answer then given was this—“The Presbyterianism of the Confession of Faith will be established on a firmer basis. And there will be a thorough exposure of Methodism.” The words from Isaiah might have expressed our prediction—“The morning cometh, and also the night?”—that is—the morning cometh to Presbyterianism, and also the night to Methodism.

I. “*The Presbyterianism of the Confession of Faith will be established on a firmer basis.*”—This was the first part of our prediction. Has it not been coming to pass? We do not claim to have gained all we desire. Far from it. We are not pure in doctrine—we have not come up to our standard of government—nor do we display the corresponding christian character. Pastors are not every where settled as they ought to be, nor sustained in conformity with Scripture and our obligations. We are not alive to the power we possess in the calls and promises of God to save souls around us and abroad. Truly we are not in the perfect day. But we may claim to be emerging from errors into which we had been drifting, and may declare that “the morning cometh.” It *cometh*, as it regards our renewed reading, studying, and appreciating the doctrines of the Bible, as exhibited in our Confession of Faith and Catechisms. A few years ago many amongst us were halting in ignorance of Calvinism. Some such are left to remind us of the midnight and fog from which we have come out. And we never expect, until the Millenium, to get clear of the native depravity of Arminianism. Yet our readers may look around and decide whether on the subject of our doctrines, we may not say—“the morning cometh.” Are we not also settling pastors as never before, and at least beginning

to believe that they live by bread? The people too are learning to believe that they, and not the ravens, are to supply that bread. In this particular, however, while we hope "*the morning cometh,*" we see but the grey light over the hills, not yet the face of the golden day. We are gradually doing more for the Bible, the tract, and the missionary efforts of the times. There has been a marked movement to pull down the *old barns*, and to build houses of worship in nearly every congregation of any note, particularly in upper East Tennessee. This is encouraging. True, the mere building of a handsome house of worship, is not of itself proof of advance in piety. Yet, unless there is something to show to the contrary, it is one of the evidences indicating an improving state of the people. Hence, when we see some of our congregations in Wythe thus honoring God—when we look upon the excellent churches at Marion, Glade Spring, Abingdon, [in progress,] Kingsport, Jonesborough, Greenville, Rogersville, Tazewell, Dandridge, New Market, Strawberry Plains, either finished or on the way, besides others being begun, and all within a few years past, we feel sure the public mind in those places is preparing to welcome the coming day. Finally, when we see that the Presbyterianism of our Synod has advanced in its religious character, and in its influence to convert sinners, seemingly at least, just exactly in those churches which have manifested the deepest interest in the Calvinistic Magazine, we feel the prophecy was true—that "*the morning cometh.*" And we trust we may borrow the other words of Isaiah, and say—"If ye will enquire, enquire ye; return, come." In other words—if ye will farther enquire of God—repent, and come.

II. The second part of our prediction declared, that this series of the Calvinistic Magazine "*would be a thorough exposure of Methodism.*" We appeal to our readers, if this exposure has not been fully made? Nay, we ask all to whom we write, if they are not astonished at the things which have been revealed?

Let us enquire—what has the magazine taught us?

Has it explained in "The Great Iron Wheel" No. I—that the Methodist policy is *a perfect system of passive obedience and non-resistance*? Has it shown in No. II—that *the Methodist church, in its class-meeting system, does as distinctly require the*

confession of sins from its members as that thing is required in the Roman Catholic Church, and that the great delusion of Rome is the very error of Methodism—that is to say—it encourages the soul of man to find relief from the burden of sin, by naked confession of sin at another place than the throne of God? Has it proved in No. III—that the Methodist itinerants have taken from the people, and are wielding a great and dangerous money power? Has it established in No. IV—that the Methodist Discipline is a fraud upon the world? Has it demonstrated in No. V—what is the pretension of Methodist Episcopacy in America? And has it put beyond honest denial in No. VI—that Methodism is fanatical, despotic, and beginning to show itself willing to use the political and spiritual sword against all opposers? Our readers can decide whether these things have been fairly established against Methodism. We know what the answer is. Far and wide the impression is deep, strong, immovable, and the word comes up—these things are so.

We are now prepared to ask—is this impression *more unfavorable* to Methodism than ever before? We affirm that it is, for the following reasons:—

(1.)—*The examination of* THE DOCTRINE OF THE DISSENT WITNESS OF THE SPIRIT AS TAUGHT BY MR. WESLEY, *prepared the way for, and has given impulse to the course of the Calvinistic Magazine.* Mr. Wesley states the doctrine in these words:—“The testimony of the Spirit is an *inward impression* on the soul whereby the Spirit of God directly witnesses to my spirit that I am a child of God; that Jesus Christ has loved me and given himself for me; and that all my sins are blotted out, and that I, even I am reconciled to God.” *This witness, in the illustration of Mr. Wesley, is a miraculous message.* And he claimed it as a peculiarity of Methodism. **THIS HAS BEEN THE CHARM OF METHODISM.** It has given to this sect an immense advantage over every other christian denomination, because Methodists claimed, [what no other christian body held,] to know, by this miraculous witness, the fact of being a child of God, in the very moment of *regeneration*, and to know, by the same abiding testimony, their *adoption* during its continuance. Hence, as Methodists ever made profession of this witness, and exhibited the *bodily exercise, and shout*, as proof to the eye and ear, of its reality, great numbers of ill-informed chris-

tians, and still greater multitudes of enquiring people, not in any church, were led astray to believe the fact. Methodists, it was *widely admitted*, had the *evidence* of their change of heart, *from the very voice of God*. Verily, verily, THIS WAS THE CHARM OF METHODISM. It was better than the mantle of charity to hide a multitude of sins. It was worth to Methodists more than all they might lack, in *manners, knowledge, wisdom, or christian grace*. It elevated them, beyond denial, in the minds of thousands, above all other christians. It was their crown of glory, the spell of their strength. No wonder he who touched that doctrine, had entered the Methodist Holy of Holies, and must be stricken dead.

Five years ago we examined that doctrine, and proved it to be unscriptural, false, fanatical, and of mischievous tendency. The effect was electric. Methodism was lifted up as if a mine had been sprung. The whole atmosphere was filled with smoke and confusion. We were, ourself, astonished at the explosion. "You have set fire to the magazine," said one. "You have beaten down plume and crest," said another. "That is the hardest hit Methodism ever got," said a third. Christians and enquiring people began to read and think. Presently, the fog, which Methodists attempted to throw over our disclosures, began to clear away. The great effort of the preachers to show that the author of the tract was no Presbyterian in his views of the witness of the Spirit, was foiled and demolished. Our tract was, at once, sustained by approbation as high as the world can give of living endorsement, to be the true Presbyterian, Calvinistic, doctrine of the Witness of the Spirit, and to be, also, the overwhelming exposure of Mr. Wesley's doctrine of the Direct Witness, as unscriptural, false, fanatical, and of mischievous tendency.

This tract, thus sustained, has to a wide extent, been blessed to dissolve the delusive charm which has been around Methodist religion. The Presbyterian mind has been freed almost entirely from this mysticism. Thinking men every where are learning what the Scriptures teach. *The spell is broken, and Methodist religion has its right place*. Men no longer will take the *profession* of the Direct Witness, and the *shout*, as sufficient *proof* that Methodists have been born of the Holy Spirit. Men now look as never before for the *fruits*. They

demand the exemplification of the life of the Saviour, in strength and beauty, from those claiming the attainment of christian perfection. Methodist religion must now pass through the same trials which other people's religion has to undergo. And when it has been made to pass through this ordeal, it has come out not any better than the piety of the Baptist, the Lutheran, the Episcopalian, the Congregationalist, or the Presbyterian. Nay, the fact is now known, and declared, far and wide, that as Methodists rest the evidence of their religion in so great degree upon a GROSS DELUSION, *then that delusion must show itself in their corresponding life.*

The charm being broken, Methodism has stood revealed as never before to the eyes of the people. There it is, with no fog about it, in the Calvinistic Magazine.

(2.) *The times have been favorable for this examination of Methodism.* First, the American people are, in this day, more attentive than ever to understand the rights of man. And, secondly, Methodists have been tempted, by certain considerations, to become a political party, especially in East Tennessee. Human rights, we say, were never so understood by the people as at this time. The extension of the right of suffrage, and the bringing many offices of trust and emolument within the gift of the ballot-box, has made every man a real *power* in the state, and he knows it. This real and controlling power possessed by the people, makes them alive, as never before, to comprehend all subjects bearing on their liberty.—Hence they are called to decide upon church government as well as civil. And thus the examination of Methodism has been remarkably helped by the advanced civil liberty of the people.

We hesitate not to say, that the American man, at this day, is greatly before the men of every former period in this country, in the possession of political power, and acquaintance with his rights and obligations. We will sustain this proposition by the following opinion from high authority, in which Whig and Democrat will unite. We copy the sentiment from the American Review for January. The writer is a distinguished Whig. He says:—"It is very generally acknowledged by those who have made a study of our political history, that the principles and feelings of democracy, [meaning demo-

cracy in the sense of the rights of man,] have gained ground in this country, notwithstanding all the changes of party, since the era of the Revolution. The great doctrine that political power emanates, or should emanate, from every citizen within the limits of sanity and honesty, has come to be understood by all classes."

This sentiment, we have said, will be acknowledged by all. Indeed we may add—that the men of the Revolution contended less for the civil rights of the *individual man*, than for the political emancipation of the country from the government of Great Britain. Since that day, however, old charters and constitutions have been broken down and built up in better structures. New and untrammelled states have also framed fundamental laws in the light of the advancing times. And from the hour of our national life, every man has been throwing off, more and more, the bandages of the grave of slavery, and coming forth strong, growing stronger, and walking abroad in the life and liberty God has given him. This noble specimen of man is seen by the men of every clime. His voice, even as the voice of God, has called to earth's millions, asleep, charmed, chained. He has awakened them, dissolved the enchantment, and broken the iron forever. And now, hark! He hears the voice of this great heaving earth as the sound of rushing winds, and mighty waters coming over from the shores of the wide Atlantic, and the gentle Pacific—from the Seine, the Rhine, the Danube, the Tiber—from the acropolis of Athens—from the minarets and domes of Constantinople—from the plains of Algeria and the borders of Zahara—from the pyramids of Egypt, the pagodas of India and the wall of China—from the green and fragrant islands of every sea—and that voice, is one great shout, "*all hail to the man of America!*"

Now we ask, when this American man hears that "*all hail!*" and sees the men of Europe, while they shout his name as their cry of liberty and battle, pulling down monarchy, aristocracy, church and state, in England, Scotland, Ireland, France, Prussia, Austria—dethroning the Pope—will not the American man look to see, as never before, if any stain of despotism yet lingers on his brow? and is he not enlightened, as never before, to see Methodism there, and to will it away?

The times then, we think, have been favorable for this examination of Methodism, since the people have more liberty than ever before, and circumstances have made them more attentive to understand human rights.

But we have said that the times have enabled us to comprehend Methodism all the better, because the preachers of this denomination have been tempted, by the condition of things, to make their body, especially in East Tennessee, a political party. They have made it so, and with a two-fold character. Thus—

Methodism is animated by two great controlling principles—the *fanatical*, and the *political*. The first is the oldest born, and naturally should govern. The second, however, although the youngest, may have the ascendancy. It has it now, and probably will continue to retain it. The two principles, although easily combined, show their own peculiar characters always. That is to say—the fanatical Methodist acts supremely for Methodism. He is honest. He would die for Methodism heartily, if his *convenient* doctrine of *falling from grace* did not teach him the *folly* of *dying* for his *religion*.—The political Methodist, may be free from fanaticism. Then he goes just for himself. He may not care a straw for Methodism. He may be a Methodist to sell a yard of calico, or to buy votes to make him constable, clerk, sheriff, member of Assembly or Congress. Another may, however, be very much a Methodist as well as a politician. He will, of course, be swayed by the one or the other impulse according to *expediency*. Now you may see him, all for the camp-meeting altar, the groan and the shout. Now all for the ballot-box, while hugging a voter round the neck at the whiskey barrel.

Such men could not fail to be tempted, from their numbers, and the attractions of the spoils of office, to make the Methodists a political party. Such a party in its organization would have its two-fold character. The leaders who might be supremely for Methodism would want the party especially to sustain their power as we have established in the “Great Iron Wheel” No. VI. The leaders who might be mere politicians, would use Methodism as their ladder. Such men might even offer Methodist votes to any, or all, who might aid them in political aspirations—to Whigs, or Democrats—to Epis-

copalians, Baptists, Lutherans, even to Presbyterians, if they could find Presbyterians, more likely to benefit Methodism, as politicians, than harm it as Presbyterians. Organized thus, this Methodist party, when *expedient*, might attempt to vote down, or overawe Presbyterians and all gainsayers. And when *expedient*, propose to elevate Presbyterians, or others, to office upon *bargain good and sufficient*.

Will any man in East Tennessee deny the existence of this party, organized exactly as we have said? And now, we ask, what sort of a political party is this? What are its political principles? Whigs, Democrats, Locofocos, Barnburners, Old Hunkers, Free Soil men, Abolitionists—all these have some avowed creed. But what is the proclaimed platform of this Methodist party? Has it principles of any kind but these two—first, *Methodist preacher power; and death to all who speak against it?*—secondly—*the cohesive attraction of public offices; and life to all who will help Methodists to enjoy them?*

THAT IS IT—IS IT NOT? Well. The times have tempted Methodist preachers thus to degrade Methodism. And the times, we think, are very favorable to enable the people of East Tennessee, and other places, to understand this thing as never before.

(3.) *The exposure of Methodism in this controversy has been more perfect than heretofore, because the examination has been in some respects more thorough.* In former discussions, Presbyterians rather acted on the defensive, and hence the disclosures of Methodism were more *incidental* to that defence, than in the way of systematic exhibition of Methodism. But, now, the editors of the magazine felt themselves urged by the previous course of Methodists to make their system the especial object of inspection. It has then not been Presbyterianism before the public, but Methodism.

Again, the mode has been somewhat peculiar. Each "*Wheel*," for example, has been one subject, made essentially complete IN THAT NUMBER. Thus, the reader had that subject amply disclosed, even if he never saw any other number. This result was perfected by giving the proof from unquestionable Methodist sources. *The reader has thus been enabled to determine every question for himself*, especially as our quotations from Methodist authorities have been so full, that even

the cry of garbling has hardly been uttered, and no attempt to sustain such a charge has come to our knowledge. This mode, then, has, we think, impressed the truth more deeply than is usual in such discussion.

(4.) The weakness of the defence, made by the preachers, has greatly helped to expose Methodism.

Presbyterians have felt that the preachers have made no defence. It may be said that Presbyterians are partial judges. They can however comprehend facts and admit the power of arguments. They could respect the abilities of John Hughes, the Roman Catholic, in his controversy with John Breckenridge. They did confess the talents of Alexander Campbell, the Baptist, in debate with N. L. Rice. Yea, Presbyterians can appreciate the strength of an adversary. And when he has no force they know it. They see that John Hughes has not answered Kirwan. They know, too, that Methodist preachers have not met the Calvinistic Magazine. Nay, Methodists feel it themselves. Many of them say so. For example—the editor of the Southern Methodist got up his Arminian Magazine, Rome, Georgia—saying, “This we feel bound to do, because we think they [the numbers of the “Great Iron Wheel”] have not been *sufficiently* answered *by any* of our church papers. It is due to the world, it is due to the people of the United States, it is due to Methodists, it is due to Presbyterians, especially that these grave charges should be gravely met, and fully answered.” This is manly and honest.—The “Great Iron Wheels” “have not been sufficiently answered by any of our church papers.” So this editor tells us. His brother preachers have failed, it seems, in East Tennessee and every where else. What then? Do his brethren feel satisfied with his attempt? *One* of them, we know, thought and said he had as well let the matter alone before he began. And we have heard no boastings over the Arminian Magazine. Truly the preachers have no expectation of defending themselves by weapons of truth. Their only hope is to hide from the people. The hope is vain. The cuttle-fish may escape in a diffusion of ink. But the “Great Iron Wheel” cannot be concealed any longer behind the altar of mystic fog, nor guarded from examination by that *fragrant breath* which is the last defence of Methodism.

Methodism has sunk down, then, because, as never before, the weakness of its defence has been felt by all.

(5.) *The SPIRIT exhibited by the preachers and the people, has undermined christian confidence in Methodism.*

Observe—the people of this denomination hold to the doctrine of the *direct witness of the Spirit*, by which they claim to know, assuredly, from the voice of God, when they obtain religion: and to know, all the time, by the same witness, that they are christians, unless they fall from grace. Methodists also believe in *christian perfection*, and claim to have gained; in many of their hearts, an elevated sanctification. It is a fair question, then, to ask—how have they established these claims to superior religious experience, and sanctified life, during this controversy? Are we allowed to judge them by their fruits? If we are—then thinking men have settled the question. There is but one opinion. And it is this—that the *spirit* of Methodism in this discussion, is the most unchristian that has ever been exhibited, by any religious body in the United States.

Just think what an opportunity Methodists have had to establish their boast of having *the direct witness*, and the attainment of *christian perfection*. Let us remember, they complain that they have been persecuted by the writers in the Calvinistic Magazine—and that the assaults upon them have been without parallel for slander and abuse. How great then, according to their own showing, the trial Methodists have had! What an opportunity to manifest the spirit of Christ! Gold, is tried in the fire. The christian, is proved by slander, abuse, persecution. Verily, verily, it has been the time, as declared by themselves, when Methodists might have charmed the public mind by their piety, and thus have silenced the Calvinistic Magazine. Truly, had Methodists shown this piety, the “Great Iron Wheel” must have stood still—and christians would have said to us—“Sirs, can that ‘Great Iron Wheel’ be fraught with danger? See how it moves along in the spirit of Jesus Christ. See above it Ezekiel’s firmament, and sapphire throne, the appearance of the bow that is in the cloud in the day of rain, and the likeness of the glory of the Lord.” Truly the dark things in the Methodist system would only have been spots in the sunlight of their christian spirit. So Romanism

itself has sometimes charmed the Protestant into love—not when its exquisite music has floated down long drawn aisles of consecrated marble, but when the Catholic has shown the faith, forbearance, forgiveness and charity of Christ. We ask then, ought not Methodists so to have met what, they said, were the slanders of the Calvinistic Magazine? Who will deny this? Will the christian? Will the men of the world?—Nay, will not all tell us—surely Methodists were bound thus to prove their piety, and their claim to the holiest walk with Christ. Alas! for the contrast.

We cannot draw the contrast. Nay, we cannot employ any words fully to express the Methodist *spirit* in this controversy. The *personalities* we have styled *complimentary things*. And the *grossness* we have called *Methodist fragrance*. But our readers—yea the people every where now know this Methodist spirit. And the knowledge of what it is, has utterly undermined public confidence in Methodist piety.

For, when men have seen Methodist ministers of the gospel and their people, professing the highest claims to piety, descending, in a body, to scurrility of the most intense, private, personal, hatred—descending to assaults, by name, upon kindred, friends, dead and living—descending to attacks on property and credit—descending in a hundred pulpits, and a thousand houses, to language directly tending to brutal outrage, or private assassination—when men have seen all this given as *spiritual bread* to Methodists Sabbath after Sabbath, day after day, and that Methodists live gladly upon this garbage—when men have seen all this, they have felt and said—“What is such a religion worth? We would sooner trust our all for time, to the honor of the world, and our souls for eternity, upon the merit of our natural fear of God, and conscientious regard for the things that are true, honest, lovely, and of good report, than hope in such a religion as that.” So feel thousands in this land. What an exposure and condemnation of Methodism!

Will Methodists deny this statement? They cannot. Everybody knows it to be true. Will they admit their course has been unscriptural? Then they testify to what we say. Will they deny their conduct has been unchristian? Then such denial establishes the more what we affirm—for they show there-

by that they do not even know what the christian character is; as it is understood by the common consent of all who believe the Bible.

Will Methodists plead justification? Will they say the Devil is in the Calvinistic Magazine, and it is right to fight him with his own fire? Alas! This is the Methodist justification. And it proves all the more what we say. For, neither Christ nor his apostles, as we believe, has given Methodists a dispensation to resist the devil with brimstone. And, we have not thought that even Wesley, or Clark, has so altered the Scriptures as to allow Methodists to rebuke Satan with sulphur. Much less has Christ or his apostles allowed Methodists to *make a Devil* to suit themselves, pretend to see him in the Calvinistic Magazine, and then fight him with the weapons of sin and shame. Alas! for Methodism.

Will Methodists tell us—"We confess our conduct, as a body, has been thus degraded. But there are amongst us many honorable exceptions—very many true christians, who weep over our disgrace?" Good. We know some. Tell us more, that all men may respect them. Tell us so many, if you can, that we may hope the body will be lifted up from the pit into which it has fallen.

Will Methodists deny that this spirit has done *great evil* to themselves? Some of them have said that fifty years will not efface it. True. Look at the evil. It is, *the HEART of hatred and vengeance, infused into the Methodist mind, as a DUTY TO METHODISM*. Is not such a HEART, cultivated as a DUTY, *an enormous evil*? IS IT NOT ANOTHER GOSPEL? And just think that this HEART has been excited in the Methodist church by the direct, unceasing effort of spiritual and political leaders to create it. How wide, and deep, such a mischief to Methodist piety! And how great the wickedness in the preachers who have done it!

But it may be asked whether this discussion has not done great harm to the Presbyterian spirit? We answer promptly, no. Because the *thing* aimed to be accomplished by the editors of the Calvinistic Magazine is a *totally different thing* from *that* sought to be produced by the Methodist preachers in this controversy. We have endeavored to expose *the Methodist system*—government, doctrines, Discipline—the public

principles of Methodist public men. *They*, on their part, have labored to excite in Methodist HEARTS malicious hatred to particular men, or to a whole body of christians, holding them as their private personal enemies. The difference then between the Calvinistic Magazine and Methodist preachers, is the difference between RIGHT and WRONG. It is *right* to expose mischievous public principles and conduct. It is *wrong* to make men hate one another. THAT is exactly the difference. We have sketched the course of the preachers. Let all examine ours.

Our object has been, as we have said, to lead men every where to distrust, fear, and disown the polity of Methodism, to watch the movements of Methodist preachers in their public character. Thus, we have established the error, or folly, of their public writings, in the light of Scripture, facts, argument, irony, ridicule. We have shown the tendency of the system to civil and religious slavery—to social degradation. True, we have said, Methodist preachers are despots. But a despot may be personally a good and a noble man. True, we have said, Methodist preachers are like Jesuits. But Jesuits may be christians and gentlemen. True, we have shown the submission and drill of the Methodist people—but they ought to thank us, although we have roused them, a little strongly, to know and claim their rights. This is what we have labored to do. And *there* is the impression we have made. Let all men see it. It is good. We rejoice to see it. What is that impression? It is, that Presbyterians are learning the principles of Methodism as never before. It is, that thinking men, every where, are watching Methodist preachers as never before. This we aimed to effect. This we have done. Presbyterians, then, do not feel malice towards Methodists as a body, or as individuals, under the influence of the Calvinistic Magazine. Their spirit is good, christian, and tending to higher faith and charity.

The course of the Calvinistic Magazine has been *right* in morals—it has also been *good in policy*. To expose bad public principles, is right. But to abuse men personally, is not only *wicked*, it is *foolish*. Hence, while it may be a great matter twenty years hence whether Methodism be now exposed, it may not matter a jot, at that time, whether Methodist

preacher A. B., in this day, was regarded a saint or a sinner. How foolish, then, as well as wicked, to try to do him personal harm! Besides, if we had abused Mr. A. B., we might not have hurt him at all. We might only have disgraced ourselves, and elevated him to notoriety, if not to distinction.—For, even in politics, mere abuse, and personal insult, hardly fail to lift up the man—often the bad man, sometimes the good. The cry of “log-cabin and hard cider,” we all know, helped to make one President of the United States. And the water of “Ramsour’s mill-pond” failed to wet the sole of the foot of another aspirant, while on his way to the same elevation. No—we, the editors, have been saved from doing wrong in this matter, and also from the folly of helping Methodism at the same time. So much then as to our motives, and what we have done. Whatever Methodists have thought in their hearts towards us, or have attempted to do, we believe has been overruled for good. We have, all of us, been benefitted by the disclosed spirit of Methodism. “The wrath of man shall praise thee: the remainder of wrath shalt thou restrain.” Secure, in conscientious duty, we live, fenced by shields of christian hearts, and guarded by that outer wall of God’s chariots and horsemen.

The watchman has said—“*The morning cometh, and also the night: if ye will enquire, enquire ye: return, come.*” “*He that hath ears to hear, let him hear.*”

[The following address was delivered by the Rev. CHARLES J. BROWN, at the Bicentenary of the Assembly of Divines at Westminster, held at Edinburgh, July 12th and 13th, 1843. We select this address as highly appropriate to our magazine.]

The Leading Features and Excellencies of the Westminster Standards.

“The subject on which I am called to address you this evening,—and I shall enter upon it at once without any preface,—is, ‘The Leading Features and Excellencies of the Westminster Standards.’ It will tend to our obtaining a more distinct and satisfactory view of this subject, if we regard these Standards under the following leading aspects of them:—first, as they are

designed to display and exhibit the revealed truth of God to the world, in opposition, especially, to the main errors and heresies that have in different periods arisen; secondly, as they are designed to aid in forming, under God, and maintaining the right character of the Church; and, thirdly, as they are intended to secure a sound, orderly, and effective government of the Church, and administration of her ordinances and affairs, for all the ends of her institution.

I. It is chiefly with the Confession of Faith and the two Catechism that we have to do, under the first of these aspects,—the display and exhibition of the revealed truth of God to the world. Let me observe here, that it would be difficult to overestimate the importance of this end of a Confession of the Church's Faith. It is a distinct object, of course, and one very much more comprehensive than that of a simple test of orthodoxy. When men, professing to adhere to the Scriptures, have published to the world, under the guise of Scripture, the most soul-destroying errors and heresies, the Church cannot fulfil her office as God's witness for the truth, by merely, in these circumstances, falling back on Scripture, and declaring her unchanged adherence to the word of God; for they also are ready to make this profession. She must be prepared to give forth her interpretation of that word to the world in some form sufficiently tangible, and clear, and unequivocal, to form a rallying point for the friends of truth,—to present a banner round which they may gather, and have their minds confirmed and assured, when error is coming in like a flood,—and to make known at the same time, to all the world, in opposition to whatsoever calumnies and misrepresentations of her faith may be spread abroad, what that faith really is,—what the real difference is between her and the adversaries of truth, professing equally to take the Scriptures for their rule. I would nearly go the length of affirming the necessity, in this view,—not the high expediency simply, in order to the full discharge of the Church's duty as the Lord's witness for the truth,—of her publishing to the world a full profession of her faith, embracing all the leading particulars of the revealed "counsel of God," so far as she may have been enabled to attain to them.

Now, in this view of the Standards prepared by the Westminster Assembly, I would ask you, first, to observe for a few

moments, their admirably complete and comprehensive character. They present an exhibition of divine truth, singularly comprehensive and complete. Glancing at the main features, we are met at the very outset with much precious, scriptural, and Protestant truth, in the simple fact, that the first chapter of the Confession is "on the Holy Scriptures." It opens, before proceeding at all to unfold the subject-matter of the Church's faith, by declaring the one divine and infallible Standard of it. It opens, in marked contrast to the Romish catechisms and formularies,—in contrast, to a large extent, to the structure even of many of the more imperfect Protestant formularies,—with the Scriptures as the only rule of faith; while, in correspondence with the Confession here, the two Catechisms of the Assembly, after an introductory question designed to prepare the mind of the learner, at once presents the Old and New Testaments before him, as "the only rule which God has given us to direct us how we may glorify and enjoy him." Of course, the Confession, in accordance with its character and design, opens up this more at large, especially in opposition to the errors, on this head, of the Church of Rome. Nor can I help remarking that, in comparison even with the various earlier Confessions of the Protestant Churches of Europe, while one rejoices in the general harmony of doctrine that pervades the whole, there is a peculiar accuracy to be observed,—a singularly unencumbered clearness, as well as fullness of statement; in the Westminster Confession, owing, in part, no doubt, to its authors having enjoyed the benefit of all the others when they were called in Providence to prepare it. Then, as the Westminster Divines would not speak even of things on which nature casts some light, without first presenting the word of God as the only infallible and perfect rule in all things, so this repository of truth being as it were opened, they proceed to bear witness of what, in religion, is necessarily first, and last also, the Alpha and Omega, unchanged from everlasting to everlasting, independent of all the varying conditions of the creature, whether as fallen, for instance, or unfallen: "Of God and the Holy Trinity,"—and this strictly, you will observe, not as mixed up, by anticipation, in many of the other Confessions, with things belonging to the remedial scheme of grace,—"Of God and the Holy Trinity," is the second leading subject of

these Standards. Let me remark here, (and the observation applies to after-parts of the Confession, on the constitution of the Mediator's person,) that while there is a marked catholicity about the doctrine of them, the substance of the chief early creeds, and of the language of the first orthodox councils, being retained, there is a very happy absence of that painful minuteness of detail which is a characteristic of these, particularly of the Athanasian creed. The spirituality of tone, also, that marks these Standards throughout, meets us here at the very outset, in these words, for instance,—“God hath all life, glory, goodness, blessedness, in and of himself, and is alone in and unto himself all-sufficient, not standing in need of any creature which he hath made, not deriving any glory from them, but only manifesting his own glory in, by, unto, and upon them,” and so on. We have all been struck (unless, perhaps, our familiarity with it from earliest childhood may have made us overlook it) with the massive fullness of that answer in this department,—“God is a Spirit, infinite, eternal, and unchangeable, in his being, wisdom, power, holiness, justice, goodness and truth.” Passing the subject of the Divine decrees, which I shall have occasion to refer to in a different connection, we are led on, through the execution of these, in creation, in providence generally, and more particularly in the fall of man, and the various fearful effects of it,—we are brought, at this point, to what I would mark as one of the most distinctive features of these Standards, namely, the fullness with which they exhibit the doctrine of the divine covenants,—of the covenant of works, first of all, “wherein,” in the words of the Confession of Faith, “life was promised to Adam, and in him to his posterity, upon condition of perfect and personal obedience;” and next of the covenant of grace, “made,” in the words of the Larger Catechism, “with Christ as the second Adam, and in him with all the elect, as his seed,” “wherein,” to use again the words of the Catechism, “the Lord freely offered unto sinners life and salvation by Jesus Christ, requiring of them faith in him, that they may be saved; and promising to give unto all those that are ordained unto life, his Holy Spirit, to make them willing and able to believe.” It is, of course, out of the question to enlarge on this subject here, under any aspect of it. But I would just take leave to express it as an opinion I

have long entertained, that the doctrine of these covenants, as thus declared in our Standards, however it may have become fashionable of late years to decry it as stiff and antiquated, lies very near the foundation of a sound and solid theology, and has not received a more prominent place from the Westminster Divines, than its grounds in Scripture, and its vital bearings on the entire scheme of grace deserve and demand for it.

The covenant of grace having introduced the whole method and plan of redemption, the Confession and Catechisms, with some varieties of form, well worthy of being studied, arising out of the character and design of the several documents, proceed to treat of the constitution of the Mediator's person, the Mediator of the covenant,—of his glorious work of obedience unto death,—of the fullness of salvation as purchased and laid up in Him,—of his prophetic, and priestly, and kingly offices in general; and then, after an intermediate connecting head in the Confession, “of free-will,” bringing out the condition of the sinner, his entire moral impotency, when the salvation is brought near to him,—they proceed to treat of his effectual calling,—of the outgoing of the whole redemption from Christ to individual souls,—of its effectual application to them by the office and work of the Holy Ghost,—with all its cardinal benefits, which are severally opened up, of justification, adoption, sanctification, through faith, treated of in the 14th chapter of the Confession,—with repentance unto life, the subject of the 15th,—assurance of God's grace, the subject of the 18th,—perseverance in it to the end, the subject of the 17th,—and in a word, here, good works, the fruits and evidences of faith and regeneration, treated of in the 16th chapter; while the Divine law is laid open, in its nature, uses, and eternal obligations, in the 19th,—just as the two Catechisms, after unfolding the whole doctrine of grace, of salvation by Christ alone,—proceed thereafter to expound the Decalogue,—the moral law in its details, as the rule of the Christian's obedience, received by him now from the Mediator's hand without a curse, but with only additional obligations on that very account to keep and delight in it forever.

The next twelve chapters of the Confession, with the exception of one “on Marriage and Divorce,” and the two, so well known, “on Liberty of Conscience,” and “on the Civil Magis-

trate," are occupied with the subject of Divine worship, and the various ordinances of it, and the Church, with some leading matters and principles connected with its administration. There is one very distinctive feature of the Westminster Standards in this department, to which I should deem it unpardonable, especially in present circumstances, not to advert, however briefly. I refer to the fullness and clearness of their testimony in regard to the Sabbath,—to the moral and perpetual obligation of the fourth commandment of the Decalogue,—of the Lord's day as the Christian Sabbath. I need give no quotations here,—the subject is so familiar to all. But I cannot help saying, that the ripeness of what unquestionably was the Augustan age of theology, nowhere, perhaps, comes out to greater advantage than here. In the earlier symbols of the Protestant Churches of Europe,—admirable as in many respects they were, this vital matter is either omitted, or the testimony in reference to it is exceedingly scanty and feeble.—How marked the contrast in this respect, of the Westminster formularies! What invaluable benefits do we not owe to them, under God, from their teaching on this subject alone! I have simply to add here, that the matter of these twelve chapters of the Catechism, is chiefly embraced in their closing department, opening with the question, "What are the outward means whereby Christ communicateth to us the benefits of redemption?" The Confession, on the other hand, closes with the state of men after death, the resurrection of the dead, and the last judgment,—subjects which had come in at previous parts of the Catechisms, especially under the head of the benefits which believers receive from Christ at death and at the resurrection.

I alluded just now to the spirituality of tone that marks this exhibition of Divine truth. I would desire, in the present sketch, to avoid everything like mere vague, indiscriminate praise of these Standards. But it were doing injustice to the subject committed to me, if, acknowledging very freely the defects in them incident to everything human, and some of which I may have occasion humbly to notice, I did not mark one or two prominent excellencies of them, still viewed as a display of Scripture truth, distinct from the comprehensive completeness of their matter. The exalted spirituality of their tone

must have struck every man competent to form a judgment on the subject. What an unction, for example, in these well-known words:—"The souls of believers are, at their death, made perfect in holiness, and do immediately pass into glory; and their bodies being still united to Christ, do rest in their graves till the resurrection." Take another example from the Larger Catechism:—"The conclusion of the Lord's prayer, (which is, *For thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory for ever, Amen.*) teacheth us to enforce our petitions with arguments, which are to be taken, not from any worthiness in ourselves, or in any other creature, but from God; and with our prayers to join praises, ascribing to God alone eternal sovereignty, omnipotency, and glorious excellency; in regard whereof, as he is able and willing to help us, so we by faith are emboldened to plead with him that he would, and quietly to rely upon him that he will, fulfil our requests. And, to testify this our desire and assurance, we say, Amen." Then, another marked feature is, a certain weighty, commanding character in the statements, bearing evident marks of their having come from men not only of very powerful minds, but profoundly and experimentally versed in the high themes which they were called to handle. One is amazed, in fact, on reading these works, to find every where in them a masculine strength of conception,—a grasp of thought without any apparent effort,—a lucid clearness and logical accuracy combined with elevation and majesty of style, that really seem to make the writers and theologians of these later days, in comparison, very small men.—Take an example, nearly at random, from the chapter of the Confession "on Christ the Mediator;" "The Son of God, the second person in the Trinity, being very and eternal God, of one substance, and equal with the Father, did, when the fullness of time was come, take upon him man's nature, with all the essential properties and common infirmities thereof, yet without sin; being conceived by the power of the Holy Ghost, in the womb of the Virgin Mary, of her substance. So that two whole, perfect, and distinct natures, the Godhead and the manhood, were inseparably joined together in one person, without conversion, composition, or confusion. Which person is very God and very man, yet only Christ, the only Mediator between God and man." You will bear willingly, I believe,

with another example from the Larger Catechism: "Wherein do justification and sanctification differ? Although sanctification be inseparably joined with justification, yet they differ, in that God in justification imputeth the righteousness of Christ; in sanctification his Spirit infuseth grace, and enableth to the exercise thereof; in the former, sin is pardoned; in the other, it is subdued; the one doth equally free all believers from the revenging wrath of God, and that perfectly in this life, that they never fall into condemnation; the other is neither equal in all, nor in this life perfect in any, but growing up to perfection."

This last quotation may equally form an example of a further excellency, which I would mention—namely, the evangelical character of the Westminster theology. What are the hinges on which evangelical truth, as such, necessarily turns? On the lost state of man by nature; on the doctrine of the atonement, as a true and very substitution of Christ in the sinner's room; on his justification by Christ's righteousness, imputed to him through faith alone, without the deeds of the law; on his regeneration by the Holy Ghost, as a thing distinct and different from every outward ordinance whatever; and on the free and unlimited offer of Christ to sinners in the gospel. I am just disposed to say here, that while the first four of these are so manifestly and largely characteristic of the Westminster Confession and Catechism, as to render examples of them quite superfluous; I humbly apprehend that there is a certain bareness in regard to the last, of the free and unlimited offer of Christ,—negative, indeed, and comparative, rather than positive and absolute, for we have this also with much plainness, once and again, as in the words already quoted, in part, for a different purpose,—“Man, by his fall, having made himself incapable of life by that covenant, the Lord was pleased to make a second, commonly called the covenant of grace, wherein he freely offereth unto sinners life and salvation by Jesus Christ.” And again, in the answer of the Shorter Catechism about effectual calling, “He doth persuade and enable us to embrace Jesus Christ freely offered to us in the gospel.” Still, considering the vast importance of this matter, and its prominence in the Scriptures, I should be disposed very humbly to say, that there was a certain want of fullness, with reference to it, in the Westminster Standards. There is one other very

prominent aspect, however, of this body of doctrine, kindred to the evangelical, to that which expresses "good will to men,"—I mean that of "glory to God in the highest,"—the aspect of holy, divine sovereignty,—the one pointed to in words like these, "it became Him for whom are all things, and by whom are all things," to do this and that,—“Him who worketh all things after the counsel of his own will.” The chapter of the Confession "on God's eternal decree," and the corresponding parts of the Catechisms, are, of course, chiefly important here. Says the former, "God from all eternity did, by the most wise and holy counsel of his own will, freely and unchangeably ordain whatsoever comes to pass; yet so as thereby neither is God the author of sin, nor is violence offered to the will of the creatures, nor is the liberty or contingency of second causes taken away, but rather established." The truth is, however, that this aspect runs through the whole of these Standards together. Scarce a section on mere vital matters but it some way appears in. It could not fail, from its very nature, to do so. Divine sovereignty, once thoroughly admitted, is necessarily an all-pervading principle. It is another expression, in fact, for that highest of all the lessons of religion, of the word of God,—“Of him, and through him, and to him are all things: to him be glory forever, Amen.” It is evident that many other ways might have been taken of presenting the leading features of this body of truth, as, for instance, marking the different principal errors against which it testifies,—the Popish, the Arian, and Socinian, in all their forms,—the Pelagian, Arminian, Antimonian, and so on. It were difficult to say against which of them the testimony of the Westminster Confession is fullest and clearest. Or, again, one might have entered into a comparison of these formularies with those of the different Protestant Churches of Europe, not only with the view of bringing out the general harmony that pervades them, but to show how the Westminster Divines, from the ripeness to which Protestant theology had, in their day, attained, together with the catholic character of the ends and objects they had in view, were in specially favorable circumstances, and were in reality blessed of God, for producing an exhibition of truth eminently free of mere local peculiarities, and well fitted to form a basis of union among Christians all over the world. Let

it never be forgotten in this view, that upon doctrine, more strictly so called, all parties in the Assembly,—Presbyterian, Independent, and even Erastian,—English Commissioners and Scotch,—clerical and lay, were thoroughly as one, adopting section after section of the Confession and Catechisms, with conference occasionally, and changes of expression, but in the end without a dissentient voice.

II. But I must hasten on to notice, much more briefly, the second leading aspect under which it was proposed to view the Westminster Standards—as designed, namely, to aid in forming and maintaining the right character of the Church.—Need I remind you here what provision is made in the two Catechisms, especially the Shorter, for the training up of youth in the fear of God, for imbuing their minds thoroughly with the principles of religion, giving them no slight and superficial, but a solid, scriptural, enlarged acquaintance with these from the very first? How invaluable these Catechisms, for the forming of character, in the family, in the school, in the ministerial class, in pastoral visitation, as the experience of the evangelical Church, of all denominations, over the world, has long and gratefully borne witness? I find, by the way, a curious passage in an exhortation for catechising, published by the London Presbytery in August, 1655:—“This testimony we may freely give to the Lesser Catechism, that it has this considerable excellency, above all those we have seen, that *every answer is an entire proposition, without relation to the question preceding;*” in other words, every answer is a perfect proposition, without the question. I have often observed the fact stated here, but never saw any particular excellence connected with it, till, on reading this passage, the idea suggested itself, obvious enough when one’s attention is drawn to it, that upon the ordinary plan of catechisms, where the answer is involved with the question, so as only to make an entire proposition when taken along with it, the pupil, to have any use of his catechism, must have his teacher beside him; whereas, in the Assembly’s catechisms, over and above the benefit of the catechetical mode when the teacher is present, the pupil has, in each answer committed by him to memory, a distinct and entire proposition, which he can employ for himself, without any foreign aid at all. Then mark, in this connection, the thoroughly practical character of

these standards,—the fullness and minuteness of detail, with which they open up the whole subject of man's duty. It is a notion widely prevalent among the ignorant, and a charge industriously preferred by the malignant adversaries of Calvinism, that it deals much more in loud and clamorous controversy about doctrine, than in the quiet and faithful practice of Christian duty. Strange, in this case, (although it is of course the lives of sincere Calvinists that alone can thoroughly meet such a charge, yet strange if there were the least ground for it,) that two-thirds nearly of each of the Westminster Catechisms are taken up with the very subject about which Calvinists are alleged to be comparatively indifferent! The Larger and Shorter Catechisms are divided, it is well known, into the two departments, of "what man is to believe concerning God, and the duty which God requireth of man." Of 107 questions in the Shorter, the first 38 only are devoted to the former head of faith. Ninety out of 196, in the Larger Catechism, are given to it. In each, also, the second and much larger division is occupied with a detailed exposition of the Decalogue. In other words, these Standards are not satisfied with bearing pointed witness against Antinomianism in every form,—testifying to the holy character, design, and tendency of the doctrines of grace,—unfolding doctrinally the uses and eternal obligations of the moral law; but they furnish to all the members, and the youth especially of the Church, minute expositions of it, precept by precept, of which I shall simply say this, that were these same adversaries but a little better acquainted with them, I suspect their charges would speedily take the shape rather of alledged Puritanism, and over-strictness of morality, than of any indifference whatever to duty and practice.

Let the following suffice as a specimen of the carefulness with which the whole subject of duty is examined and opened up. "What rules are to be observed for the right understanding of the ten commandments? For the right understanding of the ten commandments, these rules are to be observed:—1. That the law is perfect, and bindeth every one to full conformity in the whole man unto the righteousness thereof, and unto entire obedience forever; so as to require the utmost perfection of every duty, and to forbid the least degree of every sin. 2. That it is spiritual, and so reacheth the understand-

ing, will, affections, and all other powers of the soul, as well as words, works, and gestures. 3. That one and the same thing, in divers respects, is required or forbidden in several commandments. 4. That as, where a duty is commanded, the contrary sin is forbidden; and, where a sin is forbidden, the contrary duty is commanded; so, where a promise is annexed, the contrary threatening is included; and where a threatening is annexed, the contrary promise is included. 5. That what God forbids, is at no time to be done: what he commands, is always our duty; and yet, every particular duty is not to be done at all times. 6. That under one sin or duty, all of the same kind are forbidden or commanded; together with all the causes, means, occasions, and appearances thereof, and provocations thereunto. 7. That what is forbidden or commanded to ourselves, we are bound, according to our places, to endeavor that it may be avoided or performed by others, according to the duty of their places. 8. That in what is commanded to others, we are bound, according to our places and callings, to be helpful to them; and to take heed of partaking with others in what is forbidden them."

I shall only further observe on this aspect of the Standards, that, as the character of the Christian Church depends on nothing more than on the sanctification of the Lord's day, and the public services of the sanctuary, so the Westminster Standards have a very important bearing on both these matters.—The fullness of their testimony regarding the Sabbath I have already had occasion to notice. And the power of it, I may now only observe, is greatly heightened by that rejection of all festival days of human device, which, by leaving the Sabbath alone, without any rival or competitor, as it alone is of Divine institution, so evidently tends to secure for it, and concentrate upon it, the religious regards of the Church. Then, as to the public services of the sanctuary, I believe it is a common notion in some quarters, that Presbyterianism, prescribing only what these are to consist of, but leaving its ministers very much to their own caprice, without any authorized guide in the conducting of them, thus leaves the people at the mercy of each man's unaided discretion. There cannot, in reality, be a greater mistake. It is quite true, that Presbyterianism does not treat its ministers as children—does not put them in the

leading-strings of any set form of expression in public prayer, never to be varied from one year, and even age, to another. It does not treat them as men unfit for their office, and so discharge their work for them, leaving them but the mechanical function of readers. But it will be seen, by any one who examines, with the care it so well merits, the Westminster Directory for Public Worship, that, tracing the services of the sanctuary from their commencement to their close, and this both on ordinary occasions and on extraordinary, such as days of solemn humiliation and thanksgiving, together with the communion and baptismal services—it provides, for each several part, the richest and most valuable materials and directions, as to leave no competent and faithful minister at any possible loss, while room is given for the stirring up, by each, of the graces and gifts the Lord may have bestowed upon him,—“our meaning,” to use the words of the preface—“our meaning being only, that the general heads, the sense and scope of the prayers, and other parts of public worship, being known to all, there may be a consent of all the churches in those things that contain the substance of the service and worship of God; and the ministers may be hereby directed, in their administrations, to keep like soundness in doctrine and prayer, and may, if need be, have some help and furniture, and yet so as they become not hereby slothful and negligent in stirring up the gifts of Christ in them; but that each one, by meditation, by taking heed to himself, and the flock of God committed to him, and by wisely observing the ways of Divine Providence, may be careful to furnish his heart and tongue with further or other materials of prayer and exhortation, as shall be needful upon all occasions.” I may just add here, that the title of “the Directory for Public Worship,” conveys but imperfectly the character of this important part of the Standards. It is, in fact, a comprehensive body of pastoral theology, including, for example, the most precious rules and materials for the ministerial visiting of the sick,—standing out in marked and happy contrast, in the wisdom with which they instruct ministers how to suit themselves to the circumstances of each particular case, with the stiffness and formality of a mere liturgical office. I scarce feel warranted to speak of the Metre Psalms as a part of the formularies of the Assembly. They were all but a part of

them, however. They may be said to have emanated from it, —to have been one of the direct and proper results of it. And assuredly there can be no hesitation in pronouncing them a mighty engine, under God, for the forming and maintaining of the right character of the Church. If any man prefer the paraphrases, or any hymns whatever, I am sorry for it—I cannot agree with him. The divine simplicity, the very roughness of these Psalms, has, to my mind, an unspeakable charm. It brings out all the better the words of the Holy Ghost, in which the true poetry, that goes to the heart, lies. No psalmody like that,—

“Lord, thee my God, I’ll early seek;
My soul doth thirst for thee;
My flesh longs in a dry parched land,
Wherein no waters be,” &c.

It appears that the paraphrase of the Psalms in metre, by Mr. Francis Rous, was examined, corrected, and approved by the Assembly of Divines at Westminster, and by them recommended to the English Parliament, which ordered that version to be sung in all the churches of England, Wales, and Berwick-upon-Tweed. The General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, before agreeing to the use of Rous’s version, ordered it to be reviewed, and compared with other versions. And our present version, though substantially that of Rous, and in many instances identical with it, is the result of numerous corrections and improvements made on it by a Committee of the General Assembly, which was employed some years in this work. Hence the title, “The Psalms of David in Metre, newly translated, and diligently compared with the original text and former translations: more plain, smooth, and agreeable to the text, than any heretofore.”

III. The third and only other aspect under which I propose to view the Westminster Standards,—as designed to secure a sound, orderly, and effective government of the church, and administration of the ordinances and affairs, for all the ends of her institution,—has been substantially embraced in a previous part of this commemoration; and I shall only glance at it in the briefest manner. It is evident, that whatever scheme or directory of government a Christian Church may adopt, it is, above all things, necessary that no rule be sanctioned, running counter to any of the grand principles of Scripture,—and more

particularly to that vital one specially apt to be contravened here, that there is one only Lawgiver, Lord and King of the Church,—that all government of it, even in the hands of office-bearers of his authorizing, must be ministerial, not lordly, in its character—that Church rulers have authority only to declare and carry out the will of Christ, not to impose their own mind and will upon the conscience of the Church. This principle is very fully recognized in the following words, for example, of the Westminster Confession:—"God alone is Lord of the conscience, and hath left it free from the doctrines and commandments of men, which are in anything contrary to His Word, or beside it, in matters of faith and worship; to that, to believe such doctrines, or to obey such commandments, out of conscience, is to betray true liberty of conscience." And again:—"There is no other head of the Church but the Lord Jesus Christ." One simple fact, in regard to the Westminster Directory for government, speaks a volume on this subject. It is, that from beginning to end of it, there is nothing placed on the footing of expediency—of man's will. In every single particular, whether concerning the Church or its office-bearers, or its assemblies of government, or their several functions, duties and powers, the Word of God is appealed to as the only authority which the Church is either bound or entitled to recognize. The following brief sentence from the Directory for Worship, embodies a principle of the last importance, and which, in the religious struggles now to all appearance near at hand, promises to have bearings at least as vital and practical as in the days of the first and second Charles: "There is no day commanded in Scripture to be kept holy under the gospel but the Lord's day, which is the Christian Sabbath. Festival days, vulgarly called holy-days, *having no warrant in the Word of God*, are not to be continued." While such, however, is the security provided for a government sound and scriptural, the orderly and effective character of it is not less cared for. Let any one peruse, with attention, the brief but luminous, comprehensive, and every way masterly "Form of Presbyterial Church Government," embracing the different kinds of office-bearers,—their respective powers and duties,—the various judicatories, congregational, classical (or presbyterial) and synodical,—together with the ordination of ministers, (though there was one point in regard to the voice of the peo-

ple, which the Scottish General Assembly expressly reserved power to itself to re-consider and supplement)—and he will have, in this simple perusal, one of the best illustrations of the orderly and energetic character of this system,—of its fitness under God, to secure a due administration of all the Church's ordinances and affairs. He will have a pleasing example of that general principle, that, whatever is scriptural and sound, will be found in the end to be also the most politic and expedient. A fine instance of the combination of the scriptural with the orderly,—of the principle of Christ's sole lordly authority, with the ministerial authority of the government in the Church instituted by him—of the freedom of the Church's conscience from the doctrines and commandments of men, with her obligation to yield submission to the government in the hands of men which He has really authorized,—is found in the following words of the Confession, in the chapters on Synods and Councils:—"It belongeth to Synods and Councils ministerially, to determine controversies of faith, and cases of conscience; to set down rules and directions for the better ordering of the public worship of God, and government of his Church; to receive complaints in cases of mal-administration, and authoritatively to determine the same; which decrees and determinations, if consonant to the Word of God, are to be received with reverence and submission, not only for their agreement with the Word, but also for the power, whereby they are made as being an ordinance of God, appointed thereunto in His word."

In conclusion, I fear I have scarce succeeded in avoiding, to the extent to which I was desirous to avoid, the stain of general eulogy. If I have erred in this,—if I have at all spoken of these works in a manner not befitting the compositions of men,—it has been my own fault alone; I had no warrant for it in the compositions themselves, which declare that "all Synods or Councils, since the Apostles' times, whether general or particular, may err, and many have erred; therefore they are not to be made the rule of faith or practice, but to be used as a help in both:" and again, that "the Supreme Judge, by which all controversies of religion are to be determined, and all decrees of Councils, opinions of ancient writers, doctrines of men, and private spirits, are to be examined, and in whose sentence we are to rest, can be no other but the Holy Spirit speaking in the Scripture." Let us, "remembering the years of the right hand of the Most High," give him humble and hearty thanks for his great grace vouchsafed to these his servants, whereby, in the midst even of much turmoil, and confusion, and strife of human passions and interests, they were enabled to produce a "form of sound words," so excellent every way, and so many ways fitted under God to advance the cause of truth and of vital godliness in the world."

THE
Calvinistic Magazine.

[NEW SERIES.]

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

Vol. IV.

March, 1849.

No. 3.

A Sermon.

THE CHURCH—ITS DESIGN—ITS OFFICERS.

—
PREACHED AT AN ORDINATION OF DEACONS.
—

“And in those days when the number of the disciples was multiplied, there arose a murmuring of the Grecians against the Hebrews, because their widows were neglected in the daily ministration. Then the twelve called the multitude of the disciples unto them, and said, it is not reason that we should leave the word of God and serve tables. Wherefore, brethren, look ye out among you seven men of honest report, full of the Holy Ghost and wisdom, whom we may appoint over this business. But we will give ourselves continually to prayer, and to the ministry of the word. And the saying pleased the whole multitude: and they chose Stephen, a man full of faith and of the Holy Ghost, and Philip, and Prochorus, and Nicanor, and Timon, and Parmenas, and Nicolas a proselyte of Antioch.”—Acts 6: 1—5.

THE business which will come before us this morning—the setting apart of Deacons—leads me now to speak of the *church and its officers*. The particular office of Deacon, and its duties, we shall best understand by viewing it in connection with the church, and with other offices, of which it forms a part. We need not be occupied with details of investigation, but with results. I shall not neglect to notice objections and difficulties, but shall try chiefly so to exhibit the true system of the church in its completeness, as that it shall be its own best evidence.

On this occasion, then, I am not to discuss minutely—as I have done before, and may again do—particular statutes and regulations relating to the church, which are laid down in the

Bible. I shall not hold up one stone after another of all that compose the spiritual house, the church of Christ, or show before your eyes how the pieces are put together and make up the house. But I would look at the inward being and life of Christ's church, and then mark how different faculties and offices and activities spring up in it from the very nature of the body as a living whole.

What, then, *is the christian church* regarded from this point?

The christian *religion* is that knowledge of God and of Christ which guides man in holiness through this world to heaven. This divine knowledge is contained in the Scriptures. It is communicated directly to every individual, and can act directly on every individual who studies the Bible. It is the concern of individuals. The christian *church* is a provision to impart this knowledge, and to keep it diffused in such a way that it shall be influential *on the mass*. It has a two-fold movement, acting inwardly on its own members, and outwardly on the world—to consolidate in goodness all that are its own, to put down moral evil in all that surrounds it.

The Christian church is a society. But the ancient Pagan religions were social. In offering sacrifices, in keeping festivals, in singing their hymns of thankfulness, there was the presence of a number of persons, there was visible and *social* worship. This, however, was only ritual service. There was no instruction given. Holiness of character was not required and was not cultivated. The means of gaining knowledge and righteousness were not furnished in connection with the religious ceremonies of heathenism. But Christianity provides and gives instruction that leads to moral purity and elevation. It promotes individual welfare, and the improvement of the *mass*, both intellectual and moral. And it does this in a *social* capacity. That elevation which christianity as religion secures to the individual, the christian church is established to confer on mankind. The church is a social body, not merely as uniting in the forms of visible worship, but in seeking *as a body the general good*, in all modes, and in the highest measure physical good, moral good, intellectual good, whatever other legitimate organizations had sought previously, came also within the province of the church—to be by it fostered and advanced. Its special work, however, was from the first to

advance man's welfare in connection with his spiritual purity and elevation.

The instruction and worship of the Christian church are not therefore the *objects* and *ends* of the church; it does not exist merely for these. Truth is in order to goodness. Holy knowledge and holy worship are means, appointed to improve character, to bring men nigh to God in their spirits and in their lives. They are instruments to prepare the church for duty—for inward advancement and outward well-doing. The worship of the christian is not limited to days and places. The worship of the christian is *his whole being offered to God in deeds of purity, and goodness, and truth.*

The church, then, is a power designed to put down and destroy all evil, and accomplish good of every kind. Its true ends have often been mistaken. Many have conceived of it as being a thing of Sabbaths and Sabbath services, or as belonging to a special order of men, the clergy, and not a mighty diffusive power, moving, working everywhere, to renovate and exalt humanity through all the relations of social existence. The Christian religion has won many victories over individuals, but the Christian church, because misconceived and turned from its right work, has not salted the earth and sanctified mankind, as it might have done.

Every one acknowledges that if you take a number of persons possessing various qualities and resources, and bring them together to co-operate with each other, the physical welfare of these men will be greatly promoted. To have the strength of one supply another's weakness—to combine their efforts so that all may be benefitted by means of all, is obviously wise. This principle has always been applied to physical objects.—Christianity applies it to moral objects and purposes. In Christ's church each man was to be helped in his weaknesses and wants by his neighbor's strength and abundance; gifts and qualities of the head and heart, were to be used so as to advance the intellectual and moral good of the whole—so that individual weaknesses were to disappear, or not to be felt in their effects on the man and on the community.

Now this system of mutual helpfulness, as we have intimated, was to extend very far. Every part of daily life was to feel its reviving power. The objects of the church were

numerous and they were vast. Was there not danger of their becoming indistinct, of being lost in utter vagueness? To assemble for the purpose of singing hymns of praise, of offering sacrifice—this is a definite object. Of union to promote in general the *moral well-being* of men—this is not so definite. But observe how this evil was remedied, how something precise, something *personal* was connected with the multiplied duties and acts of the church. *Christ* was the one object set before them. Into every part and duty of life they were to bring Christ. All was to be done in Christ. “I speak the truth,” says one, “in *Christ* I lie not.” “I thank my God in Christ Jesus.” “For me to live is Christ.” “We rejoice in Christ.” “*A man in Christ*”—a very remarkable expression. They were bidden to do no evil one to another—“for ye are members one of another”—i. e. through Christ.

And the great object of the church was to make all parts of human society one living body, intimately united to Christ, its head. In promoting this object, of *bringing Christ into common life*, to spiritualize it all, the early christians were accustomed to connect the deepest truths of religion with the satisfaction of their simplest natural wants. Every day was begun by a partaking of the holy communion. The sacrament of the body and blood of Christ was connected with the frugal daily meal of an assembly of christians. The presence of Christ in every other act that should follow during the day, was taught in this manner:—Their special communion with Him and with one another which began the day, conveyed a lively lesson about the duty of considering, all the day through, that they were to be working for Christ and for one another—*with Christ and with one another*. The whole soul, as Paul teaches, was to be a thank-offering for the grace of redemption—the *whole christian life* a course of spiritual worship in Christ.

A stranger from Rome who visited a remote Roman province in Asia, only 71 years from the first preaching of the Gospel writes home to tell the emperor of the manner of life then common among christians. In Bithynia, says Pliny, they met before day, and first sang a hymn together to Christ, as God; then they bound themselves to one another sacramentally—i. e. we must suppose by partaking together of the Holy Com-

munion—that they would not steal, commit adultery, break faith, or refuse to give again what had been entrusted to their care. Then they went to their day's work, and met again to partake of their meal; when prayers and hymns reminded them once more of their christian fellowship.

How pleasantly is the Christian church presented in this brief account! Two great principles are seen—mutual aid for doing the duties of life, and a close communion with Christ, the day begun with Him at His table, and holy living proceeding directly from fellowship with Christ.

Christ's church, then, is not merely a number of persons associated for religious instruction and enjoyment; but it is a divine instrumentality, whereby Christ is to become more and more the purifying element of human society, until the masses be permeated with His spirit, reflect His image, and copy His life. The church is a band of fellow-laborers. All stand in just the same relation to Christ; the spirit is given to all from Christ; according to his original faculties and his received gifts, each individual is to labor in the Lord.

But *how*, in *what ways* will the church act through its members?

Look first at its organization.

It was the special work of the Apostles, after the Holy Ghost had descended upon them—it was their special work—to set up the kingdom of Christ—a work once for all. They stood between mankind and the Saviour, as no other men have stood. As teachers in the church, they have had successors, and will have to the end of time. But as founders of the church under Christ, they did a work which was finished when they died. Their office was special and personal—it ceased with them.

1. It belonged to them to be personal witnesses of the resurrection of Christ—to *have seen the Lord*. This was one special qualification of the Twelve. Many knew personally the facts pertaining to Christ, but the apostles were set apart to be *special official* witnesses of these things. Paul says of himself—“Am I not an Apostle? *Have I not seen Jesus Christ?*” Will any in modern times that claim to succeed Paul in his apostleship abide by this test?

2. The Apostles received and used miraculous powers. This, too, was essential to their peculiar office.

3. The Apostles, as such, were special inspired teachers of divine Truth. Their writings are records of the Holy Ghost. An Apostle must be *inspired*, or he is but a false Apostle.

4. The apostles were limited in number. The *twelve Apostles*. The case of Paul is to be excepted, as one born out of due time, &c. We have no record of a single successor being appointed. When James was slain by the sword, nothing is said about a successor. The case of Matthias is simply the appointment of one to fill a vacancy in the original number. Sixty years afterwards, in the last book of the New Testament, it is written of the Holy Jerusalem, that it has *twelve* foundations, and in them are written the names of the twelve Apostles of the Lamb.

Lastly, I say, when those twelve were dead, no man on earth claimed the office or the name. Both had passed away. And no man dare assume the *title*, though not a few in the world claim to have inherited the office.

It was these men, I repeat, who, exercising their peculiar office as Apostles, set up Christ's church.

What form did it take under their hands? The constitution of the church did not wholly originate with the Apostles—it was not a novelty. They did not model christian institutions upon the temple or the Jewish polity; the humbler *synagogue*, found in every city and village, was their chosen model.—They did not merely copy this—they *changed* it into a Christian church. “It appears highly probable, I might say morally certain, that wherever a Jewish synagogue existed that was brought to embrace the Gospel, the Apostles did not, there, so much *form* a christian church or congregation, as make an existing congregation Christian, by introducing the Christian sacraments and worship, and establishing whatever regulations were requisite for the newly adopted faith; leaving the machinery (if I may so speak) of government unchanged; the rulers of synagogues, elders, and other officers being already provided in the existing institutions: that is to say, the earliest Christian churches were *converted synagogues*.”

I have here used the language of Archbishop Whately, of Dublin, the Episcopal primate [or head] of Ireland, a candid

and very able writer, though not the equal in learning of some who have expressed similar views on this point. This witness, however, is very good, and is sufficient for the present.

What now were the officers of such a body, its agencies and means for acting on the community, and realizing the purposes of Christ in their institution? Every one knows that the synagogue had its elders, one of them called chief-ruler, and its deacons or attendants. But I turn to the Christian church as it is represented to us in the New Testament, with regard to its constitution, its internal and external life. (It was the constant tendency of great numbers of the early Jewish converts, to mix up Judaism with Christianity, to prefer the magnificent Temple service, with its gorgeous imposing rites, to the simplicity of Christian worship, as seen at the synagogue or church, to turn back to the High-Priests, the Priests and Levites, with their sacrifices and festivals, from the unassuming ministers of the Gospel, and *that* sacrifice which was to consist in the offering of the whole being to God. This constant tendency to go back, to leave the moral for the ceremonial, the simple and the universal for the pompous and the national, ultimately corrupted the church in government, in doctrine, and in character. But we will not anticipate.)

The Christian church, as constituted under the Apostles, had for its permanent officers, but *two orders*. These are called in the Epistles, bishops or deacons. On one occasion Paul writes "To all the saints in Christ Jesus which are at Philippi with the *Bishops* and *Deacons*." Had there been another grade, or two other grades of officers attached to the church, Paul would not have omitted mentioning them. The qualifications of office in the church are set down by the same apostle in 1 Tim. 3. Here he specifies only two orders, two officers—Bishops and Deacons. By the word Bishop, is simply meant *overseer*. It is the same with Presbyter or Elder, as elsewhere used. Thus Paul, it is said in Acts, called together the Elders, (Presbyters,) of the church, and says to them—"Take heed therefore unto all the flock over which the Holy Ghost has made you *overseers*"—(*episkopous*—*Bishops*.) Elders or Presbyters, and Bishops, then, are the same persons in Christ's church. Again, follow out the same sentence, and you find the office of *Pastor* referred to. "Take heed to *feed* the flock of God"—

i. e. to do the work of Shepherd, or Pastor—(*poimainein*.) This one officer, Bishop, if you look at the *office*, the prudence and gravity and skill to govern implied in it, is styled an *Elder*: is charged with supervision. He is called Bishop—a word that came into use among the Greek churches first, and precisely answering to the office of Presbyter or Elder, among the Hebrews, as charged with instruction. The same is called Pastor, and as serving Christ in all these things, the *Minister*—i. e. the servant of Christ.

But a distinction is here to be noted among those that were called Presbyters or Elders. It became more prominent in the later Epistles of Paul, than in his earlier writings. Paul says to Timothy, (1: 17,) “Let the Elders *that rule well* be counted worthy of double honor, *especially they who labor in word and doctrine.*” We see here two kinds of Elders—some who *ruled*, and did no more, and those who *also* labored in word and doctrine. The former, Presbyterians call *Ruling Elders*, or simply *Elders*—the latter, preaching elders, presbyters, or pastors. The Ruling Elders, with the Pastor or Pastors of a church, constitute the *governing power* in a particular church.

The early churches of New England agreed with Presbyterians in having the office of Ruling Elder. John Cotton, in his famous book, printed two hundred years ago, speaks of this body of men, comparing them to the *judges* in the civil courts. A hundred years earlier, Calvin called the same men a *senate*—likening them to the supreme part of the governing authority in a state—a body having a concurrent jurisdiction. These men, it should be observed, and these early churches, would have a very close connection kept up between the eldership and the whole church. The *rule* of the church was, from *the very first*, the special business of such overseers. They watched over the general order; they guarded the purity of Christian doctrine and of Christian practice; they watched against abuses; they admonished those that erred; they also took the lead in public deliberations of the church. All this is apparent in the New Testament, where their functions are named. But such was then, in New Testament times, the spirit of Christian communion, that the *whole church*, also, seems to have participated in the management of their common affairs. Congregationalism, if I may

frankly speak my thought, has lost a little of Puritan stringency and order, while Presbyterianism has perhaps lost somewhat of that *close contact* with, and close dependence on, the people, which is found in the kindred system of Congregationalism. Still, we have *provision* for this also in our system;—it should be brought out and felt.

I have spoken thus far chiefly of those officers that *bear rule* in the *Christian church*. With regard to *teachers*, and their *duties*, I shall for the present pass over that, as it will soon come up in another connection, and on a different occasion.

We have looked at the government established in *Christ's* house from the very first; we have considered the overseers of the church in their capacity as rulers.

This government by Elders and Pastors, we have seen, was republican and not monarchical. The church was a *commonwealth*. The concerns of the church were the business of all. The Elders are to be regarded as representatives of the whole body. Designation to office proceeds from the church, from that authority which Christ has given it. Christ the Head, as a living and uniting Spirit, is in every part of His body, the church, all His members are servants of the whole. It is because Christ is in each redeemed soul and in all, that a rightful power proceeds from the body to its members to be used over all for edification. Those that have greater honor, are to rule in love and humility.

Is it now asked, what does this view of church government mean in regard to opposite views? Is every other form of church government, differing from ours, necessarily wrong?

I do not so regard the liberty that is in Christ. Doubtless a particular church, if it see fit to yield up its privileges, may put special and large authority in the hands of one man for a time. Possibly circumstances can justify this. And even a perpetual grant of undue authority should be condemned chiefly, I think, as hindering the free and full development of Christian character in that church. Excessive activity in the matter of governing on the part of a few, induces torpor on the part of the many. You should exercise every limb of your body, if you would have healthful energy and a vigorous life in all.

If then any man desires an Episcopacy like that advocated

by good Archbishop Leighton—a sort of superintendency conceded to one Presbyter over the rest, and over the church—let him have his choice. Or the Episcopacy of the Methodists, which they defend as an *expedient contrivance*, or that of some Lutherans, who have Bishops, but put forth no claim of exclusive divine right in their behalf. Harmless too may seem an Episcopacy like that of the first Reformers in England, when Bishops declared, with the simple-hearted Archbishop Cranmer at their head, that “in the New Testament there is no mention made of any degrees or distinctions in orders, but only of Deacons and Bishops”—or an Episcopacy maintained in England for *sixty years after the Reformation*, which expressly allowed through all its defenders that the Presbyterian government as found on the continent was Scriptural and valid—an opinion never publicly opposed until 1590, when a bold innovator, Dr. Bancroft, asserted in London the exclusive divine right of Prelacy.

If a man prefers Episcopacy as a *form of government*, we here interpose no objection. We embrace in charity those who hold that opinion.

But there is a usurpation in Christ’s church, which is more than government carried to excess—it is more than a stretch of jurisdiction. There is an error about government which I am bound to oppose as I love Christ. It is all wrong. Its principle and foundation are wrong. There is now in the world a mystery of iniquity, which as Paul says, worked already in his day. This denies Christ’s place in his church as head. This is Antichrist, whether Papist or Protestant, whether working at Rome, at Oxford, or in these United States.

I refer to that theory which turns the Christian Ministry into a Jewish Priesthood, the communion of the Lord into a sacrifice; which talks of priestly intervention as necessary for the pardon of sins; which speaks of its being “an inherent power in the Ministry to forgive sins.” This theory of the church, if a man would know whether he is a christian, does not say as the Bible says—“*examine your own self,*” but sends him to examine the genealogies of a priest, to investigate his spiritual pedigree. It does not say, “believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved,” but receive the sacraments from one who is in the right line, and you are sure of being in the chan-

nel of covenanted mercy. This is that doctrine of priestly intervention for the pardon of sins—directly opposed to justification by faith—which the Reformers fought with utmost zeal. It is ever creeping into the church, and is ever the deadliest foe of vital godliness.

It sets up a mediation for man, in contempt and defiance of Christ, and is the nurse of idolatry and superstition.

Time does not permit the discussion of this brood of errors in relation to the great Christian sacrifice, and the great High Priest of our profession. This sacramental theory subverts all.

Its claim to wield *church government*, as its exclusive divine right, is among the least of its mischiefs.

But I hasten to speak, briefly, of the second office in the Christian church.

The *office of Deacons* is the one first named in the New Testament. The occasion of its institution you have in Acts 6.

The duties of this office could hardly be mistaken, had not every matter of the sort been dragged into controversy. In the same passage are specified the qualifications appertaining to the office. The most distinguished church historian of our age, remarks on this language, that the Apostles required the church to entrust this business of general distribution to persons who enjoyed the *general confidence*, and were fitted for the office, being animated by *Christian zeal*, and armed with *Christian prudence*. "The chief quality," he says, "required by the Apostles, was *practical wisdom*,"* implying a special capability in the management of men's dispositions, and earnestness in laboring for the kingdom of Christ."

They were not, therefore, set to *preach*, though I dare affirm they were all the better Deacons if good speakers.

Philip, one of the seven first chosen, afterwards preached the Gospel, but we hear subsequently of this same Philip as then an *Evangelist*. Stephen made a *powerful defence* when accused by the Jews, but he is not spoken of as preaching the Gospel. Doubtless, however, the more of persuasive talent they had, the better were they fitted to do the duties of their office.

What were those duties? To *take care of the poor and needy*, to *afford relief to destitute widows*, to provide comforts for the

*Neander (with others) drops *agion*, v. 5.

sick; in a word, to dispense the charities of the church. They were to show forth Christianity as practical benevolence.

The temporal matters, generally, of the church, were soon committed to these men. And as charged with such affairs they were continually applying the principles of the Gospel to all the business of life. The Gospel written down in books is very pleasant to read of;—you are interested in the treatise, that tells you of the growing of grains in the field; but you understand *far better* when you see the wheat springing up from the ground—and when you *taste* it, you know then, best of all, its nutritious qualities. The Gospel *producing fruit in the life*, is what men want to see. The Gospel feeding the hungry, clothing the naked, relieving the widow and fatherless, is the sweetest Gospel to the human heart.

Publish *that* Gospel, my friends! It is for you to publish it. What other christians should do individually, you must do officially, for them, for your brethren, as well as for yourselves, you who are about to take on yourselves the office of Deacon.

This church having long merged that office in the duties of another, now brings it forth to light, and is about to place it upon your shoulders. We do not think this movement a light matter. One of the first of Englishmen and of men, the eminent and eminently pious Dr. Arnold, expressed to a friend very earnestly his estimate of this office. “If it could be revived in power, it would be one of the greatest blessings that could be conferred on the church. In many large towns many worthy men might be found willing to undertake the office out of pure love, if it were understood to be not necessarily a step to the Presbyterian order, nor at all incompatible with lay-callings.” [This is just *our* conception of the office.] “You would get an immense gain by a great extension of the church—by softening down that positive distinction between clergy and laity, which is so closely linked with the priestcraft system, and by the actual benefits, temporal and spiritual, which these men would ensure to the whole Christian congregation.” He adds, referring to the priesthood in his own English church, “I have long thought that some plan of this sort might be the the small end of the wedge by which Antichrist might hereafter be burst asunder, like the Dragon of Bel’s temple.”

You, my friends, are to make the beneficent spirit of this

church available for positive good to all whom you may reach. And you, brethren of this Christian church, you are to *co-operate* with these men, whom you have chosen specially to undertake such duties in your name; you are to supply them with requisite means and facilities; you are to yield to them, as their due, all suitable encouragement, sympathy, assistance and deference.

Would you promote union among yourselves, that intimate sympathy and harmony which belongs to Christ's church? I remind you that men do not become united merely by complaining of disunion. To feel that you *ought* to be cordially united, and to say hard things about the want of harmony, is not the best way of promoting union. *Fix on something to be done, by all.* Undertake some good work together. Now, this office, filled up to-day, is not designed to take the place of your activity, but to give direction to it, and make that activity efficient, successful.

Act through them, and with them, in seeking the good of men, and you will find sentiments of true affection, and of real kindness, and of finest harmony, imbedded firmly in your hearts, and shedding a daily beauty over your lives.

From the Presbyterian.

First Declaration of Independence.

To the Hon. Willie P. Mangum, United States Senator from North Carolina.

DEAR SIR—I am encouraged by the uniform courtesy which I received at your hands, during my connexion of five or six years with the Senate of the United States, as the chaplain of that body, to avail myself of the advantage of your name in order to secure attention to a few historical incidents, in which *you, as a North Carolinian, and I, as a Presbyterian,* are alike interested.

The subject of "*the Mecklenburg resolutions of May 20th, 1775,*" has of late engaged the attention of some of our most distinguished statesmen and historians, and much valuable information has been elicited on this interesting topic.

Our minister to the Court of St. James, (Mr. Bancroft) whose literary attainments have placed his name high up on the column of renown, has discovered in the archives of the mother country, evidence not to be questioned, that such a document as "*the Mecklenburg Declaration of Independence*" did exist more than one year anterior to the formal Declaration of Independence, by the Congress of July, 1776.

As these resolutions are but partially known to the American people, it has occurred to me that I might render an acceptable service by asking for this immortal document a place in the columns of the *Presbyterian*, and thus secure for it a perusal by many who desire accurate information respecting the "punctum saliens" of one of the most important movements that has transpired upon earth since the ensign of spiritual emancipation was unfurled by Luther from the towers of Wittenberg.

DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE

*By the Citizens of Mecklenburg County, North Carolina,
May 20, 1775.*

In conformity to an order issued by the Colonel of Mecklenburg county, in North Carolina, a Convention vested with unlimited powers, met at Charlotte, in said county, on the Nineteenth day of May, 1775, when ABRAHAM ALEXANDER was chosen Chairman, and JOHN McKNITT ALEXANDER, Secretary.

After a free and full discussion of the objects of the Convention, it was

UNANIMOUSLY RESOLVED,

I. That whosoever, directly or indirectly, abetted, or in any way, form or manner, countenanced the unchartered and dangerous innovation of our rights, as claimed by Great Britain, is an enemy to this country, to America, and to the inherent and inalienable rights of man.

II. *Resolved*, That we, the citizens of Mecklenburg county, do hereby dissolve the political bands which have connected us to the mother country, and hereby absolve ourselves from all allegiance to the British Crown, and abjure all political connection, contact, or association with that nation, who have wantonly trampled on our rights and liberties, and inhumanly shed the innocent blood of American patriots at Lexington.

III. *Resolved*, That we do hereby declare ourselves a free and independent people, are, and of right ought to be, a sovereign and self-governing association, under the control of no power other than that of our God and the General Government of Congress; to the maintenance of which Independence, we solemnly pledge to each other, our mutual co-operation, our lives, our fortunes, and our most sacred honour.

ABRAHAM ALEXANDER, CHAIRMAN.

J. M. ALEXANDER, *Secretary*.

Adam Alexander,	Henry Downs,
Hezekiah Alexander,	John Flenniken,
Ezra Alexander,	John Ford,
Chas. Alexander,	Wm. Graham,
Waitstill Avery,	James Harris,
Ephraim Brevard,	Robert Irwin,
Hezekiah J. Balch,	Wm. Kennon,
Richard Barry,	Matthew McClure,
John Davidson,	Niell Morrison,
Wm Davidson,	Samuel Martin,
Duncan Ocheltree,	John Queary,
John Phifer,	David Reese,
Thos. Polk,	Zacheus Willson, Sr.
Ezekiel Polk,	Wm. Willson.
Benjamin Patton,	

These resolutions, accompanied by several others of a similar character, having been discussed and adopted in Convention, were entrusted to a special messenger, *Captain James Jack*, of Charlotte, North Carolina, who, with all the despatch which the existing circumstances of the country would permit, hastened to place them in the hands of Messrs. *Caswell*, *Hooper* and *Hewes*, delegates from North Carolina, then in Philadelphia. These gentlemen approved of the patriotic spirit of their fellow-citizens as developed in this sublime document, but at the same time regarded the movement as somewhat premature, inasmuch as all hope of reconciliation with the mother country had not been abandoned by the general Congress, and under this aspect of the subject the resolutions were not submitted to the action of the House at that time. Moreover, the minds of the people throughout the colonies were not yet

fully imbued with the sentiment of *Independence*, and the hesitation of the delegates from North Carolina, may, perhaps, find at least a partial justification in that important fact. But while the citizens of Mecklenburg thus lost the lofty eminence to which their daring patriotism aspired, they nevertheless attained their honor and their privileges. From the passage of those resolutions, *May, 1775*, which, from their date and spirit, deserve to be written in letters of gold, these *early patriots* were *independent*, and never, from that eventful hour acknowledged any allegiance whatever to the British crown. If the prudence of their delegates did not permit them to sever the galling chain, by which the neck of the colonies had been chafed and wounded even to bleeding, they had prepared the well-tempered instruments, and stood prepared with the sledge and chisel to execute the work of glory whenever the predestinated moment should arrive.

To the people of Mecklenburg then belongs the immortal honor of having first set the ball of revolution in motion, and when the great truth shall be understood by the American people, I am sure there is too much generosity and justice in this great confederacy to permit any member of it to desire for a moment to pluck a single leaf from the wreath of ever-green which the *Old North State* has placed so honorably upon her own sedate and noble brow.

Massachusetts, intelligent, patriotic Massachusetts, may be the cradle, but to North Carolina, faithful and unpretending North Carolina, unquestionably belongs the high honor of having given birth to American freedom and independence.

But my honorable and esteemed friend, you will excuse me for saying, that it is not to the *political aspect* of this *subject*, bright and attractive as it may be, that I would wish to call the *exclusive attention* of the numerous and intelligent readers of the *Presbyterian*. I am concerned to render the fullest justice to your noble State, among whose honest yeomanry I have the pleasure of numbering some of my earliest and best friends, both in Congress and out of it; but there is *another aspect* of the subject which, as a *Presbyterian minister*, I cannot fail to regard with the liveliest interest.

It may be very naturally asked, whence came those people who thus, in the glorious race of liberty and independence so

far outstripped the most ardent leaders of the continental Congress, and furnished the "*Sage of Monticello*" with some of the burning sentiments and glowing words of his immortal document?

To any who may propound this interrogatory, I respond, these people were *Protestant emigrants* from the North of Ireland, and from the commixture of their blood with that of their neighbors, the Caledonians, received the expressive, if not euphonious soubriquet of *Scotch-Irish*. "Their religious opinions swayed their political opinions, and in maintaining their forms of worship, and their creed, they learned the rudiments of republicanism before they emigrated to America. They demanded, and exercised the privilege of choosing their ministers and spiritual rulers, in opposition to all efforts to make the choice and the support of the clergy a State or governmental concern. In defence of this, they suffered fines, imprisonment, and banishment, and took up arms at last, and succeeded in establishing the Prince of Nassau upon the throne, and thus gave the Protestant succession to England." Emigrating to America, they brought with them these sentiments of religious freedom, and insisted that *civil*, as well as *ecclesiastical rulers*, should be chosen by those who were to be ruled, and that all laws should be approved by the people who were to be the subjects of them. A *limited monarchy* they defined to be a ruler chosen by the people for a limited time, and with circumscribed powers and privileges, and in carrying out this principle they dissolved their connexion with the British throne, and resolved at all hazards to maintain that position; and they did maintain it, with their blood upon *the Alamance*, at *Gambold Court-House*, and wherever else duty and patriotism called for a sacrifice. They imbibed their sentiments of justice and right, not from the erudite pages of *Vattel* and *Puffendorf*, but from *Moses* and from *Paul*, and from Him "who spake as never man spake." Though clad in the panoply of the gospel of peace, they nevertheless held that "opposition to tyrants" was "obedience to God." And they stood ready to resist the encroachments of power, even though invested in purple and bedecked with a diadem.

It is with no spirit of bigotry or sectarianism, but with the sentiment of gratitude to "the Giver of all good," that I here

record, for the information of our own people, the imposing fact, that in this first movement of these colonists in North Carolina towards freedom and independence, *the ministers, elders, and members of the Presbyterian church were the foremost.*

One of the signers of the *resolutions* which make a part of this communication was the *Rev. Hezekiah James Balch*, a minister of the Presbyterian Church, a man distinguished for his talents, his patriotism, and his piety. He was, it is believed, a brother of the late *Rev. Stephen B. Balch, D. D.*, of Georgetown, District of Columbia, who also participated, to some extent, in the same revolutionary struggle, (though in a different sphere,) and who up to the hour of his death received a pension from the government for those early services.

Abraham Alexander, the Chairman of the Convention, was an elder in the Presbyterian Church in the county of Mecklenburg, and so also was *John M. Alexander*, the accomplished Secretary of the meeting. Several others whose names appear appended to that paper, sustained the same official relation to the Presbyterian Church, and all, or nearly all, were members of the several congregations of the same denomination in that vicinity.

Whilst I cheerfully accord to North Carolina the high honor of being the theatre of this marvellous monument, I must claim for the members of the Presbyterian Church the loftier distinction of having been the principal actors in the amazing scene.

The Genius of American freedom stands forth before the nations of the earth, an object of wonder and admiration, holding in her right hand "*the Mecklenburg Declaration of 1775*," and in her left "*the Declaration of 1776*." When the sons of the Presbyterian Church shall be charged with the hateful design of aiming to connect the *Church with the State*, in self-vindication they may point their accusers to the name of the *Rev. John Witherspoon, D. D.* adorning one of these immortal papers, and the name of the *Rev. Hezekiah James Balch*, adorning the other, and the vindication of the Church will be complete.

The Presbyterian Church asks no favors of the government, except such as are extended to all other denominations, but she simply desires that she may occupy the place she deserves in the confidence and esteem of the virtuous and good, and

that our statesmen and historians will do justice to her patriotism and loyalty, if not to her purity and faithfulness.

The incidents connected with the early history of North Carolina, to which reference is had in this letter, are all confirmed by a very valuable book, recently published by the Rev. W. H. Foote, D. D. of Romney, Virginia, called Sketches of North Carolina, a copy of which I hope to have the pleasure of presenting to you in a few days. Very truly your friend, &c.,
SEPTIMUS TUSTIN.

Hagerstown, Md., Feb. 10, 1849.

“Embracing both Sides”

BY REV. WM. MINNIS.

In the Methodist Episcopalian of July 25, under the above caption; we see some strictures by the editor, on a sermon published in the July No. of the Calvinistic Magazine, on “Election and Free Grace,” upon which strictures we wish to make a few remarks.

Before noticing the sermon, the editor adverts to a charge which he had made in a former publication—“That Rev. F. A. Ross had departed from the standard authors of his own church—that a party had been formed in that church embracing doctrines adverse to the Confession.” If Mr. Ross has departed from the standard authors of his own church, in his publications, is it not passing strange that these publications are so fully approved and so highly recommended in both branches of the Presbyterian church, as it is well known they have been? This would not have been the case if the charge were true. As to the party spoken of, we know assuredly that no such party exists in the Presbyterian church. We have never known greater unanimity to prevail in our church than at the present time.

Again he says, “Meanwhile the Calvinistic Magazine has continued openly to attack some of the doctrines contained in that book, (the Confession of Faith,) and covertly to under-

mine others. The editors of that work have continued openly to assail the doctrine of the direct witness of the Spirit, and covertly to uproot the old established doctrines of grace as held by Presbyterians, and to substitute in their place, Taylorism, Finneyism, self-conversionism." We deny that the Calvinistic Magazine has, either openly or covertly, attacked any of the doctrines of the Confession of Faith. We deny that the editors of that work have either openly or covertly assailed, or attempted to uproot, any of the old established doctrines of grace, as held by Presbyterians. We deny that the editors of that work have substituted Taylorism, Finneyism, self-conversionism, or any other isms, in the room of the established doctrines of grace, as held by Presbyterians. The editors of the Magazine have openly assailed the doctrine of the direct witness of the Spirit, but this doctrine never was held by Presbyterians, in any age or country, and never will be, for Presbyterianism is founded upon the principle, that the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments are the only rule of faith and practice. The doctrine of the direct witness of the Spirit is expressly condemned in the Confession of Faith. In fact this doctrine is more peculiarly a Methodist doctrine than perhaps any other doctrine that could be named; yet the editor of the Methodist Episcopalian classes it with the old established doctrines of grace as held by Presbyterians!!—Wonder if the Calvinistic Magazine will not, next, attack the doctrine of falling from grace, as held by Presbyterians? It would seem, from the above quotations, that the Calvinistic Magazine is laboring to "uproot" Presbyterianism, and to substitute Arminianism in its place, for Taylorism, Finneyism, and self-conversionism, all belong to the Arminian side, in the great division of theology. But if this be the case, is it not unaccountable that the Magazine is so highly approved of by Presbyterians, and so violently opposed by Methodists?

We can assure this politic defender of Calvinistic faith, the editor, that there is exceeding little tendency to, or sympathy for Methodism, in our church just at this time. We know of but one Methodist belonging to our ranks—that is "Medicus."

Again the editor says, "But mark the policy—to secure the patronage of the Presbyterian church—the Confession must be lauded to the skies—the doctrines of grace almost adored,

and yet the axe laid at the root of these very doctrines.”—High charges, these, published against these ministers of the Gospel of ours. Base deception and hypocrisy, a total want of candor and sincerity, secretly laboring to deceive and ruin the church to which they belong! Outrageous charges these! But the editor tells us, before he finishes his piece, that he does not himself believe what he has here stated. He says, “But it occurs to us just here, that we may be asked if these gentlemen are not as much in earnest, and as sincere and candid when they avow their belief in the Confession, and defend Calvinistic election, as when they proclaim the offer of mercy to all men, and declare that all men are capable of closing in with those offers? To this we reply—most assuredly they are. We accord to them the utmost degree of candor in all these avowals.” This reminds us of the anecdote of the two men quarrelling in the town of Newport. After the one had calmly listened to a torrent of abuse from the other, he coolly said to him, “Do you really believe all this that you have said of me?” The other, as coolly, said “No, I do not believe one word of it, I just said it to aggravate you.”

From the above quotations Presbyterians may learn the necessity and importance of such a publication as the Calvinistic Magazine, in which to set forth and defend the doctrines of our church. Methodist preachers have so long been in the habit of misrepresenting our doctrine, that now, when we set them forth as our church has always held them, these same preachers have the effrontery to tell the world that either we do not know what Presbyterianism is, or if we do that we have abandoned it!!! The members of the Methodist church, in general, and multitudes who belong to no church, are kept in total ignorance of the true doctrines of our church, and it is the policy of the Methodist clergy to keep them so.

We come now to notice the remarks of the editor on the sermon founded on John 6: 39—40, in which the following questions were proposed to be answered:—

- I. When were the persons spoken of in the text given to Jesus Christ?
- II. Why were they given to him?
- III. What is the state of those, with regard to eternal life, who were not given to Christ?

The editor says that the answer to the first question is Calvinistic enough, but he denies that there ever was such a covenant as the covenant of redemption between the Father and the Son, as set forth in the sermon, and he inquires for the proof.

For the proof, we refer him to the sermon, where he will find proof demonstrative—proof unanswerable—proof which he can never lay aside without laying aside the Book of God.

On the answer to the second question, "Why were they given to Christ?" he says—"The answer is found in the declaration, that 'God who is rich in mercy, for his great love wherewith he loved us, even when we were dead in sins, hath quickened us together with Christ; (by grace are ye saved;)'—Eph. 2: 1—5; and because the passage proves that none were chosen on account of any foreseen merit of their own, the sage conclusion is drawn by the author of the sermon, that a certain part were given to Christ before they were born—that they were given while they were dead in sins, and their salvation is as certain as that the death of Christ hath taken place." Now this whole statement respecting the answer to the second question, is utterly devoid of truth—a gross misrepresentation of the facts in the case. In place of the answer being found in the passage quoted by the editor, that passage is neither part nor parcel of the answer, nor are there any such conclusions drawn from that passage by the writer of the sermon, as stated by the editor.

The passage of Scripture quoted by the editor, together with the three preceding verses, not quoted by him, were introduced by the writer of the sermon, to prove that the persons spoken of in the text, were not given to Christ because the Father foresaw that they would by nature, and of their own accord by practice, be better than others; and the only conclusion drawn from the passage, is that none were chosen because of any foreseen merit of their own. After refuting this false hypothesis respecting the answer to the question proposed, the writer then proceeded to give what he conceived to be the correct answer. The truth of all this the reader can see by turning to the sermon. Now is it not lamentable to see a minister of the Gospel so reckless of truth?

But the editor tells us that his main object in his critique, is to bring to view the answer to the third question, "What is

the state of those, with regard to eternal life, who were not given to Christ?"

The doctrines advanced, in the answer to this question, which give the editor so much distress, are the following:—

1. That Jesus Christ has died for the whole race of Adam.
2. That the invitations of the Gospel are addressed to the non-elect as well as to the elect.
3. That if any finally perish, it will be their own fault.

The object of the editor in his remarks, is to make the impression upon the mind of his readers, that these doctrines are peculiarly Methodist doctrines—that it is a new and strange thing for a Presbyterian to advance these doctrines, and that he who advances these doctrines cannot be on the Calvinistic side of the great questions between Calvinists and Arminians. This will appear from the following quotation. After a pretty lengthy quotation from the sermon, he says—"But perhaps the reader is ready to say, enough! enough!—this must be some vile Arminian who hates God's 'electing love and persevering grace with a hatred beyond that of the natural heart,'—surely such stuff is 'Arminianism,' with all its 'moral palsy'—it is 'Methodism,' 'with all its degrading elements.' Hold, friend—speak softly—deal gently—listen! while we tell you that this is the *self-same* Rev. Wm. Minnis, from whom we have quoted in his answer to his 1st and 2d questions; and this answer to the third question quoted above, is found in the Calvinistic Magazine, under the editorial management of the identical corps of editors who have declared so fully for Calvinism and the Confession. Which side of the great questions between Calvinists and Arminians, have these gentlemen taken?"

Now are the doctrines which we have stated above peculiarly Methodist doctrines? Is it a new and strange thing for a Presbyterian or Calvinist to advance these doctrines? And cannot the man who advances these doctrines be on the Calvinistic side of the great questions between Calvinists and Arminians? In the 2d article of the Synod of Dort, we read as follows:—"This death of the Son of God is a single and most perfect sacrifice and satisfaction for sins; of infinite value and price, *abundantly sufficient to expiate the sins of the whole world;* but because many *who are called by the gospel do not*

repent, nor believe in Christ, but perish in unbelief: this doth not arise from *defect or insufficiency of the sacrifice offered by Christ upon the cross, but from their own fault.*"

Here we have the sum and substance of the answer to the third question in the sermon, set forth in the most clear and forcible terms, and in stronger language than is used in the sermon. Here it is not merely asserted that Christ died for all—but that his death is a sacrifice of infinite value and price, abundantly sufficient to expiate the sins of the whole world. Here it is stated that those who do not repent, nor believe in Christ, but die in unbelief, were called by the Gospel, of course they are not of the elect. And here it is stated that the death of those who are finally lost, is "from their own fault."

Here, then, we have our Methodist doctrines, fully and forcibly set forth in the articles of the Synod of Dort!

The Synod of Dort met November 1618, and sat until April 1619; just about two hundred and thirty years ago, and about one hundred and twenty years before Methodism was born. The Synod of Dort was composed of delegates from the Belgic churches, the churches of England, Scotland, Geneva, Switzerland, Embden, Bremen, the Palatinate and Hesse. Deputies from all the reformed churches of Europe were there, except those of France;—their commissioners were prevented from attending by an order from the French government. Had they been present, no doubt they would have subscribed to the articles agreed upon, as all the members that were present did. Here then we have our editor's peculiarly Methodist doctrines subscribed by representatives from all the reformed churches of Europe, two hundred and thirty years ago! and the church of Geneva, built up by Calvin, and the church of Scotland, the mother of American Presbyterianism, amongst the rest. And from that time, and long before that time, until the present now, Calvinists have maintained and incessantly preached these self-same doctrines;—individual exceptions there have been, but amongst the ministers connected with the General Assembly of our church, there is not, to our knowledge, a single exception. In what light, then, must we view the insinuations of the editor, that it is a new and strange thing for a Presbyterian minister to advocate these doctrines? And with what feelings must we look upon the claim which he sets up—

that these are peculiarly Methodist doctrines? Why, these doctrines were preached, by Calvinists, before God knew that there would be any Methodists, if the opinion of some be correct, respecting the fore-knowledge of God. They were preached by Calvinists ages before Methodism was born. And now, when we advocate these doctrines, it is insultingly insinuated, that we are "taking after the Methodists!"

But was the Synod of Dort strictly Calvinistic. It was. The editor of the Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge, after speaking of Calvinism, says—"We now proceed to exhibit an abstract of the *same system*, as arranged and matured in the articles of the Synod of Dort, in reference to the five points in dispute with the Arminians, which forms the general standard of *strict Calvinism*."

There were no Arminians in that body, they went home in a pet before any thing was done, and never returned. The same writer says—"The Synod determined almost unanimously, that the Arminians should appear before them to explain and defend their peculiar opinions, in which they had deviated from the standards of the Belgic church, and from the doctrines of the reformed churches. But all their efforts to induce them to take this ground were unavailing, and accordingly they left the Synod in a body, and went home and never returned."

But perhaps the editor would like to know, if the doctrine of election, as set forth in the sermon, is maintained in the articles of the Synod of Dort. The following extract from the first article, will give him light on that subject:—"Election is the immutable purpose of God, by which, before the foundations of the earth were laid, he chose, out of the whole human race, fallen by their own fault, from their primeval integrity into sin and destruction, according to the most free good pleasure of his own will, and of mere grace, a certain number of men, neither better nor worthier than others, but lying in the same misery with the rest, to salvation in Christ—and therefore he decreed to give them unto him to be saved, and effectually to call and draw them into communion with him, by his word and Spirit: or he decreed himself to give unto them true faith, to justify, to sanctify, and at length powerfully to glorify them.—Eph. 1: 4—6; Rou. 8: 30." This same

election is not made for any foreseen faith, obedience of faith, holiness, or any other good quality and disposition, as a prerequisite cause or condition in the man who should be elected, He hath chosen us, (not because we *were*) but that we *might* be holy.—Eph. 1: 4; Rom. 9: 11—12; Acts, 13: 48." Now, Mr. Editor, can you tell "which side of the great questions between Calvinists and Arminians these gentlemen," composing the Synod of Dort, "have taken?" Or were they "embracing both sides?"

What must the reader now think of the insinuation of the editor, that he who maintains that Christ has died for the whole race of Adam, and that the offers of the Gospel are made to the non-elect as well as to the elect, and that if any are finally lost it will be their own fault, cannot be a Calvinist?—Again, the doctrines in question are fully set forth in the Confession of Faith of our church, chap. 7, sec. 3. "Man by his fall having made himself incapable of life by that covenant, (of works,) the Lord was pleased to make a second, commonly called the covenant of grace: wherein he freely offereth unto sinners life and salvation by Jesus Christ, requiring of them faith in him, that they may be saved." Here it is stated that man is capable of life by the second covenant—here it is asserted that the Lord truly offers life and salvation to sinners, without distinction, and this offer is made by or through Jesus Christ, and faith is required of them in order that they may be saved; hence if they are finally lost it must be their own fault. All the above remarks are founded upon the fact, that Jesus Christ has died for all sinners of Adam's race. This is confirmed in the answer to the 32d question, Larger Catechism. "The grace of God is manifested in the second covenant, in that he freely *provideth* and offereth to sinners a *Mediator*, and life and salvation by him; and requiring faith as the condition to inherit them in him." Then follows what God has specially promised to the elect, making a clear distinction between sinners in general, and the elect. Here it is asserted that God has *provided* a mediator for sinners, which include all of Adam's race. Here, then, we have the editor's Methodist doctrines fully set forth in the Confession of Faith! a part of "the old established doctrines of grace as" always held by Presbyterians. It may be asked, did the editor know these

facts when he penned his piece? If he did not, he has quite too little intelligence for the editor of a religious newspaper; and if he did know these facts, he has quite too little honesty for a minister of the gospel. But a large majority of the members of the Methodist church do not know these facts; and many others do not know them, nor will they know them shortly, if the Methodist clergy can prevent it.

Doubtless one of the objects which the editor had in view, was to enlist the Old School Presbyterians in the Methodist war against the New School Presbyterians. But in this he will be disappointed, for the Old School Presbyterians, as a body, do not deny the doctrines in question. So far as we have heard, they are well pleased with the sermon; in fact, it is the same view of the subject as held forth by Rev. A. G. Fairchild, D. D., one of their ablest writers.

The editor closes his remarks on the sermon with a brief formula on this particular subject, compiled for the instruction of his readers. This formula is prepared in the following manner—the doctrines set forth in the answer to the third question in the sermon, which we have had under consideration, are contrasted with detached sentences, and parts of sentences, taken from the Confession of Faith, where the positive redemption of the elect by Jesus Christ, the sovereignty of God over his creatures, and the doctrine of God's eternal decrees are set forth, together with a mixture of his own language, found neither in the sermon nor the Confession, and in this way he makes out an apparent discrepancy between the sermon and the Confession of Faith. Our only wonder is that he had not done it up in better style than he did. We will condense the editor's formula a little, and arrange it in more systematic order, retaining the substance, only excluding the apocryphal mixture thrown in by the editor.

1. We believe that God exercises an absolute sovereignty over all things in the universe.
2. We believe that man is a free moral agent, and that God governs him as such, without destroying his free agency.
3. We believe that Jesus Christ has secured the infallible salvation of the elect.
4. We believe that Jesus Christ has died for the whole race of Adam.

5. We believe that God freely offers life and salvation, by Jesus Christ, to the whole race of Adam on condition of faith.

6. We believe that if any finally perish, it will be their own fault.

Now under the editor's "brief formula," thus condensed, systemized, and freed from extraneous matter, we write, all correct, and we feel able, from the Book of God, to sustain all and every article therein contained.

The Faith Delivered to the Saints.

BY JNO. MAXVILLE HOFFMEISTER.

THE Bible is the divine charter authorizing the christian to *contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints.* That "faith" embraces the whole gospel scheme of love and mercy. It extends from God's uncontrollable sovereignty, to the impotency of the ungodly, who are left to reap the reward of their own depravity. And while all this is meant, it goes still farther, and comprehends that system of truth and grace which embodies and makes known to us the laws of God's government—the character and condition of its subjects—the plan of redemption—the terms of salvation, and the future destiny of souls. And as these, with their kindred truths, are severally made known by divine revelation and taught to man, they become a system of truth to be believed, and may be expressed by the general term FAITH.

Here we have set forth that great and comprehensive system of divine truth on which the Saviour founded his church, and which has been maintained and defended by the servants of God from the Apostolic age down to the present. Here is an epitome of the "faith" delivered to the charge of the saints. And the nature of the heavenly injunction is such that its behests are as imperative now on christians, as on those to whom the apostles and evangelists preached after the Pentecostal days. The design *then* was to establish christians against certain false teachers who "crept in unawares," and

turned the grace of God into lasciviousness; and the same is designed now, and manifestly taught by that sacred charter of christian rights. Hence the christian is called upon to disseminate the true "faith;" and with the weapons of charity and brotherly love, to stop the fatal spread of delusion, refute error, and confirm the faith and practice of the wavering. The commands of Christ must be obeyed, both in the recognition of this great cardinal doctrine, and in the spirit by which it is defended.

But without examining the several prominent features of this "faith"—abler pens ever and anon are unfolding their beauties—we notice the *manner* in which we are to contend for its purity and preservation.

The command is expressed in the most emphatic language. A literal and easy rendering would read, that the christian should contend with the utmost earnestness and zeal. A liberal deduction from this positive declaration will teach us to "spare no costs for truth's sake," as Bishop Patrick says, "neither depart from it for any gains." Correct views of Bible truth are of the utmost importance. There can be no wisdom in compromising one essential feature of the christian "faith" for any object that heaven or earth can name. "Search the Scriptures;" for they are the rule of our faith. Surely then there can be no neutral ground. The christian cannot be indifferent as to the import of Bible truth. He *will* "count all but loss, for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ." He *will* "buy the truth and sell it not." Hence the most effectual means must be used to reach the heart and conscience. This can be soonest accomplished by direct appeals. Speaking to men at a distance, either in the social circle in conversation, or from the sacred desk, through long labored essays upon the excellency of one system or fallacy of another, where but timid appeals are made, fails to meet the desperate exigencies of man's condition. The privileges of probation will ere long cease, and eternity, with all its dread realities, must be entered, and that too with the awful issues of the judgment dependent upon man's character "according to the deeds of the flesh." The christian should be in earnest, and act with decision and energy. He should *pray much—study much—think much*, and live entirely for Christ's kingdom. Activity is the

christian's native sphere. And the obligation is reciprocal. Talents are committed to all God's intelligent creatures—lay members and ministers. Hence we are brought very obviously to speak of the different duties severally binding on all christians, by the performance of which, the great system of doctrines delivered to the church, will be preserved inviolate from all combinations of earth.

I. *Ministers should be approved of God, apt to teach, and able to divide aright the word of truth.* The love of God should dwell richly in their own hearts. Here is the first important requisite, without which all other qualifications are useless. Purify the fountain *here*, and the pure limpid stream will carry blessings on its bosom to numberless beings *there*. But, if "the light that is in thee be darkness, how great is that darkness!" The power of its gloom not only obscures the path of christian duty, but, like a moral simoom, spreads moral death among the ranks of the living. So great is the blighting influence, that in the morning of resurrection it will be said—"Had that minister been a light in his sphere, and approved of God, that friend, that neighbor, would have gone to heaven; but his light was darkness, and that friend, that neighbor, went to hell, and that too through his unworthiness."

In this age of independent thought, *their lips should keep knowledge.* Mind is no longer isolated and alone in its investigations. Men act in compact. One mind gives form and energy to thousands, and when its power is put forth to clothe error in the flimsy garb of man's ingenuity, how immense the danger! The novice and tyro have their admirers, and even error diffused by such hands, and consolidated by association, proves a bulwark in opposition to the "faith" for which we are to contend.

These thoughts leave the plain inference that the minister must not only be well versed in sacred learning, but an adept in the literature and research of the age in which he lives. His reading, studying and investigations, must necessarily keep pace with the progressive tendency of the age; otherwise how can he become a workman that needeth not to be ashamed? And we avow that without high attainments in all departments of learning, he cannot set forth and defend that truth which becomes "a discerner of the thoughts and inten-

tions of the heart," and through which, by the sanctification of the Spirit, many a false refuge is pulled down.

II. *Elders should be active, circumspect, and persevering in their sphere.* The duty of the *Ruling Elders* is, perhaps, as important as that of the *Preaching Elders*. They should rule well. Their lives should be exemplary, for their influence is not confined to the session room. In the PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH their influence may be as extensive as their minister's. No arbitrary power seals their lips when they enter Presbytery or Synod. And in some cases they are authorized to carry their jurisdiction into the bosom of families and individuals; to disarm private resentment, and arbitrate in cases of domestic variance.

And these officers are not only to attend on the external regulations of Christ's visible church, but to hold up the hands of their minister. They must see that prayer meetings are established and sustained; for a church whose prayer meetings are neglected cannot prosper. A congregation that only meets once a week to attend on the public means of grace, and never comes together expressly for prayer and communion with God, will soon become cold, formal, and dead. Such a church need not expect success to attend its labors; it need not look for the conversion of sinners and revivals of religion; for God will not bestow such blessings if they are not asked for. "Ask and ye shall receive."

III. *Private members have an important work to do.* A proper discharge of duty on the part of church members, will take from the session and pastor one half their burdens, and make the other half easily borne. Their light should be manifest. God certainly will not predicate opposite destinies upon distinctions of character too small, and too faint to be seen. No christian should fix his eye on some dim, doubtful disciple, in order that his case may be an easy one, for then he is sure to settle down on something short of Christ. One false hope uniformly begets another. A low, uncertain character for godliness, propagates its kind. And the consequence is, that many who seem to set out for heaven, lose their way, and finally lose their souls. But rather let Christ and his perfections be the model from which to form the spiritual life and character.

Such is the general meaning of the *manner* in which we are to contend for the "faith," and from which we draw a practical lesson. Let these liberal sentiments, with their kindred truths, be promoted and cordially received in the love and practice, and all subordinate ends of utility to Christ's church will be fully accomplished. The church to whose charge this faith is committed, will arise from her lethargic state with healing in her wings, become fair as the moon, and terrible as an army with banners. The toleration of civil and religious freedom will become universal, while social evils will pass away as by enchantment, and human ignorance, servitude and oppression will end, and the jubilee of universal liberty break upon the ravished ears of a redeemed race. Then will charity displace all unhappy schisms, and from the elements of discord will arise the halcyon forms of peace and love.

But that day has not come. Christian effort must aid in bringing it about. A great work is yet before us. Evangelical religion must herald the glad tidings of salvation to the world. And if our civil and religious privileges ever pass away, they must die through the workings of corrupted religious principles.

CHARACTER OF THE BRITISH CHURCH.—Of its 16,000 ministers in England, the Rev. B. W. Noel says that about 1568 do nothing; about 6681 limit their thoughts and labors to small parishes, which contain from 150 to 300 souls; while others in cities and towns profess to take charge of 8 or 9000 souls; and of the 12,923 working pastors of Churches, I fear, from various concurrent symptoms, that about 10,000 are unconverted men, who neither preach nor know the Gospel.

THE CUP OF SORROW.—The cup of sorrow is in constant circulation—we must all drink of it, and some drink deeply. It is not material whose turn comes first—the thing is to benefit by the draught—for it requires very little self-knowledge to convince us that we are unequal to prosperity, and unable to sustain it without growing careless, or attaching ourselves too strongly to the things which perish, to the exclusion of things eternal.—*Grant.*

THE
Calvinistic Magazine.

[NEW SERIES.]

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

Vol. IV.

April, 1849.

No. 4.

Witness of the Spirit.

BY REV. WM. MINNIS.

*A Sermon delivered before the Synod of Tennessee in Rogersville,
October, 1848, and published at the request of that body.*

*"Examine yourselves whether ye be in the faith; prove your
own selves."*—2 COR. 13: 5.

To be in the faith, is to be a christian, a new creature in
Christ Jesus.

To examine, is to inspect carefully, with a view to discover
truth, or the real state of a thing.

To prove, is to evince, establish or ascertain as truth, reali-
ty or fact, by testimony or other evidence.

We propose to prove,

I. That there is danger of being deceived respecting our in-
terest in Christ.

II. That we need not be deceived, for if we be in the faith
we may have satisfactory evidence of the fact.

III. From what source the evidence upon which we may
rely, is to be derived.

I. There is danger of being deceived.

We may believe that we are in the faith when we are not,
and we may be in the faith and not have satisfactory evidence
of the fact. If this were not true, the command in the text
would be altogether unnecessary, and a compliance with the
command would be totally useless, for if we cannot be in the
faith without knowing the fact, then all who are in the faith
do know it, and to examine and seek for proof to establish
that which is already known would be useless, and all who do

not *know* that they are in the faith, cannot possibly be in the faith, for if they were they would know it; hence, in their case, self-examination and proof would be as useless as in the case of those who knew that they are in the faith. We have, therefore, demonstrative proof from the words of the text, that the hypothesis that no one can be a christian without knowing it, is false and unscriptural, and would lead, unavoidably, to a total neglect of the important duty of self-examination.

Again, that there is danger of being deceived; is evident from the fact that multitudes have been deceived. The great body of the Jews, in the days of Christ, and especially the sect called the Pharisees were deceived. The Pharisees not only believed themselves to be the favorites of heaven, but they claimed to be sanctified, and to live without sin, and they gloried in *knowing* that they were not only holy, but more holy than others. But He who searcheth the heart, and knoweth what is in man, has declared, "That except your righteousness shall exceed the righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no case enter into the kingdom of heaven." —Matt. 5: 20.

Again, the Son of God declares, that many shall not only be deceived, but that they shall remain under deception, until they knock at the door of heaven. "When once the master of the house is risen up, and hath shut to the door, and ye begin to stand without, and to knock at the door, saying, Lord, Lord, open unto us; and he shall answer and say unto you, I know you not whence ye are; then shall ye begin to say, we have eaten and drunk in thy presence, and thou hast taught in our streets. But he shall say, I tell you, I know you not whence ye are; depart from me all ye workers of iniquity." —Luke, 13: 25—27.

Again, man is in danger of being deceived from the fact that he is always less or more biased in his own favor, his heart by nature is deceitful, his judgment, through the depravity of the heart, is perverted, he is perpetually under the influence of selfish partiality, hence, to his mind, every thing connected with his own interest bears too favorable an aspect. He thinks himself, and his own, and every thing that is his, better than they really are.

It is a thing of daily occurrence amongst men in their dis-

putes, contentions and litigations, to place the utmost confidence in the validity of testimony to sustain their cause, which when tested proves to be no evidence at all.

This principle, if not specially guarded against, will have a powerful influence upon the mind in judging of our own prospects for eternity.

Our anxiety to escape the curse of the law, too often leads us to lay hold upon any thing and every thing that can be construed into the faintest proof of our acceptance with God, hence dreams, lights, voices, direct supernatural manifestations, animal excitement, &c., have been resorted to as evidences of our interest in Christ. Here is a wide and luxuriant field for deception, and it is truly lamentable that this source of deception has been so extensively encouraged by ignorant, deceived, or unprincipled teachers. Finally, on this part of the subject, Satan, who was once an angel of light, that arch enemy of God and man, is assiduously striving to deceive us. The above facts not only prove that there is great danger of being deceived, but also evince the vast importance of an honest, prayerful compliance with the injunction in the text.

II. We need not be deceived, for if we be in the faith we may have satisfactory evidence of the fact.

The command in the text clearly implies the possibility of ascertaining the fact, it implies that the means of ascertaining, and the testimony by which it may be proved, are within our reach, and that if we will pursue the proper course, we may have satisfactory evidence whether we be in the faith or not. If this were not true, the command would be unreasonable, it would require an impossibility. If a master should command his servant to examine and prove whether the moon be inhabited or not, the command would be unreasonable—it would require an impossibility, because the means of ascertaining and proving would not be within his reach. But God requires no impossibility of his creatures. If, then, we faithfully and honestly comply with the injunction in the text, we will not be deceived; and those who are deceived have deceived themselves, it is their own fault.

But because we think it more proper to say we *hope* we are in the faith, than to say we *know* that we are, we are represented by our adversaries as claiming to have no evidence

whatever of our interest in Christ, and the inference which they draw is, that we have no religion. This is done partly for effect and partly through ignorance of the meaning of the word hope.

The object which they have in view, is to make the more ignorant portion of the community believe, that true religion is to be found no where but in their ranks, or that their's is a better religion than that possessed by those belonging to other sects, or that through special favor God has vouchsafed to them evidence of their interest in Christ, which he has withheld from others. The plain meaning is, if you wish to possess true, genuine religion, a religion that you can feel, and if you wish, when you have religion, to *know* that you have it, and when and where you got it, connect yourselves with us, for we are the people respecting whom all these things are true. The false representation, that we claim to have no evidence of our interest in Christ, is made in part through ignorance of the meaning of the word hope. They assume that there can be hope without evidence; whereas hope is always founded upon evidence. There can be no such thing as hope without some kind of evidence upon which it rests. A vain hope is founded upon vain evidence—a false hope upon false evidence—a mistaken hope upon mistaken evidence, and a good well-grounded hope is founded upon good substantial evidence. "Hope," says Webster, is "an opinion or belief not amounting to certainty, but grounded on substantial evidence."

What then do I mean when I say I hope I am a child of God? My meaning is, that I have examined the evidence in the case, and my belief is that I am a child of God. Why, then, do we not say, we *know* we are the children of God? We think we have very substantial reasons for preferring the word hope in this connection.

The first reason is, that after we have examined the evidence in the case, there is still a possibility that we may be deceived—we may not have been honest and impartial in the examination, or we may have drawn evidence from an unreliable source. Others have been deceived; many who had gone so far as to say they *knew* that they were the children of God, have proved to the world, and have admitted themselves, that they never were in the faith. Hence, there is more humility,

and more modesty, and it is more prudent to say, I hope I am in the faith. Moreover, this expresses the true state of the believer's mind on the subject, no matter how much self-confidence he may assume.

Another reason is, that the question, am I in the faith? is, and ought to be, an open question for life. Self-examination is a duty binding upon the professor of religion as long as he lives;—the faithful christian is looking for more and clearer evidence of his acceptance with God every day. But if, when we become christians, we do know certainly that we are in the faith, self-examination is totally excluded, there would be no room left for it at all—it would be a useless, senseless, unnecessary work. Why examine ourselves whether we be in the faith, when we certainly know that we are in the faith? As well might we examine whether we be in existence. He who settles the question in his own mind, with absolute certainty, from some experience, so called, that he is, without doubt, a child of God, is likely to look back to, and rely upon that old experience through life, though he may be bringing forth none of the fruits of righteousness, and he may rest upon it until he knocks at the door of heaven, and hears the soul-piercing repulse from the Master, depart from me, thou worker of iniquity, for I never knew thee.

We esteem the duty of self-examination to be of too much importance to justify us in adopting an opinion, or using a phraseology, that would cut us off from a discharge of that duty.

Again, the apostle calls the best evidence that we can have, "a full assurance of hope unto the end," and he shows us that this is obtained neither miraculously nor instantaneously, but by diligence. He says, "And we desire that every one of you do show the same *diligence* to the full assurance of hope unto the end."—Heb. 6: 11.

III. From what source is the evidence upon which we may rely to be derived?

Two sources have been advocated.

The one is the scriptures of the Old and New Testaments. Evidence derived from this source is called the indirect witness of the Spirit.

The other source is the Divine Spirit, immediately. Evi-

dence derived from this source, is called the direct witness of the Spirit.

An effort has of late been made, to confound the doctrine of the direct witness of the Spirit, with the doctrine of the Spirit's influence in conviction, conversion, and sanctification; but this is merely raising a dust to blind the minds of the community, lest they should see the falsehood, absurdity, and pernicious tendency of the doctrine of the direct witness of the Spirit, for we cannot believe that any writer is so grossly ignorant as not to know that the two doctrines have not the least connection.

The doctrine of *the influences of the Spirit*, has always been held and tenaciously advocated by all the different Calvinistic denominations, while at the same time they have totally rejected the doctrine of *the direct witness* of the Spirit.

The doctrine of the direct witness of the Spirit is, that the divine Spirit reveals to the believer the fact that he is a child of God—makes him know, with absolute certainty, (either by a voice, a dream, a light, or an impression upon his soul,) that he is a child of God, that all his sins are blotted out, and that he is reconciled to God. And this revelation, says Mr. Wesley, is made to the believer, before he has any holiness of heart—before he has any love to God!!!

The whole of this doctrine we totally reject, because, in the first place, it is a departure from, and a contradiction of, the grand, important, and for the support of truth, *essential* principle upon which the reformation from Popery was based and consummated. That principle is, that the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament are the only rule of faith and obedience. But the doctrine under consideration teaches that my faith, in the important matter of my acceptance with God, is not founded upon the Scriptures at all, but upon a *new revelation* made, directly, by the Spirit to the believer; hence the doctrine is, undeniably; anti-Protestant, and that too in regard to a most important cardinal principle in religion. The moment that we abandon the Scriptures as the only rule of faith and obedience, we are in the wide wilderness of uncertainty and fanaticism, we are upon the broad ocean, without chart, compass or pilot. A departure from this grand principle, which is the only safe-guard to truth, opened the door to, and was the originating cause of the gross errors, superstition and fanati-

cism, which debased, disgraced, and ruined the church of Rome. Any doctrine, therefore, that contradicts the glorious motto, "the Bible, the whole Bible, and nothing but the Bible in all that pertains to religion," we reject and abhor.

2. The doctrine of the direct witness of the Spirit is founded upon the supposition that the Book of God is amazingly defective, in a most important point, or that this new revelation is superfluous and useless. For if the believer could not learn from the Book of God that he is in the faith, it would evince a most alarming defect in that book—a defect sufficient to shake our confidence in its inspiration. Can we for a moment suppose, that after God has revealed his holy religion to man in the Scriptures, with all its requirements, conditions, obligations and promises, still man is unable to learn, from this whole regulation, whether or not he has complied with its conditions? The supposition would be most absurd and God dishonoring.

But who will deny the fact that the believer can learn from the Book of God that he is a child of God? Mr. Wesley, who originated the doctrine of the direct witness, did not deny the fact. Speaking of the indirect witness of the Spirit, the truth of which he fully admitted, he says—"The foundation thereof is laid in those numerous texts of Scripture which describe the marks of the children of God, and that so plainly that he which runneth may read. Every man applying these Scriptural marks to himself, may know whether he is a child of God." If, then, the believer may so readily learn from the marks of the children of God, described in these numerous and plain texts of Scripture, that he is a child of God, why should a new revelation be given on the subject? Of what use would it be? Is there any more need of a new revelation on this subject than on any other subject revealed in the Bible? This supposed new revelation could be of no use whatever; it would be entirely superfluous, unless it were to free the slothful believer from the duty of self-examination! God has given us a full and complete revelation in the Scriptures, containing, with all-sufficient clearness, every thing necessary for man to know on the subject of religion in this life. A new revelation on any subject already revealed in the Bible would be superfluous, and to maintain that God gives such a revelation is pre-

sumptuous. Therefore, the doctrine under consideration is false and presumptuous, and casts a reproach upon God and the Bible.

3. The doctrine of the direct witness of the Spirit opens the way for the Scriptures to be supplanted and entirely laid aside. Has not the believer in this doctrine laid aside, entirely, those numerous texts of Scripture which describe the marks of the children of God? What use has he for this portion of the Book of God? Surely none on the face of the earth. It has been superseded, in his opinion, by something which he esteems to be far better. Why look after marks of christian character, to satisfy his mind that he is a child of God, after the Spirit has caused him to know with absolute certainty that he is a child of God? It would be perfect folly for him to look at those numerous texts of Scripture. Suppose a physician send a written prescription to his patient; but before the time comes to take the medicine the physician himself arrives and gives direct verbal directions, would the patient have any farther use for the written prescription? No, he might tear it up, throw it away, or burn it. And the believer in the doctrine of the direct witness, may do the same with those numerous texts of Scripture which describe the marks of the children of God.

We see, then, that so far as this doctrine has advanced, it has supplanted and laid aside a correspondent portion of the Book of God. And there is nothing to prevent the extension of the doctrine to every thing contained in the Bible; for, if we admit that the Spirit now gives a new revelation on one subject, we *must* admit that He *may* give new revelations on all other subjects. Suppose an advocate of the doctrine under consideration informs me that the Spirit has directly witnessed to him that he is a child of God, and I admit the truth of his claim. I then inform him that the Spirit has directly witnessed to me that the doctrine of election, as I hold it, is strictly true. Is he not as much bound to believe me as I am to believe him? And would it not be very uncharitable in him not to admit my claim to a new revelation after I have admitted his? Should he refuse to admit my claim, what arguments could he urge in confutation of it? Could he maintain that the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament were the only

rule of faith, and that we are bound to believe nothing pertaining to religion, until it be proved from this rule? Certainly not, for he has departed from this rule himself, and this argument would as fully confute his own claim as it would mine. Could he assert that no new revelation was to be given after the Inspired Volume was closed, and that, therefore, my claim to a new revelation must be false? No, he could not, for he claims to have had a new revelation himself. Could he require me to prove by miracle that I have had a revelation from heaven, as the apostles and prophets did? No, for he has given no such proof of his revelation. Could he require me to prove from the Bible that such a revelation, as I claim to have had, may be expected? He could not, for he has not the shadow of proof from the Bible that such a revelation as he claims to have had may be expected. The fact is, he could urge no argument against my claim that would not press with equal force against his own. And suppose, rather than renounce his claim to a new revelation, he admits mine—and suppose all the different denominations set up claims to new revelations, in support of their peculiar views, what would become of the Book of God? Why, it would be supplanted. It would be laid entirely aside. And such is the tendency of the doctrine of the direct witness of the Spirit.

4. The doctrine of the direct witness of the Spirit, directly contradicts the Word of God. How does the Bible assert that we know we are the children of God? If the reader will turn to the first epistle of John, he will find a full and explicit answer to this question. In this epistle, which is addressed to believers, the inspired writer points out more than a dozen marks, by which we may know that we are the children of God, and no less than six times, as he proceeds to describe these marks, he reminds the reader that by these marks we do know that we are the children of God. For example, he says, "And hereby we do know that we know him if we keep his commandments." "Hereby know we that we are in him." "We know that we have passed from death unto life, because we love the brethren," and so on. And in the 13th verse of the last chapter, he states explicitly for what he had written this epistle. He says, "These things have I written unto you

that believe on the name of the Son of God, *that ye may know that ye have eternal life.*"

Here the Book of God asserts, positively and repeatedly, that we know that we are the children of God by these numerous recorded marks of christian character, and it asserts that these marks were recorded in the Inspired Volume for this express purpose. But the advocate of the doctrine of the direct witness denies that we know that we are the children of God in any such way as this. He denies that we learn this fact from the Bible at all. He asserts that we know the fact, because the Spirit directly reveals it to us. Here the Book of God is directly and positively contradicted. If the doctrine of the direct witness be true, then the Bible is false, and if the Bible is true, then this doctrine is false, for they cannot possibly both be true.

Again, the Bible not only asserts that without these marks we do not know that we are the children of God, but that unless we have these marks we are not the children of God.—John says, in this same epistle, that he that loveth not, abideth in death; and while describing these marks, he says, in this the children of God are manifest and the children of the devil. But the advocate of the doctrine in question asserts that we are the children of God before we have any one of these marks—before we have any love to God—before we have any holiness, and that the Spirit witnesses to us the fact that we are God's children while we are sinners all over, while we are sinners both in heart and life!!!—See sermons 10 and 11 of John Wesley. Here again the Bible is expressly contradicted, while at the same time the statement itself is a gross absurdity, directly in the face of common sense and reason.

5. The doctrine of the direct witness of the Spirit is proved to be false by an overwhelming majority of the people of God in every age of the world. By this we do not merely mean that the doctrine has been disbelieved by a majority of God's people;—the argument is infinitely stronger than this. For, if the doctrine be true, there never has been, nor can there possibly be, a christian who has not had the direct witness. Mr. Wesley, in explaining the doctrine, says, "We must love God before we can be holy at all, this being the root of all holiness. Now we cannot love God till we know he loves us. And we

cannot know his pardoning love to us, till his Spirit witnesses it to our spirit."—Sermon 10. Hence, every christian must, necessarily, have the direct witness of the Spirit. Again, according to this doctrine, every christian must, and absolutely does know, that he has the direct witness of the Spirit. For Mr. Wesley says again, "Suppose God were now to speak to any soul, 'thy sins are forgiven thee,' he must be willing that soul should know his voice, otherwise he would speak in vain. And he is able to effect this, for whenever he wills, to do is present with him. *And he does effect it, that soul is absolutely assured, this voice is the voice of God.*"—Sermon 10. Hence, every christian must be *absolutely assured* that he has the direct witness of the Spirit. But an overwhelming majority of the people of God, in every age of the world, testify that they never had this direct witness—that they never did learn that their sins were forgiven, and that they were the children of God from the direct witness of the Spirit. If, then, this doctrine be true, there never have been any christians upon earth except John Wesley and his followers, and perhaps a scattering few beside.

6. The doctrine of the direct witness of the Spirit opens a wide door for self-deception, while at the same time it cuts off those who may be deceived thereby from all human means whereby they might be undeceived. The human family are naturally superstitious and fanatical on the subject of religion. The unregenerate almost invariably entertain the belief that there is much mystery about religion, and that if they should ever embrace it, things marvellous and supernatural will be connected with the circumstance. Hence, in all cases where the people are taught by their religious instructors to believe, and encouraged to expect, that supernatural dreams, lights, voices, apparitions, &c., will be connected with a religious experience, the imagination, under the anxiety and excitement of the mind, will supply the place of reality, and multitudes will really believe that such things have actually taken place. This has been verified in all ages of the world. But when these things are viewed as mere circumstances which usually accompany a religious experience, and Bible proof is mainly relied upon as evidence of a change of heart, the danger of deception is measurably avoided. But let any one of these things

be received as infallible evidence of a change of heart, and the widest door for self-deception is thrown open. And this is precisely the case in regard to the doctrine of the direct witness; it meets the views and expectations of the natural man; it is supernatural and mysterious, and it is received as infallible proof of a change of heart.

Here it may be asked, if the people are taught to believe, and encouraged to expect, Bible evidence as proof of a change of heart, may not many imagine that they have this evidence? We answer, they may, and some do, but cases of this kind are of but rare occurrence, because the plain, calm, common sense Bible evidence of a change of heart, by no means meets the views and expectations of the sinner under concern and excitement. Every faithful minister of the Gospel who has had any experience in revivals of religion, knows how difficult it is to bring the minds of those under excitement to bear upon the plain Bible evidence of a change of heart. They are looking for something very different, something mysterious and supernatural. And should any who are taught to rely exclusively upon Bible evidence be deceived, the means by which they may be undeceived are left unimpaired and available; the Bible evidence may at any time be brought to bear upon their minds, and they themselves can at any time have access to it. They may be prevailed upon, after the heat of excitement has subsided, in their cool, calm, reflecting moments, to bring their hearts to the Bible, and examine themselves, by this infallible rule, whether they be in the faith.

But the case is very different with those who are taught to rely upon the direct witness, as infallible evidence of a change of heart, and are deceived. They cannot at pleasure cause the Spirit to repeat the voice or impression in order that they, again and again, may judge whether it was from the Spirit, or a mere fiction of the imagination; they have no means, no criteria by which they can scrutinize it. The evidence is mysterious, supernatural and inexplicable. Mr. Wesley says, "It is hard to find words in the language of men to explain the deep things of God. Indeed there are none which will adequately express what the children of God experience. But perhaps one might say, (desiring any who are taught of God to correct, to soften, or strengthen the expression,) the testi-

mony of the Spirit is an inward impression on the soul, whereby the Spirit of God directly witnesses to my spirit that I am a child of God. To require a more minute and philosophical account of the manner whereby we distinguish these, and other criteria, or intrinsic marks, whereby we know the voice of God, is to make a demand which can never be answered; no, not by one who has the deepest knowledge of God."—There it is, and the sum and substance of the whole matter is, that I just know that the Spirit has caused me to know that I am a child of God! No words in the language of men that can adequately express it or explain it, nor can those who have the deepest knowledge of God, explain how the direct witness may be known to be the voice of God!

It appears to us that there is a second revelation needed, to prove that the first was not a delusion, but really the voice of God. And in order to show that all this should be no objection to the doctrine in question, Mr. Wesley says, "Suppose when Paul answered before Agrippa, the wise Roman had said, 'Thou talkest of hearing the voice of the Son of God, How dost thou know it was his voice? By what criteria, what intrinsic marks dost thou know the voice of God? Explain to me the manner of distinguishing this from a human or angelic voice.' Can you believe that the apostle himself would have once attempted to answer so idle a demand?" Are not these remarks most astonishing? Had Mr. W. forgotten the substance of Paul's defence before Agrippa? Why Paul did in a most masterly manner answer this very demand, without having been called upon directly to answer it, because he well knew that every thing depended upon this very point. If the apostle had appeared before Agrippa like a fool with his finger in his mouth, and informed him that he had heard the voice of the Son of God commanding him to do certain things, but that he could not inform him how he knew that it was the voice of the Son of God, nor could he explain how he distinguished the voice which he heard from the voice of a man or an angel—that he had no criteria, no intrinsic marks by which he knew that it was the voice of God, but that he just knew that it was the voice of the Son of God, the wise Roman would have dismissed him as a deluded fanatic, and very justly too.

But Paul did tell Agrippa how he knew the voice which he

heard was the voice of the Son of God. He did explain to him how he knew that the voice was neither a human or angelic voice. He did tell him how he knew that it was no delusion, but indeed and in truth the voice of God. He informed Agrippa that he knew it was the voice of the Son of God, because the voice was accompanied by a notable miracle, witnessed not only by himself, but by all the men who journeyed with him—a light shining from heaven at noonday, above the brightness of the sun, which caused the whole company to fall to the earth—that in the midst of this miraculous light he demanded of the speaker who he was, and he said I am Jesus whom they persecutest. Was not this a full and satisfactory answer to Mr. Wesley's supposed idle demand? Let those who claim to have had the direct witness of the Spirit, give as good evidence as this that it was the Spirit that made that impression upon their souls—let them explain as clearly as Paul did *how* they know that it was not a delusion, and then they may expect their claim to be credited.

Again, the man who believes he has the direct witness of the Spirit, and is deceived, is cut off from all the means by which he might be undeceived. He is cut off from self-examination, for he cannot examine himself whether he be in the faith—he cannot look after any other evidence—he cannot for a moment call in question the fact of his being a child of God, without mistrusting or discrediting what he believes to be the direct testimony of the Spirit of God.

For example, suppose I ride into this village, and I ask a gentleman who chances to be standing on the pavement, what town is this? He answers, this is the town of Rogersville. Now, can I call in question the fact of this being the town of Rogersville—can I ride across to the other side of the street and ask a company of gentlemen standing there, is this indeed the town of Rogersville, without mistrusting or discrediting my first informant? Most assuredly I cannot. The moment that I look after any additional proof to satisfy my mind that this is the town of Rogersville, I mistrust or discredit the information which I first received.

How then is it possible for the man who believes he has the direct witness, and is deceived, ever upon earth to be undeceived? Suppose I say to such a man, friend, I fear you are de-

ceiving yourself on this most important subject, for your walk and conversation do not appear to me to be that of a child of God. He answers, it may be that I am not as upright and holy as I should be, but my imperfections cannot prove that the Spirit has witnessed to me a falsehood.

Again I say to him, the subject is one of infinite moment, I think you ought carefully and prayerfully to examine yourself, whether indeed you be in the faith, lest you should be deceived. He answers, why should I examine whether I be in the faith, after the Spirit has absolutely assured me that I am?

Again I say, it is an awful thing to be deceived, I think you ought to compare the feelings and exercises of your heart with the Word of God, and ascertain whether you possess those marks of the children of God there pointed out, by which we may know that we have passed from death unto life. He answers, why should I look after these marks, either to prove or disprove the direct witness of the Spirit, when a knowledge of the possession or the want of those marks would neither increase nor lessen my confidence that I am a child of God?

There he is, and unless he abandon this soul-damning doctrine he must and will remain deceived until he knocks at the gate of heaven. And to our amazement, the substance of what we have stated above is fully admitted by Mr. Wesley himself. He says, "How many have mistaken the voice of their own imagination for this witness of the Spirit of God, and thence idly presumed they were the children of God, while they were doing the work of the devil! With what difficulty are they convinced thereof! All endeavors to bring them into the knowledge of themselves they will account fighting against God, and with men it is impossible."—Introduct. to serm. 10. Yes, verily, with men it is impossible to undeceive them. Every such effort they will account fighting against God. God alone can undeceive them, and that only by causing them to abandon this doctrine, so exceedingly dangerous to the souls of men.

Finally, on this part of the subject, the doctrine of the direct witness of the Spirit is not merely fanatical, it is pure unmingled enthusiasm. Enthusiasm, says Webster, "is a belief or conceit of private revelation, the vain confidence or opinion of a person, that he has special divine communications

from the Supreme Being, or familiar intercourse with him.”—The man who claims to have had the direct witness of the Spirit, has a belief or conceit that he has had a private revelation—he has the vain confidence or opinion that he has had a special divine communication from the Supreme Being. This, says Webster, is enthusiasm.

III. From what source is the evidence upon which we may rely to be derived?

We answer, from the very same source from which we derive evidence on all other subjects pertaining to religion—the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, the only infallible rule of faith and obedience. Any supposed evidence of our acceptance with God; no matter what it may be, if derived from any other source, cannot be relied upon; the person possessing such evidence may be a child of God, and he may not. Evidence of an interest in Christ, derived from the Bible, is called the indirect witness of the Spirit, because it comes to us, not *directly* from the Spirit, but through the written word of God. The inspired writers wrote under the dictation or plenary inspiration of the Spirit; hence, all the evidence or testimony on every subject contained in the Scriptures, is the testimony or witness of the Spirit.

Here it may be asked, how am I to apply this Bible evidence to my own case, that I may thereby learn whether or not I am a child of God? In order to give as plain and concise an answer to this question as possible, we will suppose that some one informs me that he has for some time been deeply concerned on the subject of religion—that he now has views and feelings and exercises of heart, which he did not formerly have—that now he has no taste for the things in which he formerly delighted, and delights in the things for which he formerly had no taste, and that sometimes he is almost tempted to indulge the hope that he is a child of God, but that he does not wish to indulge that hope without clear and satisfactory evidence, and he wishes some assistance in the investigation of his case. I ask him, do you feel in your heart that you love God, his character and perfections—that you love the law and service of God—that you love truth and holiness, and that you love the people of God? He answers, if I am not mistaken in the feelings of my heart, I do. I then read, (1 John, 4: 7, 8,)

“Every one that loveth is born of God and knoweth God,” and remark, in this passage love in general is intended, loving the things that ought to be loved. If, then, you are not mistaken in the feelings of your own heart, the Spirit here in the written word beareth witness with your spirit that you are born of God and know God. I also read, (1 John, 3: 14, and 4: 12,) “We know that we have passed from death unto life, because we love the brethren. If we love one another God dwelleth in us, and his love is perfected in us.” Here again the Spirit in the Word bears witness with your spirit that you have passed from death unto life, and that God dwells in you, and that his love is perfected in you.

Again I ask him, do you feel that you have been a great sinner against God, and that you are still an imperfect, sinful creature; and have you, and do you still confess your sins to God with a penitent heart? He answers, yes, I certainly do. I then read, (1 John, 1: 8—10,) “If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us. If we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness. If we say that we have not sinned, we make him a liar, and his word is not in us.” Here the Spirit in the Written Word testifies that your sins are forgiven, and that God will cleanse you from all unrighteousness.

Again I ask him, have you lost that supreme love of the world which you once had, and have you overcome the world, that is, have you so overcome the world that you will not neglect known duty, nor transgress the commands of God for sake of the things of the world? He answers, if I am not mistaken I have. I then read, (1 John, 2: 15, and 5: 4, 5,) “If any man love the world, the love of the Father is not in him. For whatsoever is born of God, overcometh the world, and this is the victory that overcometh the world, even our faith? Who is he that overcometh the world, but he that believeth that Jesus is the Son of God?” Here the Spirit in the Word bears witness with your spirit, that the love of the Father is in you, and that you have that saving faith in the Son of God which alone overcometh the world.

In this way, if he wished it, I would pass over with him the numerous marks of the children of God recorded in the first

epistle of John, and elsewhere in the Scriptures. And to show him that this is the way by which God intends the believer to know that he is a child of God, I would read to him, (1 John, 5: 13,) "These things have I written unto you that believe on the name of the Son of God, *that ye may know that ye have eternal life.*" I would then read to him, (Romans 8: 16,) "The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit that we are the children of God." I would then ask him, do you not, from what has been said, clearly see that the meaning of this passage is, that the Spirit bears witness with our spirits that we are the children of God, in the Written Word, and not by a private direct new revelation. And he would answer, yes, this is entirely clear. I would then advise him to look over those Bible marks of the children of God repeatedly, and examine and prove himself carefully and prayerfully thereby, whether he be in the faith. I would also exhort him to be specially careful that the graces of the Spirit in his heart be not counterfeited, but genuine. I would then dismiss him, feeling assured that if he has honesty in his soul he will not and cannot be deceived. Now, in all this evidence there is nothing mysterious, supernatural or inexplicable—no supposed new revelation—no fanaticism. It is all so plain, simple and comprehensible, that the most illiterate believer who can listen to the reading of the Word of God, may know that he is a child of God—that he has eternal life. Will the advocates of the doctrine of the direct witness of the Spirit deny this? Mr. Wesley did not. He says, "With regard to the latter," (that is, the indirect witness of the Spirit,) "the foundation thereof is laid in those numerous texts of Scripture which describe the marks of the children of God, *and that so plainly that he which runneth may read them.*" "Every man applying those Scriptural marks to himself may know whether he is a child of God. Thus, if he knew first, 'as many as are led by the Spirit of God' into all holy tempers and actions, 'they are the sons of God,' (for which he has the infallible assurance of Holy Writ.)" If, then, the Bible marks of the children of God are so plainly described in the Written Word, that he which runneth may read them, and if every man by applying these marks to himself may know with the infallible assurance of Holy Writ, whether he is a child of God, we ask, in the name of

common sense, why a new revelation should be given upon the subject? Of what use could the direct witness of the Spirit be? As well might we expect a new revelation, a direct witness of the Spirit, to convince us that Jesus Christ has come into the world, or that the dead will rise.

To illustrate the absurdity and folly of expecting or relying upon this supposed direct witness of the Spirit, we will suppose that a man of wealth, about to engage extensively in merchandizing, expects to receive notes on a certain bank in exchange for merchandize, and to guard him against the danger of receiving counterfeit bills, the cashier of the bank furnishes him with a book in which the marks, by which a genuine bill may be known, are set forth and clearly described, and in which also the marks by which counterfeit bills may easily be detected, are pointed out. This book lies upon his counter. In a few days a bank bill is offered him in exchange for goods, or in payment of a debt. Suppose he remarks—I am very fearful of receiving counterfeit bills on that bank, as there are many in circulation. I must have time to examine and be satisfied in my own mind that it is a good bill before I can receive it. I will retain it for this purpose until to-morrow; then I will let you know whether I can rely upon it as being a genuine bill. But suppose, in place of examining carefully the marks of the bill, and comparing them with the marks set forth and described in the book, and thereby testing its genuineness, he lays it away, purposing in his mind that if, that night, he should have a remarkable dream, or if he should see a supernatural light, or hear a supernatural voice, he will receive the bill, and if not, he will return it as a counterfeit. Or, he purposes to keep a sharp look out to see if the cashier of the bank will not send him a direct special communication, witnessing to him that the bill in question is a good bill, and if so he will receive it, and if not he will return it as a counterfeit. Now, can we conceive of greater folly, absurdity and fanaticism, than this would be? And of what use to him would his book be? It might as well lie on the bottom of the ocean as upon his counter. And if the book were altogether sufficient for the purpose, and he could safely rely upon it, why should he expect a direct special communication from the cashier of the bank, and of what use could it be?

God has given us a Book in which the genuine graces of the Spirit, the true infallible marks of the children of God are set forth and described, "and that so plainly that he which runneth may read them." And in which, also, the counterfeit graces, and the marks of those who are not the children of God, are set forth with equal plainness. This book is the Bible, and it lies upon the book-shelf in every house. Shall we, then, turn away from this sure word of divine revelation, and rely upon dreams, voices, lights, or new revelations, as evidence of our interest in Christ? If so, that portion of the Book of God which relates to this subject might as well lie at the bottom of the ocean as upon our book-shelves. If we do we are justly chargeable with folly, absurdity and fanaticism, surpassing in criminality that of the supposed case of the merchant, as far as the worth of the immortal soul surpasses the worth of dollars and cents.

For the Calvinistic Magazine.

The Differences of Presbyterians.

Messrs. Editors:—Some of the doctrinal differences existing among Presbyterians having been somewhat fully discussed in your magazine of late, will you permit a subscriber briefly to review this subject, with a view to ascertain whether these are of so material and vital a character as the controversialists would have us to infer, from the earnestness with which they insist upon their peculiar views? Is there, or is there not, common ground upon which sound men of both sides can meet, without any sacrifice of Gospel truth and principle?

The writer of this article flatters himself that he *can* discuss this subject with a degree of impartiality. He is not conscious of being exclusively attached to either of the theories of Presbyterianism. He believes in Calvinism, because fully persuaded that the system of doctrines implied by that term is coincident with the teachings of the Bible, and cordially subscribes to our Confession of Faith for the same reason. Further than this surely no one should be required to go—less than this ought to satisfy no one who calls himself a Presbyterian. While then none, no, not one iota, of the cardinal points of

Presbyterianism should be surrendered, so, also, neither should any insist upon conformity to all the refinements, and mystifications, and favorite inferences, and peculiar phraseologies of either party. Having the substance, why cling so obstinately to the shadow?

I am aware that this will, in all probability, be regarded as suspicious language by all parties. But this only proves the partizan character of the existing belligerency—the bigotted adherence to peculiarities, even though they be the veriest shadows that ever beguiled and stultified the human intellect.

For very many centuries of the christian era, the differences of christians, and the sharp strifes of theological controversy, have been the derision and the stumbling-block of the unbelieving world. And yet these differences are perfectly natural, and by no means to be wondered at. A thousand reasons might be suggested for their existence. One of the most pregnant of these reasons is to be found in the very piety and devotion of the church itself. The man of God, honestly entertaining his peculiar belief, regards himself as bound to contend for it as the momentous truth of God—not one jot or tittle of which must be sacrificed or surrendered. Almost without exception, indeed, these differences are honest, sincere, and conscientious. Hence the indomitable pertinacity with which every inch of ground is wont to be disputed, when theologians encounter in the lists of religious controversy.

Another of these reasons is to be found in the intrinsic difficulties of the sublime subjects of dispute themselves. Many of these are mere matters of revelation. The Savior did not pretend to explain the mysteries of regeneration, even when directly discussing the subject; nor did Paul offer any answer to the (still popular) objection to the doctrine of election, which he suggests, except to resolve it into the simple sovereignty of God. Strong intimations, these, that there are mysteries connected with the faith of the Gospel which are incommunicable to probationary man. But to the sanguine controversialist there are no mysteries and no difficulties, and as each one has his favorite method of elucidation, perfectly clear and satisfactory, (to himself,) the non-concurring views of others are of course heterodox, and to be resisted; and here again is controversy.

And then there are so many learned and wise men, who, in spite of all their learning and wisdom, when contemplating "one side of the shield," will not choose to remember that it has another side;—"men of one idea," who will insist that all other ideas, doctrines and truths, shall either consort with, or succumb to, the one all-devouring dogma.

And still another of these reasons is to be found in the fact, that theologians are not apt to be satisfied even when others really think with them, unless they will also conform to the use of phraseology which they shall prescribe when the doctrines of the Gospel are stated. In other words, the differences are verbal merely, and therefore unreal or non-essential. And here again, I am aware, is suspicious language. But of all the reasons above stated, (which might be greatly multiplied,) this is, undoubtedly, not the one least applicable to the existing condition of things in our church at the present day, as I shall now endeavor to show.

To illustrate the views above expressed, let us state some of the differences which now divide Presbyterians. And first, with regard to the great atonement for sin—what, how much, how, and in what character, did Christ suffer? Do we not all agree in rejecting the Unitarian view, that he suffered merely as an exemplar, and that his human nature, sustained and dignified by its union with the Divine nature, suffered even unto death, to make satisfaction to the violated law of God for the sins we have committed, so that God, in perfect consistency with his justice, might exercise his mercy and grace in the pardon and salvation of the sinner? And thus agreeing, my New School brother, why dispute so earnestly against the proposition that Christ suffered the penalty of that violated law? You are compelled to admit that he did suffer a portion of it, at least, namely, the pain and the shame of the garden and the cross, he being made a curse for us, and the hiding of God's countenance—in short, all of the penalty he could suffer, and certainly what was an equivalent for the whole of it. Why not, then, indulge your Old School brother in his favorite phraseology, and say with him, "Yes, He did suffer the penalty of the law." Surely there can be no more sacrifice of truth in adopting this phraseology, than in saying a man has paid a debt of a thousand dollars when he did not pay a cent

of money, but gave up a tract of land worth that sum or more, which was accepted by the creditor in satisfaction of his demand.

And you, my Old School brother, when it is admitted that Christ did suffer the portion of the penalty as above stated, and what was an equivalent for the whole of it, but also contended that he did not suffer the remorse of conscience and the penal fires of hell which constitute a most momentous portion of that penalty, as you are compelled to admit that he did not, why refuse, so stoutly, to modify or explain your proposition? Why re-assert and insist upon it, as a dogma not to be qualified or abated of an iota of its naked signification? And why regard your brother as heretical, when *thus far he believes the very same things about the atonement which you do*, and merely refuses to adopt your phraseology? Would it not be more magnanimous to admit that his reservations are not unreasonable, and if he will not adopt your favorite language, to say to him, as you might do with perfect sincerity as well as kindness—"I perceive that although you do not express your views in the language I would prefer, yet we believe the same things on this point, and there need be no controversy between us." Undoubtedly there are ultra latitudinarian views of this doctrine entertained by some on the one side of the question as there are ultra, rigid, and triangular views on the other side; but surely this conciliatory language might, with perfect consistency and propriety, be addressed to the great body of New School Presbyterians—that large class excepted, with whom there is no controversy about this doctrine, either as to its substance or the language employed to define it.

But the manner in which the discussion of this subject is sometimes conducted is absolutely painful. It would seem, as we read, so exclusive and one-sided are the views presented, that we are listening to a studied argument, on the one hand, against the glorious doctrine of the atonement itself, against the precious revelation that "Christ died for our sins," that "he was wounded for our transgressions and bruised for our iniquities," that "the chastisement of our peace is upon him," and that "by his stripes we are healed;" and on the other hand, that the labor seems not so much to present this doctrine in the naturalness, simplicity and sublimity with which

the Scriptures invest it, as to maintain a theory and to erect a dogma, which would stand alone of itself and be timidly greeted of all men, were it not bolstered up with so many extraneous collateral props as to give it an air of exceeding stiffness, slightly bordering on the repulsive.

The same things may be said of the differences as to the extent of the atonement. The controversy on this point has always struck me as being simply ridiculous. The one side believes that the atonement made by Christ is sufficient for all men, but in point of fact, enures, and was intended to enure, only to the benefit of the elect, and therefore think it correct phraseology to say that "Christ died only for the elect." The other side contend that the right language is, that "Christ died for all men," but admit that the benefits of his atonement in reality, and in accordance with the purpose of God, are obtained by the elect alone. If there is a shade of difference *in the things believed* on this point by the opposite parties, I confess myself unable to perceive it. I have always thought, however, that the phraseology of the Old School side on this point might safely be modified, simply because of its seemingly direct contradiction of the language of Scripture—compelling a resort to awkward and far-fetched explanations of that language. But undoubtedly the differences on this point are verbal merely, the protestations of partizan bigotry to the contrary notwithstanding.

The differences on the subjects of natural and moral ability, are also the results of the ultrasisms of both sides. One party delights in endeavors to establish the sovereignty of God in the great matter of salvation, the necessity of the Spirit's agency, and the absolute dependence of the creature; while the other is equally strenuous in endeavors to impress the sinner with a sense of his accountability, and to encourage him to action and effort for his salvation—each leaving partially out of view the truth insisted on by the other, and both thus contributing to mar the beautiful symmetry of the true doctrine as presented in the Book of God. But is there not satisfactory evidence to believe that each heartily receives the doctrine taught by the other? And is it not common ground which we may all unitedly occupy on this subject, that the unwillingness of the natural heart to submit to God is so great, that this

unwillingness cannot be, and never is, overcome without the agency of the Divine Spirit? Is not this indeed a sufficient union of sentiment on a point shrouded in so much mystery as the relative action of the Creator and the creature, in the article of regeneration?

And so of the reputed differences in reference to the federal union of the race with our first parent, and the imputation of his guilt to us. Do we not all believe on this point that Adam, in the garden of Eden, representing the race, fell and became depraved—that his depraved nature became hereditary in the race, and that his posterity suffer its curse and its consequences? That those who insist upon the use of the language, “we sinned in” Adam “and fell with him,” do not mean the absurdity that we personally committed Adam’s sin, is evident from their explanations of the different *meanings* of the words “guilt” and “sin,” showing that *the things believed*, in relation to this doctrine, are not materially diverse.

The same may be said of the doctrine of the imputation of Christ’s righteousness to the believer. A denial of the thing signified by this term, in its Scriptural acceptation, is a denial of the atonement itself, which surely none of us mean to be guilty of. What matters it whether we say the righteousness of Christ is “imputed to us,” or “provided for us,” or “counted for,” or “stands in the stead of,” our righteousness? Is not *the thing believed* on this point, by all parties, simply that we are pardoned, accepted and saved through the merits of Christ, and for the sake of his righteousness and sufferings for us, received, *regarded*, and dealt with by the Father, as though ourselves personally righteous?

I might thus go on through all the differences which distract the Presbyterian family, and if we could but find a disposition to accommodate these differences, the task would not be at all difficult, as I humbly conceive. A little charity, a little concession of offensive phraseology, a slight surrender of long-cherished prejudices, a little true wisdom, and a sincere desire for christian union and harmony, would accomplish the work at once. True there are ultra men mixed up with the probabilities of this result, who may not be arrested in their mad career—rampant, self-opinionated men, who thrust their rude research, and feel “at home where angels bashful gaze”—

men who claim to monopolize all the orthodoxy, and who obey, by contraries, the injunctions, "be ye of one mind," "love one another," "be gentle," "be courteous." Such men, originally instrumental by their ultraisms in the division of the church, may long defer the accommodation of its differences. But let us hope that the tendency of their recklessness will be overruled and obviated.

In conclusion, it may be remarked,

1. A goodly portion of the phraseology employed by modern divines to define their views on these contested points, is to be found neither in the Bible nor in the standards of our church. Such being the fact, would it not be a wise as well as equitable adjustment of all merely verbal differences, to conform, by mutual consent, to the language of the Bible and of our standards? There can be no danger while we abide by the old landmarks.

2. The brother who finds himself at war, on any point, with the Confession of Faith, should suspect himself and calmly review his ground; nor should he think himself badly treated if his orthodoxy is doubted, and his claim to be called a Presbyterian contested.

3. On the other hand, the Confession of Faith is the work of fallible man, and entire exemption from error should not be claimed for it. Let its peculiar friends—(I say it fearlessly in the face of their jealous suspicions)—let them be content with a substantial conformity to its teachings. I do not ask them to be satisfied with a hollow and merely nominal conformity. I believe *there have been* divines in our church who ought to have changed their views, or in honesty retired from our communion, or been ejected for non-subscription to our standards. The number of such is very small now, and is daily decreasing. The body is sound and healthful as a whole, although a partial gangrene may, here and there, possibly be still found among its members.

AN ANALOGY FOR CHRISTIANS.—The swan subdues the eagle when he attacks her on her own element; so the weakest Christian may subdue his strongest foe, if he will but *keep his place* and do his duty.

From the Salem Gazette,

The Returned Missionary.

THE recent return from India, of one of the earliest of that band from this country who first devoted their lives to the great work of spreading the light of Christianity and civilization over the darkest portions of Asia, is an event worthy of more than ordinary announcement. It is of itself, a circumstance of importance, as suggestive of the deep and strong feelings of philanthropy which must possess the heart of the Christian Missionary, to enable him for so many years to leave his kindred, and brave all the dangers, submit to all the trials, and perform all the labors required of him among a heathen and barbarous people.

It is but a few weeks since the Rev. DANIEL POOR, D. D., after an absence of *thirty-three years*, set his foot on the shores of his native country. He arrived with his lady at New York, where he was forced to remain a few days, by the pressing importunity of some of his old friends, who found him on his arrival. He then hastened to Fairhaven, in this State, to meet his children, who, many years since, had been sent to this country for their education, and in the pulpit of his only son, who is there settled in the ministry, he preached his first sermon after his arrival in America. He intended to hasten to his ancient home, but it happened that a large party of missionaries were to be set apart for their work, part of them destined to his own station in Ceylon. His counsel and advice were considered so essential, that he was detained in Boston, and took a part in their ordination. He was appointed to give them a *farewell* address, which he very aptly turned to a joyous *welcome*, by conducting them in imagination to the several stations where they were destined to be joyfully received as messengers of glad tidings.

Having again addressed the departing missionaries on their embarkation, he proceeded to Danvers, to the spot always dear to him as the place of his nativity, where he had spent the days of his childhood and youth, and where dwelt most of his kindred and friends. It was his *home*, and the place which, for many long years, he had most desired to re-visit in person, as he had already done often in thought and imagination.—

Various and conflicting indeed must have been his feelings, as he approached that venerable mansion. He had left it almost a youth, and now he was returning to it nearly on the verge of old age. The widowed mother who had guided his youthful steps, and devoted him with a self-sacrificing spirit to the missionary cause, had long since passed to her reward. Of eight brothers and sisters, fondly and dearly beloved, who bade him farewell on his departure, two only, a brother and sister, both well stricken in years, remain to welcome his return. Of the many friends and associates of his earlier days, after whom he makes enquiry, most of them are no more.—Although affection claims for these the “natural tear,” yet constitutionally of a disposition happy and cheerful, he is not disposed to dwell too intently on the darker side of the picture, and he hears with interest of new names connected with the expanding family circle. More than two hundred branches extend from the family tree, of which his patriarchal father and mother constitute the trunk.

He now arrives in the centre of his native village. He looks around, and finds no place he can recognize, to assure him that it is the place he has left. The lapse of time has obliterated all the old landmarks. If the objects themselves have not changed, every thing around them has. Even the physical features have altered. The felling of forests, and the growth of new vegetation have given a changed aspect to strongly marked natural scenery.

He goes to the paternal mansion, which is the least changed of all. It would not become us to describe too minutely, the circumstances of the joyous meeting there of friends, so long separated. Suffice it to say, that the fraternal embrace and kiss of affectionate recognition, were largely indulged with all the intensity of deep emotion. Friends quickly gathered around him and his partner whom he had brought, and who had for many years shared in his labors abroad. They were affectionately received, and he recounted to them in a concise and familiar manner, the story of his sojourn in a strange land, his labors, and his many narrow escapes from imminent dangers. Among the latter it may be mentioned, that it was only apparently by a very trivial cause that he was deterred from taking a passage home in the ill-fated *Ocean Monarch*, and

thus sharing in the tragic scenes of that awful disaster. For these and unnumbered other mercies, and for his safe return to his friends, he poured forth his thanksgivings with a fervor of feeling and eloquence of expression, only to be expected under circumstances so extraordinary.

It is not easy for us who have witnessed in detail, the changes that have taken place in a course of years, to have an adequate idea of the impression they would make upon one, on whose memory was engraven the exact state of things as they were thirty-three years ago. More than half of Dr. Poor's life-time has been spent abroad in a tropical climate. Almost all the time he has been actively engaged with true missionary zeal in labors of philanthropy, among a barbarous race, and has paid comparatively little attention to the changes which have taken place in the civilized world. He has all this time spoken another language, been identified with the people of his charge, and considered himself as self-exiled forever from his native country. It was only on account of the fear of his friends in India, that he was sacrificing his health, that they permitted, and even urged him to seek its restoration, by a visit to his friends in America.

He came by the way of England, where he stopped awhile to visit the friends of Mrs. Poor, who is a native of that country, and the sister of an English missionary. On their arrival in England, they were astonished beyond measure, at the changes which everywhere met their eyes. He describes it as like landing on another planet. As to all the improvements and discoveries which have so strongly marked the age, he had been in a Rip Van Winkle sleep. He not only found a people of different color and language from those with whom he had been accustomed to associate, but all the new discoveries in science and art for the last third of a century, burst at once on his attention, and produced a whirl of excitement not easily described. The changes produced by the steam engine, steam navigation, railroads and magnetic telegraphs, as well as the minor improvements, were entirely new to him, and struck him with astonishment and wonder.

In this country he was lost in the new aspect of things in the literary, political and theological world. He knew nothing of the nice differences of opinion between old and new

schools of theology, or the shades of political excitement which now agitate the public mind, neither is it his desire on those topics to be better informed. In meeting his personal friends, the illusion of expecting to find them appearing much as they were when he bade them farewell, was only dissipated by observing their surprise at not finding him just as they had pictured him in their own minds. Thus were they looking-glasses to each other, reflecting upon both the changes that time had made on their personal appearance.

On Sunday last, he preached his first sermon to his townsmen since his return. It was in the same place where thirty-three years ago he stood up and preached to a congregation, almost all of whom have passed away, but some of the youth and middle aged of that assembly, constituted the aged of this. Altho' it was in the same place, it was not in the same *house* that he stood before this new congregation. That ancient structure had been taken down and a new one erected. This, too, had been removed to make room for a larger house. The third house had been destroyed by fire, and a fourth, the pulpit of which he now occupied, had been erected in its place. As it became generally known that Dr. Poor was to officiate, a congregation larger than usual assembled and listened throughout to the exercises, with marked attention and interest. After the invocation, he read a part of the 107th Psalm. This was followed by singing with fine effect, that beautiful hymn by Addison,

“When all thy mercies, O, my God,” &c.

He now requested the congregation to join him in his thank-offering for his preservation and happy return to his native land, and then offered up a prayer of great fervency, and replete with true devotional feeling. Many an eye unused to weep was moistened, as the venerable speaker in broken tones and moving accents, poured out the humble acknowledgments of a grateful heart. His sermon was extemporaneous, and exceedingly well adapted to the occasion which called it forth. His text was taken from Romans 15: 22; and the following verses:—

“*For which cause also I have been much hindered from coming unto you; but now having no more place in those parts, and having a great desire these many years to come unto you,*” &c.

These words he applied with great aptness of illustration to his own past and present situation, giving a brief narrative of his residence abroad, and the objects he hoped to accomplish by his return. We have not room to say more of the discourse, only that it was listened to with the most undivided attention, by a large audience. In the evening he again addressed a crowded house, taking for his text, "*The churches of Asia salute you.*" As the messenger of the Asiatic churches, he eloquently presented their salutations and also their claims to the support of their sister churches in America. He described graphically, the difficulties of introducing Christianity into India, and the manner in which they were to be overcome, and closed with a powerful appeal in behalf of the missionary cause.

The manner of Dr. Poor is earnest and almost enthusiastic, his voice sometimes breaking with the intensity of his emotion, when highly excited by his subject. He unites the zeal of an apostle with the energy of a reformer. Without using notes, he is fluent in speaking, which surprises many, as he has been so many years accustomed to speak in another language. We doubt not that his return will awaken the religious community to new effort in the cause of Asiatic missions.

Catechetical Instruction.

THE biographer of the Rev. Richard Watson, one of the most distinguished divines of the Methodist Church, and the author of the body of Divinity now most extensively used by the Methodist clergy, in speaking of his residence at Lincoln, says:—

"To him (that is Watson) the most important arrangement connected with this period of his life, was the course of catechetical instruction which he attended under the direction of the minister who officiated in Lady Huntington's chapel. The catechism which was used, was that of the *Westminster Assembly of Divines*; which, with the confession of faith, drawn up by the same authorities, is well known to be the standard of doctrine in the Scottish Church. Both these formularies are decidedly Calvinistic on the question of predestination

and its concomitants; but they are, otherwise, *among the best summaries of Christian doctrine ever compiled*. To young Watson it must have been a great advantage to be rendered familiar with this brief system of divine truth. Though the effects of this course might not immediately appear, he doubtless derived from it a great benefit, when he became serious, and especially when he was called upon to instruct others in the way of salvation. Religious training is an essential part of sound education, and no mode of accomplishing this object has been found so effectual as catechising.”

Such a tribute, coming from a highly distinguished member of another church, to the value of the Catechism and Confession of Faith of our church, is alike creditable to his discernment and liberality of sentiment. An infidel once remarked to us that whilst the doctrines of the Confession of Faith seemed to him to lead naturally to the subversion of all the principles of morality, yet as a practical fact, their inculcation had produced the sternest and most unyielding virtue that the world had ever seen. He added that some of the most distinguished champions of opposing systems had received the moral stamina and intellectual force which enabled them to oppose these doctrines with effect from the training which they had afforded. The fact above stated is an illustration of this latter remark. Should there be in any of our churches individuals who doubt whether the effects of catechetical instruction upon the minds of their children will be beneficial, we entreat them to ponder the statement made above by one whose prejudices, had he yielded to them, would have led him to disparage this formula of doctrine.—*Presbyterian Herald*.

Cinnabar, by being bruised, becomes brilliant and glows into vermilion; so christian character is made beautiful by adversity.

Corals, agates and crystals are found on many a stormy shore; thus the soul finds God's most precious gifts in the rugged path of sorrow.

The frost which nips the foliage of the mulberry tree, kills not the silk-worm cradled in its leaves; so christian calamity may blight your bowers of ease, but it cannot destroy you.

THE
Calvinistic Magazine.

[NEW SERIES.]

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

Vol. IV.

May, 1849.

No. 5.

Methodist Policy.

It is now pretty generally understood to be the regular practice of the Methodist Episcopal Church, in all controversies with Calvinists to shun, as far as practicable, the true issue, and deal largely in personal aspersion, and bold and hardy misrepresentation. From the time of the famous decision of John Wesley, by the toss of an English shilling, “to preach and print against Calvinism,” and down to the latest issues of the mammoth Book Concern in New York, the same sinister course has been uniformly observed. Methodist writers and preachers have adhered to it with as much tenacity as if their existence depended on it; and it may now be fairly regarded as the settled policy of the denomination. All this is so well known, that however painfully it may be felt by their Calvinistic opponents, it seldom or never creates surprise. The only wonder is, that men can contrive to give weight and credit to misrepresentations, some of which are so extravagant as to shock credulity itself. One would suppose that they must fail to command the belief even of their own warmest partisans, and that consequently their misstatements would recoil upon their own heads. Not so. They have counted the cost. They have anticipated and provided against all contingencies. In failure of other expedients, they are ready to fortify their misrepresentations of Calvinism by *garbled and falsified extracts from the standard works of Calvinists.* This charge is a

serious one. It is not made without due deliberation. And it is to this remarkable feature of Methodist policy, that we now wish to call the attention of Presbyterians.

Methodism, we assert, undertakes to sustain its perversions of the doctrines of grace, by unfair and fraudulent quotations. In proof of this assertion we adduce a single one out of the swarms of Anti-Calvinist publications issued from the grand Depository, viz: the far-famed "Doctrinal Tracts." We select this particular volume, not because there are no others adapted to our purpose, but because there is no other which possesses such weight and authority with Methodists, or which has so wide a circulation among them, the Discipline only excepted. Indeed, the greater part of these "Tracts" were once published in the Discipline itself, as an accredited exposition of what Methodists are to believe concerning Calvinism, and are now printed separately for the sake of convenience, and a more extended circulation. All but one or two of them are virulent attacks upon Calvinism, and contain the essence of all the sophistry, distortion and calumny employed against that system, from the time of the Jesuit Molina down to the days of John Wesley. They form the arsenal from which Methodists draw their favorite weapons against the doctrines of grace. Indeed, there is now scarcely any thing uttered by them on the subject, from the pulpit or the press, that may not be traced to this source. These Tracts are, moreover, issued by the express "authority of the General Conference," who thus make themselves responsible for the contents of the book. We shall briefly notice a few of the misrepresentations it contains, and some of the quotations by which they are fortified.

On pages 172, 195, 200, 201, of these "Doctrinal Tracts," and in other places, Calvinists are accused of making God the author of sin, and reducing man to the condition of a mere machine; of teaching that "God makes men and angels sin;" that he "compels them to continue in sin," and that "sin necessarily comes to pass by the irresistible will of God," &c. In support of these shameless imputations, the Confession of Faith, chap. 5, sec. 4, is fraudulently quoted. For the satisfaction of the reader we give the Methodist version, and the true reading, in parallel columns.

Doct. Tracts, p. 195.

“The almighty power of God extends itself to the first fall, and all other sins of angels and men.”

Confession of Faith.

“The almighty power, unsearchable wisdom, and infinite goodness of God, do so far manifest themselves in his providence, that it [viz: his providence] extendeth itself even to the first fall and all other sins of angels and men; and that not by a bare permission only, but such [a permission] as hath joined with it a most wise and powerful bounding, and otherwise ordering and governing them in a manifold dispensation to his own holy ends; yet so that the sinfulness thereof proceedeth only from the creature and not from God; who being most holy and righteous, neither is, nor can be the author or approver of sin.”

The reader will see with what ingenuity the language of the Confession is curtailed and altered to give it a sense the very opposite to that which it expresses. The Assembly of Divines say simply that the power, wisdom and goodness of God appear in his providence, and that this providence extends to all the sinful acts of angels and men, by such a permission as is connected with a wise and powerful restraint and control by which the wrath of the wicked shall be made to praise the Lord. So also in chap. 6, sec. 1, they tell us that God was pleased to *permit* the fall of our first parents and that this permission was connected with a purpose to order the event to his own glory. But the Methodist hierarchy are determined to convict Calvinists of impiety at all events, and if they cannot find evidence enough in the Confession, will manufacture it to order.

In support of the same charges against Calvinism as are enumerated above, we find on page 194 of these Tracts, a garbled quotation from chap 3, sec. 1 of the Confession. Again we present the two in parallel columns.

Doct. Tracts, p. 194.

“God did from all eterni-

Confession of Faith.

“God from all eternity did

ty unchangeably ordain whatsoever comes to pass."

by the most wise and holy counsel of his own will, freely and unchangeably ordain whatsoever comes to pass; yet so as thereby neither is God the author of sin, nor is violence offered to the will of the creatures, nor is the liberty or contingency of second causes taken away, but rather established."

Three important restrictive clauses, each necessary to a right understanding of fore-ordination, are seen to be omitted in the Tracts. More than this, the suppressed clauses expressly repudiate the identical charges which the Confession is adduced to establish.

On page 8 of the volume, we have another specimen of artfully garbled extract. Again we set the original in contrast with the Methodist version.

Doct. Tracts.

"The rest of mankind God was pleased for the glory of his sovereign power over his creatures, to pass by, and to ordain them to dishonor and wrath."

Con. of Faith, chap. 3, sec. 7.

"The rest of mankind God was pleased, according to the unsearchable counsel of his own will, whereby he extendeth or withholdeth mercy as he pleaseth, for the glory of his sovereign power over his creatures, to pass by, and to ordain them to dishonor and wrath *for their sin*, to the praise of his glorious justice."

It is not difficult to conjecture the motive for the above mutilation. Throughout these Tracts, Calvinists are represented as teaching that men are fore-appointed to damnation without regard to their moral character. Thus, on page 96, they are represented as asserting, "That God by an eternal and unchangeable decree hath predestinated to eternal damnation the far greater part of mankind, and that absolutely *without any respect to their works*, but only for the showing the glory of his justice; and that for the bringing this about, he hath appointed these miserable souls to walk in their wicked ways, that so his justice may lay hold on them." Again, on page 170, "It [viz: Calvinism] represents the most holy God as

worse than the devil, as both more false, more cruel, and more unjust." And again, page 172, "One might say to our adversary, the devil, Thou fool, why dost thou roar about any longer? Thy lying in wait for souls is as needless and useless as our preaching. Hearest thou not that God hath taken the work out of thy hands? And that he doeth it more effectually? * * Thou temptest; He forceth us to be damned," &c.

Now it was shrewdly suspected by the Methodist hierarchy that even their membership would find it hard to believe these to be fair representations of Calvinism, unless sustained by positive proof. It was also evident that should the above passage from the Confession be quoted entire, it would refute instead of supporting the meditated calumny. Accordingly, the words, "for their sin," were suppressed, and several other members of the sentence omitted, in order to favor the iniquitous design.

Another instance of criminal suppression of truth, in giving a quotation from the Presbyterian Confession, is found on page 8 of the Tracts. Here it is.

Doct. Tracts.

"Those of mankind that are predestinated unto life, God, before the foundation of the world, hath chosen in Christ unto everlasting glory, without any foresight of faith or good works."

Con. of Faith, chap. 3, sec. 5.

"Those of mankind that are predestinated unto life, God, before the foundation of the world was laid, according to his eternal and immutable purpose, and the secret counsel, and good pleasure of his will, hath chosen in Christ unto everlasting glory, out of his mere free grace and love, without any foresight of faith or good works, or perseverance in either of them, or any other thing in the creature, as conditions or causes moving him thereunto; and all to the praise of his glorious grace."

It is well known that Methodists are accustomed to assert that according to Calvinists a person may be saved as well without faith and holiness as with it. Some plain proof of this assertion, drawn from the Presbyterian Confession, was of course a great *desideratum*. This is readily attained by detaching a part from the rest of the sentence. The Confession

is thus made to say that God foresaw no faith or holiness in his elect. By omitting the words "out of his mere free grace and love," and the words "as conditions or causes moving him thereunto," the very gist of the whole passage is ingeniously suppressed. The Assembly of Divines simply assert that in the election of men to salvation God was prompted solely by his own spontaneous mercy, and not by any foreseen excellence in the creatures. Faith and holiness, wherever they exist in fallen man, are the effects of special grace, and are consequences, not the cause of election. Believers were chosen in Christ "that they should be holy," not because of their holiness.

But these are not the only instances of imposition practised by the Methodist clergy upon their uninformed members. At page 176 of the volume, a tract entitled "The Consequence Proved," commences as follows:

"Mr. Toplady, a young, bold man, lately published a pamphlet, an extract from which was soon after printed, concluding with these words: 'The sum of all is this: one in twenty, suppose, of mankind are elected; nineteen in twenty are reprobated. The elect shall be saved do what they will, the réprobate shall be damned do what they can.'"

It is almost unnecessary to observe that neither Mr. Toplady nor any other Calvinistic writer ever expressed the sentiment contained in this pretended "extract." The whole is a piece of shameful imposture. Its history is this: the Rev. A. Toplady published a work on predestination, which Mr. Wesley and his friends found themselves unable to refute by fair argument. Mr. Wesley composed a gross caricature of it, to which he subscribed the initial letters of Toplady's name, with a "Witness my hand." This he printed and circulated among his followers as Toplady's abridgement of his own work. In this, as well as in several other instances of the kind, it is quite apparent that Mr. Wesley, in his dealings with Calvinists, did not always feel himself bound by the precepts of the moral law; either because he had embraced the notion of the lawfulness of *pious frauds*, or because he did not regard Calvinists as the "neighbors" against whom men are forbidden to "bear false witness."

In a subsequent edition of his work, Mr. Toplady added an

Appendix in which he remonstrates with Wesley in reference to the forgery, addressing him thus:

“Your concluding paragraph, which you have the effrontery to palm on the world as mine, runs thus: “The sum of all is this: one in twenty (suppose) of mankind are elected; nineteen in twenty are reprobated. The elect shall be saved, do what they will; the reprobate shall be damned, do what they can. Reader, believe this, or be damned. Witness my hand:—A. T.”

“In almost any other case,” continues Mr. Toplady, “a similar forgery would transmit the criminal to Virginia or Maryland, if not to Tyburn.” “Why do you introduce me as enjoining them to believe, under the same penalty, ‘that the elect shall be saved, do what they will; and the reprobate damned, do what they can?’”

“This is a sample, indeed, of your own modesty, tenderness and self-diffidence; but God forbid that I should give such dismal proof of mine. I believe and preach, that the chosen and ransomed of the Lord are ‘appointed to salvation through sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the truth.’ And with regard to the rest, that they will be condemned, not for doing what they can in a moral way, but for not doing what they can; for not believing the gospel report, and for not ordering their conversation according to it.”

“Let me likewise ask you, when or where I ever presumed to ascertain the number of God’s elect; point out the treatise and the page, wherein I assert that only ‘one in twenty of mankind are elected.’ The book of life is not in your keeping, nor in mine.”

The tract entitled “The Consequence Proved,” was evidently written to screen Mr. Wesley, by proving that the fraud did Toplady no injustice. The General Conference still reiterate the slander through the agency of their Book Concern, and give it the full sanction of their authority, thinking, perhaps, that as the imposture did not originate with themselves, they may still make use of it to serve a purpose. In all this, they remind us of a popular Methodist song, sung with great glee in some parts of the country, and containing these lines:

“We’ll whip the devil round the stump,
And give him a kick at every jump.”

But Satan, we surmise, will not be so easily managed by the Conferencæ.

On page 98 of these Tracts, Zuingle, the Swiss Reformer, is quoted as using the following shocking expressions: "God moveth the robber to kill. He killeth, God forcing him thereunto." And again—"When God makes men or angels sin, he does not sin himself, because he does not break any law. For God is under no law, and therefore he cannot sin."

We have not access to the works of Zuingle, but Mosheim asserts that he did not teach the doctrine of absolute decrees, afterwards maintained by Calvin. See Mosh. Eccl. Hist. Cent. XVI, Sec. III, Chap. II, § 7 and 12. The General Conference, however, represent him as quite in advance of Calvin, who never admitted the doctrine of the divine agency in the production of moral evil. At all events, unless better authority than the Doctrinal Tracts shall be produced, we shall never believe that Zuingle expressed the sentiments ascribed to him.

We might add many more specimens of dishonest quotation from Calvin, Zanchius, Twisse and others, but we deem it unnecessary, especially as this subject has been thoroughly discussed, and the injustice done to these authors fully exposed by the Rev. Wm. Annan, in his well known and popular treatise, "The Difficulties of Methodism," to which the reader is referred.

Such is the policy of Episcopal Methodism, and such are a part of the means by which she professes to "spread Scriptural holiness over these lands!" Such, too, are some of the *good works* of which she claims to be the foremost advocate. Who, after this, will doubt that the men engaged in this crusade against Calvinism may claim the style and title of "perfect christians?"

On the first view of the subject we should readily suppose that these dishonorable artifices would redound to the disgrace of their authors and abettors. But on reflection we shall perceive that the preachers, after all, incur no great danger from this quarter. Probably not one in five hundred readers of the Doctrinal Tracts will ever discover the deception practised on them, or suspect the fidelity of the testimonies against Calvinism. If, however, there should be some appearance of danger—

if, for instance, Presbyterians should publicly and solemnly disavow the creed thus manufactured for them, the hierarchy have only to put in circulation a large edition of the famous tract, "Duplicity Exposed," already provided against such emergencies. This will effectually persuade their membership that, however Presbyterians deny the sentiments charged upon them, their denial is all sheer hypocrisy and falsehood. Or, should there appear a book or pamphlet, adapted to expose the unfair dealing of the preachers, they have only to raise a shout of "slander!" "falsehood!" "persecution!" "the worst book on this side of hell!" and then not one in a hundred of their members will dare to touch it. At the same time they will raise a hue and cry against the author—load him with personal abuse—instigate all "soft shell Presbyterians" against him as a "disturber of the peace," and combine together to destroy his character, so that unless he is made of pretty stern stuff he will be tempted to quit the field. There is no knowing to what lengths they may go to check free investigation. Some years since, when the Rev. Wm. Annan, then resident in Mifflin County, Pa., was writing his celebrated exposure of Methodism, he received an anonymous letter threatening him with personal violence in case he persisted.

But while we thus speak of the body of the Methodist preachers, we design to exempt the laity from any participation in the fraudulent practices, of which we treat. They are in no wise responsible for the character of the publications issued by their church. They have no control whatever over the Book Concern, nor have they the least weight or influence in ecclesiastical matters. The government to which they are constrained to submit is a pure hierarchy. The preachers are every thing—they are *the church* itself. They make the laws, and they execute them. They create the offices, and they fill them. They publish the books, and they circulate them. All that is left to the people is summed up in two words, PAY and OBEY.

Upon the preachers, then, and especially upon their General Conference, lies the guilt of bearing false testimony against Calvinists, and of seeking to strengthen that testimony by garbled and falsified quotations. The slander comes out from the press under their "authority," and they industriously cir-

culate it. They are the only persons who share the responsibility, and the sin is all their own. Let it not be said that they too are deceived, and that they would willingly correct whatever is discovered to be erroneous in their publications. For, however many of the subaltern preachers may be in the dark on this subject, this excuse cannot be alleged in behalf of the higher grades of the clergy. Unless we are much mistaken, their candor and sense of justice in relation to this matter have already been put to the test. Their attention has already been called to the dishonesty of their citations, and the only effect which followed was a reiteration of the slander. Look at the following paragraphs taken from the introduction to one of their "Doctrinal Tracts," page 193.

"TO ALL PREDESTINARIANS."

"I am informed some of you have said, that the following quotations are false; that these words were not spoken by these authors; others, that they were not spoken in this sense, and others, that neither you yourself, nor any true Predestinarian, ever did, or ever would speak so.

"My friends, the authors here quoted are well known, in whom you may read the words with your own eyes. And you who have read them know in your own conscience they were spoken in this sense, and no other; nay, that this sense of it is professedly defended throughout the whole treatises whence they are taken.

"But, be this as it may, do you indeed say, 'No true Predestinarian ever did or would speak so?' Why, every true Predestinarian must speak so, and so must you yourself too, if you dare speak out."

In the dialogue which follows, are some of the most shameful misquotations in the whole volume; among others the first two on which we have commented in this article. Here, then, is evidence enough that the men at head-quarters are acting with their eyes open. After this, the plea of ignorance or mistake will not avail them. Besides, their actions, which are a stronger testimony than words, prove beyond a doubt that they do not believe their own statements in regard to Calvinists. Witness their conduct when they spread the table of the Lord. Would they, if they believed their own representations to be true, invite Calvinists to come forward and take their places

among the followers of the Saviour, and make so many strong professions of cordial fellowship with them? No, surely, if they credited their own statements they would as soon invite infidels or atheists to their communion.

We shall conclude with a few reflections.

1. What a prodigious amount of labor is employed by the Methodist clergy to impress their people with wrong notions of Calvinism! Most other ministers make it their principal business to teach "what man is to believe concerning God, and the duty which God requires of man." Methodists, on the contrary, appear to be intent upon teaching what men are to believe concerning Calvinists. Take, as a sample of their teaching, the "Doctrinal Tracts," a work designed as a popular manual of Theology—and what does it contain? Setting aside one short treatise on Baptism, and another on Perfection, all the rest is little else than a gross caricature of Calvinism. This kind of doctrinal instruction is carefully instilled into the minds of their young converts, and in very many instances we fear it is all the instruction they receive—all their religion consisting in a fiery zeal against Presbyterianism. Hence, among the numerous apostates from the body, though few can give you an intelligent account of Arminianism, all can repeat with fluency the stereotyped slanders against Calvinism. However short the period of their connexion with the class, it has been long enough to produce a settled hostility to the doctrines of grace. And though they should never re-enter the Methodist communion, there is at least this much affected, that they are not likely ever to become Presbyterians.

2. What a tribute of honor do the Methodist clergy indirectly pay to the doctrines of grace! Men do not usually employ fraud or artifice to overthrow a system, when the object can be as well attained by fair argumentation. Wesley would not have slandered Toplady or misquoted Hervey, if he could have refuted their doctrines. Nor would the modern Methodist clergy persist in their disreputable course, if they could overturn the Presbyterian system by arguments drawn from reason and the Word of God. But that system, when fairly represented, is so much in accordance with the dictates of sound reason and revelation, that it cannot be overthrown by argument. It shines by its own light, and in most cases needs

only to be correctly stated in order to secure the ready assent of unsophisticated christians of every denomination. This has been seen and felt by its opponents in every age, and by none more than modern Methodists. If it is to be assailed successfully, it must be misrepresented. To give plausibility to the misrepresentations, its standard writers must be garbled and falsified. Moreover, in all discussions with Calvinists the true issue must be evaded, and a hundred other Popish artifices employed to keep the people in the dark. Truly all this is the highest compliment that can be paid to any system of doctrine.

3. What a sad exhibition is here afforded of the character of Arminian Methodism! Methodist preachers are accustomed to boast of their system as superior to all others in its strong incentives to holiness; and they villify Calvinism as immoral in its tendency. But systems, as well as individuals, must be judged by their fruits. And where, let me ask, can be found a Calvinistic body as unscrupulous in relation to the means of advancing its interests as the Methodist hierarchy? The great founder of Methodism, when pressed by hard necessity, would stoop to calumniate his opponents, to misquote them, and to descend sometimes to the style of a vulgar blasphemer. His successors are willing to tread in his steps. Too many of them can misrepresent facts with all the effrontery of a pettifogger, and confound truth and falsehood with all the dexterity of a Jesuit. Few of them have an adequate sense of the obligation which speakers or writers who profess to state the truth owe to the public. And whoever has had one of them for an opponent, will readily admit that the disciple of Wesley is not much above his master. In reference to this glaring defect the very fathers of Methodist Arminianism were compelled to cry out, "How little faith is there among us?" * * * "What gossiping, evil-speaking, tale-bearing? *What want of moral honesty.*" Many a Presbyterian minister has found to his cost, that these admissions are too well grounded.

4. With what an ill grace does the cry of *persecution* come from Methodist Episcopalians! Those who bring a charge of this kind against others, should be free from it themselves. He that would pull the mote out of his brother's eye should first cast out the beam out of his own eye. In defiance of this rule

Methodists accuse Presbyterians of persecution. In particular, they raise an outcry against the editors of the Calvinistic Magazine, as though they were notorious offenders in this respect. But what have these gentlemen done? They have claimed the rights guarantied to them by the laws of God and man. They have exercised the privilege of free discussion. They have vigorously and successfully repelled Arminian aggression, whether open or disguised. And what have Methodist preachers been doing all along? They have been circulating through the whole extent of the Union such defamatory publications as the "Doctrinal Tracts," replete with the most scandalous perversions of Presbyterianism. They have been retailing these perversions through their periodical presses. They have made the pulpit itself the vehicle of public and personal detraction and of bitter denunciation. They have slyly insinuated, and boldly asserted, in public and in private, that Presbyterians believe and teach the damnation of infants not a span long. Not unfrequent have been the occasions when

"The pulpit, drum ecclesiastic
Was beat with fist instead of a stick,"

while Calvinism, and, by implication, its abettors too, were consigned to the bottomless pit. This we know is what Methodist preachers have long been doing; and if they have not been guilty of literal persecution they have come as near to it as the laws would permit.

"O but," say they, "the Rev. F. A. Ross says too many hard and severe things. He has fairly libelled the poor Methodists." Well, if he has uttered hard sayings are they not true sayings? If there is severity in his writings is it any thing but the severity of truth? We verily believe it is even so. If he has published great libels upon Methodism it must be on the principle of the old English law, that "the greater the truth the greater the libel." It is true that his work, "The Direct Witness," has exposed a dangerous delusion maintained by Mr. Wesley and his followers. It is true that the series of articles he is now publishing in the Calvinistic Magazine do set in a clear light the evils of Methodist Episcopal Church polity. And we doubt not these works will live and be valued while Methodism maintains its present character. But we challenge the world to show when and where he has failed in

point of honor, integrity, courtesy or generosity toward his opponents. Well has he deserved to bear on his escutcheon the motto, *sans peur et sans reproche*. The productions of his pen all bespeak the gentleman, the scholar, the patriot and the christian. In regard to their *value*, we have the testimony of New School and Old School, of Baptists and Congregationalists, in the North and the South, in the East and the West. As to their *efficiency*, we have the testimony of his opponents. There is the virulent personal abuse,—there is the loud cry of the wounded, and both shield and breast-plate of the hierarchy pierced through and through with his Calvinistic lance. But he needs no defence from our pen, and we forbear. We will only repeat, that Methodist Episcopalians ought to be the last to say a word about persecution; and if we had the confidence of those who seek to excite sympathy by telling sad stories of the wrongs inflicted by Presbyterians, we would say to them, as Johnson once said to an acquaintance of his, “Do not tell that story again, you make a poor figure in telling it.”

A. G. F.

Reminiscences of our Venerable Church.

THE EJECTION, AND THE SABBATH OF WEEPING.

“ALL we have been doing for these last thirty years, is at once thrown down.” Thus spake King Charles—thus spake his amazed prelates, as they listened to the recital of what had been doing in that old church-yard, namely, the signing of the “Solemn League and Covenant.” “Let us meet these stubborn Presbyterian Scotch in their own way. Let us summon a ‘Free General Assembly,’ which shall be *free* only in name: for *we*, by intrigue and bribery, *will* sway it.” Mistaken men! Think ye to bind the Spirit of the Lord? What saith the historian? “This famous Assembly, of which Alexander Henderson was Moderator, met at Glasgow in 1638, and sat for twenty-six days; but, instead of being swayed by the king or his prelates, it nobly asserted the sole headship of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the presbyterian government of the church.” Royalty and its adherents were enraged, and a determination was soon carried into effect to march a well disciplined army

against the Covenanters. A war of self-defence was now imperative, and accordingly in 1639 the Covenanters rose to arms.

We leave it to the historian to describe the gathering of these conscientious soldiers, as from different quarters they repaired to their rendezvous. We might in imagination linger by their tent-doors, and hear some singing psalms, some lifting up their hearts in prayer, and others reading God's Word. We might wish to rest the eye awhile on that "banner," which bore not only the "arms of Scotland," but the expressive words, "For Christ's Crown and Covenant." But we hurry on. Suffice it that God enabled them *then* to avert the danger, though soon the days of the Commonwealth and the reign of Charles II. brought new disasters. It was in the year 1661 that the days of sorest trial begun.

In one of our first papers we have spoken of the executions of the Duke of Argyle and the Rev. Mr. Guthrie, the first martyrs since the days of *popish* cruelty. Influential and active as these men were, it was necessary that they should be removed out of the way before the corrupt government of Charles II. could proceed with its design of establishing prelacy in Scotland. How little may they be depended on who fear not the Lord. How bitterly was this felt by the pious Argyle, when brought to an infamous trial and made to experience how important the warning, "put not your trust in princes." This perjured man, the second Charles, had, only the year previous, sworn before high heaven that he would maintain for his Scottish subjects their presbyterian discipline. Yet now, in August 1661, he sends a letter to the Scottish Council, in which, after flattering some, cajoling and bribing others, and using every stratagem that unprincipled courtiers could help him to devise, he tells them of the *inconvenience* of presbyterianism to his government, its utter inconsistency with monarchy. "Wherefore," concludes he, "we declare our firm resolution to interpose *our royal authority* for restoring the Church of Scotland to its right government by bishops." So much for "*our royal authority*" trampling in the dust "The Solemn League and Covenant" it was sworn to protect. So much for the choice of a *convenient* church, fitted to suit the royal taste and despotic will of the second Charles. How often shall his arbitrary measures to destroy the Presbyterian church recall

to our minds his hackneyed slander, "that presbyterianism was not a fit religion for a gentleman." A pity, after all, that this poor specimen of a gentleman, loaded with perjury and weltering in debasement, could not die without the Pope's blessing! When he had found that his bishops had done him no good, what could the Pope's blessing do for his wretched soul?

And did this wicked court call a parliament? And was this parliament so mean as to second such high-handed tyranny? And was a proclamation immediately issued announcing the restoration of bishops, prohibiting meetings of Synods and Assemblies, and forbidding all preaching against the change on pain of imprisonment? It was even so, and nothing leaves a darker blot on the history of Scotland, than the seeming ease with which the change was effected; and justly did the men who *then* sat in parliament merit the taunt of an English his-
thrian, that "Presbytery fell without the honor of a dissolution." But did it fall? We shall see. We could tell of members of that parliament, earth's nobility, who had become wearied of Christ's yoke, now that they had acquired a taste for the licentiousness of manners which was introduced at the Restoration. We could tell of the flatteries of a set of avaricious courtiers. We could tell of the wicked Sharp and *two* others, who basely betrayed the cause of their church and country; for we will not include the pious, talented, amiable, but *latitudinarian* Leighton, whose rich commentary on Peter all must admire and appreciate. We could tell of the fomenting of jealousies, and much more which the history of the times reveals; but the same history also tells us of the eloquence and the courage of the champions of the covenant; and we know that it was not until the time had come when most of the eminent men who had guided in councils were either in the dust, or sinking in the vale of years, that the tyrants dared make the wicked attempt; and we could tell, that notwithstanding all that had been done to corrupt and alienate, the great body of the people were as staunch presbyterians as ever; that a large number of the nobility were not ashamed of the covenant their fathers had signed; and that, as regarded the ministers, not one Presbytery or Synod in Scotland, with the exception of the Synod of Aberdeen, disgraced itself by yielding one jot to prelacy.

But the die was now cast, and Sharp, Fairfoul and Hamilton, (Leighton, ashamed of his company, left them ere they entered Edinburgh,) came down from London with full canonical powers to "absolve" *all* who would confess their sin in signing or adhering to the covenant. The ruling party were now swelled to the utmost, and parliamentary enactments came thick and fast, and still it was not enough to satisfy those who wished, if possible, ere the year would close, to annihilate every root and branch of presbyterianism.

The 29th of May, 1662, the anniversary of the king's restoration, was ordered to be kept as "a holy day to the Lord," and to carry out the spirit of profanity, "on this day the Covenants were torn in pieces at the cross of Edinburgh by the hands of the common hangman;" and the same was kept in Linlithgow and other towns with like honors by a hired soldiery, and others inflamed by ardent spirits. How heavily beat the hearts of those who in tears witnessed these proceedings! More than one aged minister, like Eli, died of grief, when they saw this daring affront to the God of Heaven.

The Courts of the Presbyterian Church were now closed, and in this way was her voice hushed. Still, as the ministers were yet permitted to occupy their pulpits, each Sabbath brought a rest and refreshing for God's people. This, however, could not last long. It was soon deemed insufferable by Sharp and his associates, that these ministers, such men as Rutherford, Dickson, Livingston, Welsh, &c. &c., should dare preach, without owning the authority of a superior bishop. And so "parliament ordained that all ministers should wait upon the diocesan courts, on pain of being held contemners of royal authority." To enforce this act, the Earl of Middleton, who was the king's representative in Scotland; made a tour through the western part of the country, and the scenes of drunkenness, profanity and kindred wickedness which disgraced this circuit, could not be rehearsed without exciting feelings of disgust. At Glasgow, the Archbishop, Fairfoul, complained to Middleton that, notwithstanding the act of parliament, not *one* of the ministers had owned him superior bishop, and suggested the passing of another act and proclamation, banishing all those ministers from their churches and mansees who had been admitted since 1649, when patronage

was abolished, unless they would submit to the authority of the bishop of the diocese before the 1st of November. This was agreed to, and the proclamation was to be made on the 4th of October, giving the ministers less than a month's warning, either to sacrifice their consciences and their soul's birth-right of liberty, or be driven out upon the charity of the world with their wives and little ones. "Duke Hamilton told me," says Burnet, speaking of the counsel who passed this act and proclamation, "they were all so *drunk* that day that they were not capable of considering any thing that was laid before them, and would hear of nothing but executing the law without delay." And the military were ordered to pull the ministers out of their pulpits if they should dare, after the 1st of November, either preach or pray. Sir James Loudon's was the only dissenting voice. He told his fellow counselors that from what he knew of these ministers, he was sure that, before they would bow the knee to prelacy, they would suffer more than the loss of their stipends. The Archbishop, judging others by his own grovelling and perjured soul, maintained that there would not be *ten* in his diocese who would refuse to comply. And Middleton *sneered* at the mere supposition of men throwing themselves and their families in penury on the wide world, for the sake of a good conscience.

Yes, the act was passed and the proclamation made, and when

"Chill November's surly blasts
Made fields and forests bare,"

nearly 400 ministers came out from their homes with their wives and their children, determined to brave the angry storms of winter, rather than an angry God.

On one Sabbath day 400 churches were closed and silent, while the people met in groups to weep and pray; aye, and to *rejoice*, that those beloved pastors who had been so long feeding them in the green pastures of Gospel ordinances, were now enabled to give *proof* that *they* were true successors of the apostles, who held not their lives dear so that God might be glorified.

"Scotland," says Wodrow, "was never witness to such a Sabbath as the last on which these ministers preached; and there is perhaps no parallel to it, except another Sabbath pre-

ceding the 18th of May, 1843.* This first of November was indeed a "Sabbath of weeping" not to be described. Bursts of sorrow, long and loud, which could not be restrained, would again and again interrupt the psalm or the prayer.

We shall be pardoned if we again refer to that courageous and faithful champion, Mr. John Welsh, the minister of Irongray, a beautiful country parish near Dumfries. His energetic character and his great popularity were so well known to the prelates, that they sent an order by one Maxwell, a papist, to apprehend him, should he not leave at the very hour appointed. The 1st of November came, and every member of the church, young and old, men and women, the whole parish, assembled to convey their minister a little on his way, and the mournful procession followed him to the banks of the stream Cluden; "the murmuring waters of the Cluden," made classic by the "Ploughman Poet," where he was to mount his horse and bid adieu. At this place he paused, and men, women and children clung to him on all sides, and refused to part with him. With a heart almost broken Mr. Welsh knelt down upon the green sod, and the whole multitude followed his example, while one of the ministers beside him led in earnest prayer. This being over, and resolving not to be detained, in a moment he sprung to his horse, dashed into the stream and rode quickly away, while several of the youth of both sexes rushed into the shallow water, and followed him on the other side as long as he was in sight, rent the air with their cries and lamentations.

Many such and even more deeply affecting scenes took place, but we care not to do more than to *point* to the times that ought never to be forgotten. "They who sow in tears shall reap in joy," and how this promise has been fulfilled in the experience of our venerable church, is known full well. Let those who have conscientiously adopted her pure standards, see that they act up to their profession. Let us feel sure that we have entered in at the strait gate, ere we imagine that we are walking in the narrow way. There is such a thing as being a member of Christ's church, and being *no* member of

*The mind cannot keep from reverting also to English history, and to St. Bartholomew's day, when 2000 Presbyterian ministers were ejected for non-conformity. A stroke of policy from which the Church of England has not recovered down to this day.

Christ. There is such a thing as being zealous for the church of our fathers, and having *no* zeal for the honor of Christ. Let us ever keep in mind the words of the Saviour to Nicodemus, and let us see that our whole walk and conversation be in accordance with that law of love, the keeping of which, we are told, is the proof of our being indeed the disciples of the meek and lowly Jesus. M.

From the Christian Instructor.

The Assembly's Shorter Catechism.

At a very early period Catechisms were in use. The Reformed Churches of Europe, especially the Scottish, held them in high estimation, and used them with signal benefit. But of all which have ever been drawn up, that of the Westminster Assembly holds a pre-eminent place. At the time of its composition, there was an absolute necessity that something of this kind should be prepared and circulated; for of the Catechisms that were in general use, some contained erroneous views of the gospel, others were infested with the leprosy of Rome; and others still, were deficient in presenting any complete system of divine truth. The one hundred and twenty-one divines, therefore, who assembled at Westminster in 1643, perceiving this state of things, proceeded to devise a remedy. That remedy was the preparation and general use of some proper form of catechetical instruction. Accordingly, before they had finished the Confession of Faith, they made some progress in this work. The committee to whom it was assigned, were men adequate to the task; men deeply imbued with the spirit of true religion; indeed, men fully sensible of their dependence upon God, and of their being called to transact business of a sacred and most momentous character. It need not trouble us if we cannot ascertain the author of the original draught, or whether each had his own part assigned him; suffice it to know that it was unanimously approved. And now, after a lapse of some two hundred years, the work will speak for itself, telling the ability of its authors, and showing that the Lord eminently qualified them for presenting to the church

and to the world, a complete and perfect summary of evangelical truth. The humility which characterized those who were engaged in this work, and the prosperity which accompanied them, may be strikingly seen in the following incident. It is reported, that when they had come to the question, "What is God?" they all felt the unapproachable sublimity of the divine idea suggested by these words; all shrunk from the too sacred task, in awe-struck, reverential fear. At length it was resolved, as an expression of the committee's deep humility, that Mr. George Gillespie, the youngest member, should first make the attempt. He consented, but begged that the brethren would first unite with him in prayer for divine enlightenment, and thus in slow and solemn accents, he used in the introductory part, the very words which were afterwards written down, and adopted as the most perfect answer that could be conceived, and which now stand in the Catechism verbatim. This strikingly unfolds the success they experienced in such an arduous and weighty undertaking; such success, indeed, as shows that the Lord was with them in every answer. As a whole, it cannot fail to excite our wonder that uninspired men could have produced a work so thoroughly complete in its design and execution. There seems to be nothing wanting. The language is simple and scriptural; the arrangement is admirably calculated to assist the memory; the summary and detail of religious truths comprehensive, and the whole bears upon its face every mark of conciseness, clearness, excellence and truth. It is of itself a complete body of divinity.

It was laid before the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, and being approved, was afterwards ratified by the Scottish parliament, and in the year 1648 was issued for public use. From that moment to this, it has been a holy textbook in Scotland and other parts of the United Kingdom, and it has happily found its way to this country. It formed a part of the precious freight of the May Flower, which bore the pilgrims across the boisterous deep, from the land of oppression and tyranny. They would not be tempted to leave it. To them it claimed a place next to the Bible, and was considered a treasure never to be resigned. The martyrs, who sealed their testimony with their blood, clasped it to their hearts, and it is still loved by those who hold reformation principles, and who

desire to walk in the good old way. Its very name, to many, is connected with sweet associations, bearing them back to days gone by; to the school-room, to the parental fireside, and to the annual diets convened by the minister, where they often studied this Catechism, and received salutary instructions from the sacred truths it contains. And now, can any be so lost to all good, as to discard that which their fathers loved so much, and bequeathed to them with so many prayers? Or is it so, that any bearing the Presbyterian name have altogether rejected it? Yes, it is a lamentable fact, that there are too many who are thus characterized; they have freely exchanged it for something new. Old-fashioned and time-honored things must hold no place in their vocabulary. Their craving appetite for novel productions, renders the wholesome food which the Catechism contains insipid; but is this reasonable, is it just, to reject it because it is of ancient date, irrespective of its worth? On this principle, the Bible itself might be rejected. If, indeed, it had nothing but antiquity to recommend it, it would alter the case, but when it is made up of sterling worth, then it demands the approval and preference of all. Because it is founded upon, and agreeable to the word of God, and embraces the glorious doctrines and practical truths of Christianity, it deserves and claims a welcome reception from us. Others may be disposed to discard it, because they have been brought somehow to think that it is exclusively Presbyterian, but this view is in direct opposition to the facts in the case. It was framed to meet the wants of all. The great majority of those who composed the Assembly were Episcopalians and Independents, and, therefore, seeing it received their unqualified approbation, it cannot be called Presbyterian, any more than an Episcopal, or an Independent Catechism. All, therefore, should adhere to it, and love it; but alas! when we look around us, how comparatively limited is its circulation. Into many places you might go, and not find this Catechism at all; or if, perchance, you happen upon *one*, and make inquiry how much of it has been treasured up in the memory of each individual, the answer will be humiliating and sad.

But are there any connected with the department of the Church to which we more immediately belong, who do not prize the Catechism above rubies, and who do not familiarize

themselves with its precious truths? Wherever such carelessness is evidenced, you may expect to find a decay of religion. Are there any elders among us who neglect their families in this point of view, and who leave the whole burden and labor upon the pastor? Are there any parents who can let week day and Sabbath pass, without calling their households together, to receive catechetical instruction? Are there children who would be more desirous of some worthless tale, than those of the contents of the Catechism? And are there any ministers who neglect to enforce the necessity of properly estimating it, from house to house? If there be any such, who may cast their eye upon such interrogatories, I would say, let this be said no more concerning you. Elders, you are bound to perform this duty; your families require it, and the Church demands it from you. Parents, have you not promised to train up your children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord, and is this not a very profitable way of doing so? Youth, love the Catechism, commit it to memory at an early hour in life, and let the truths it embraces have a place in your heart. Brethren in the ministry, if we forget our duty here, we need not look for the performance of it from our people. A great responsibility lies upon us to love this precious boon, and transmit it to posterity. The Church can look to this Catechism as the means of preserving and delivering her from many furious attacks of the enemy, and raising embankments against floods of innovations, which threaten speedy destruction. It has been a bond of union, and will remain so. Should it not be appreciated and loved? In speaking of its value, Dr. Bel-
frage remarks: "Amidst the jealousy and rivalry of contending parties, it has been a centre of union, in which the faith and charity of good men have met, and in seasons of innovation, when a veneration for what is ancient is derided as the freak of imbecility or prejudice; when the march of intellect is the pretext for every change, however presumptuous or violent, and when all the foundations of the earth seem out of course, this summary of the truth remains uninjured and revered, and it will continue to be an exhibition and defence of true religion and undefiled, before God and the Father, to the latest age." Oh, may we all "hold fast the form of sound words," as contained in the Assembly's Catechism, that we

may be "rooted and built up in Christ, and established in the faith, as we have been taught, abounding therein with thanksgiving." S. T.

Calvinism—its Gloom—its Fruits.

[We take the following extracts from an address by Dr. LAPSLEY, when the corner-stone of the first Presbyterian Church of Nashville was laid. The address was published in the Presbyterian Record.—EDS.]

The Calvinistic system thus understood and thus presented to the view of men, built upon the rock of eternal truth, fortified by the words of scripture, the will of God expressed; the doctrines all clustering around the cross, and deriving their efficacy from it, is a beautiful, compact, lucid system of undying truth, a column of living light emanating from the sun of righteousness, the eternal source of light, directing the footsteps of the pilgrims of earth in the ways of peace.

Hume, the historian and infidel philosopher, calls it "*the gloomy system.*" But in the same breath, acknowledges that Edwards on the Will seals the gloomy system; i. e. proves it. This admission is significant; but, his attempts to overthrow it are still more so. And how? Not by fair and manly argument, but by sophistry, by attacking first principles, attempting to unsettle the foundations of all knowledge, and to bring about universal skepticism.

The System was no doubt fraught with gloom and terror to that subtle and malignant enemy of all the righteous, and to all who are like-minded with him. His proud spirit disdained a superior, and was fully set on self-indulgence and sin; and this system sealed his doom; hence his abhorrence of it. But the practical effects of the system are the very antipodes of the gloomy. These doctrines, when properly understood, carry joy and gladness into the heart of the humble penitent, in every condition of life; brighten to him the gloom of the death struggle, and throw wide to him the portals of eternal day.—The system is simply the message of God's love—his eternal love to sinful men, and his plan of saving them. Or, in other

words, it is "*the story of the cross*," related more fully. "*God is love.*" The very essence of God is love. His bosom from all eternity yearned over dying sinners, whom he saw lying under condemnation and in deep sorrow. This prompted the gift of his well beloved son, "*God so loved the world as to give his only begotten son*" to die for them. This holy, this self-caused love of the eternal Essence is no blind passion venting itself at random. It had its object and its end. Its object was the souls of men. Its end their restoration to holiness and eternal bliss. The details of the plan of effecting this are spread out at length in the Scriptures, and recorded in a condensed view in our Confession. And need you to be informed that this plan is ordered in all things and sure; that the covenant of grace sealed by the blood of the Son of God shall never be disannulled?—that "*Messiah shall see of the travail of his soul and be satisfied!*" While Jehovah is on the throne of the universe he will fulfil all his pleasure, and not one word of all that He hath spoken shall fall to the ground; nor shall his purpose fail. His attributes are the guarantee that there shall be no miscarriage in the grand result.

The effect of this system on the race *may* be traced as with lines of light running back from this point to the bloody hill of death. Wherever these doctrines are understood, and believed, and conformed to, there man has been, there man is free and happy; and in due proportion to the accuracy of his views and attachment to the system.

We might anticipate this in view of the principles involved: The system places the Deity on the throne, secures the glory of the Messiah, relies on the agency of the promised Spirit to accompany the gospel of the ever-blessed God, proclaims free salvation through faith in the risen Saviour, and urges immediate and unconditional acceptance of the generous offer, in view of the retributions of eternity! A system such as that, can not fail of success, where ever it finds its way to the bosom of a generous man. The history of the past and present proves this remark true. In the days of the apostles, these doctrines were preached in their simplicity, and their power was omnipotent;—the primitive church, the witnesses of the truth during the long dark, long and bloody reign of Anti-christ,—the Reformers of the 16th century, the Huguenots of France, the Puritans;

the Presbyterians of all distinctions and periods, with one exception are Calvinists, and they stand out in the world's history as men and christians of a peculiar mould—have produced more patriots and philanthropists than all others besides. . . . And the Presbyterian church at this very hour stands with her armor on, and ready to do battle for the King, on any field in the wide earth. She will stand in the breach, or she will lead the way, as the Master calls. Clad in her principles, with the captain of salvation at her head, she confers not with flesh and blood, and her watchword is onward.

I will close these hasty remarks, with a brief notice of the genius of our system, and its bearing on the free Institutions of the country.

1. The spirit and form of the Presbyterian government is strictly republican—a federal representative government, in which the people choose their own rulers and teachers in religion—a government in which a man is tried by his peers, and may, if he desire it, have three or even four chances for justice, by appeal to higher courts; a government in which the balance of power in the courts, is in favor of the laity, and against the clergy, and hence it is impossible for the power to concentrate into the hands of the bishops, or to be usurped by them. Our system therefore is opposed to all monopoly, and oppression of every form, and stands forth a fearless advocate of liberty, and the rights of man.

Gibbon says: "After we pass the difficulties of the first century we find the Episcopal form universally established, till it was interrupted by the *republican* spirit of the Swiss and German reformers; for Calvin, though born in France, was a Swiss reformer."

Bishop Horsely says: "Calvin was unquestionably a *republican* in theory." His success in establishing the Republic of Geneva, and in restoring the government by Presbytery as in the beginning, is a monument to his imperishable fame.

Bancroft attributes high merit to Calvin and to Presbyterians as republicans and promoters of the cause of American Independence.

Galloway, the apologist of the English government, ascribes the origin of the revolution mainly to the Presbyterians.

Another author, of kindred spirit, says, "Believe me sir,

the Presbyterians have been the chief instigators in all these flaming measures, for their *restless* and *anti-monarchical* spirit which has *always distinguished them every where.*" What agency they had in producing the difficulty with England is not known, yet when the collision came, their zeal and effectual service are known and read by all men. The Synods of New York and Philadelphia, the highest court of the church at that time, addressed a pastoral letter to all the churches under their care, exhorting them to union and zeal in the great struggle. And they set the example, of personal effort, and self-sacrificing in the common cause; especially in the South. The battles of King's mountain and of the Cowpens, where the best blood of the colonies was poured out like water, were fought on our side, mainly by Presbyterians. Gen. Pickens, who planned the battle of the Cowpens, and Col. Morgan who fought it, were Presbyterian elders. Cols. Campbell, Williams, Cleveland, Shelby and Sevier, than whom braver men or better officers drew not the sword in the cause of our country, were members of the Presbyterian church. Their religion and forms of church government fanned the flame of patriotism and made them strong in the day of battle.

It is believed by some, who have investigated the subject, that the style and tone of the Declaration of Independence was not a little influenced by the solemn league and covenant of the Scotch Presbyterian church. How that is, we know not; yet one thing is doubtless true, that is, when that instrument was first read in the House, there was dead stillness, and a solemn awe on the stoutest hearts, in view of the boldness of the position assumed, and of the tremendous issues of the contest. At that fearful crisis, the destiny of half the globe hung on a single hair, and the venerable Witherspoon, a Presbyterian minister, broke the death-like stillness, and said:

"There is a tide in the affairs of men, a nick of time. We see it now before us. To hesitate is to consent to our own slavery. That noble Instrument, upon your table, which insures immortality to its author, should be subscribed this very morning, by every hand in the house. He that will not respond to its contents, and strain every nerve to carry into effect its provisions, is unworthy the name of a freeman. For my part, of property, I have some, of reputation more. That reputation is staked, that pro-

party is pledged on the issues of this contest. And although these gray hairs must soon descend into the sepulchre, I would infinitely prefer that they should descend thither by the hand of the executioner, than desert the cause of my country.

This great and good man was one of the founders of the Presbyterian Church in the United States, and his is the spirit of our people and the genius of our system.

We will state a fact in the history of Presbyterianism in Virginia, that further illustrates the tendency of our system. The fact is this: after the Revolution, the Legislature, being about to make provision for the support of religion by law, the ministers of the Presbyterian church got up a remonstrance, with the names of 10,000 Virginians, and confronted that body with it. One of their number, Rev. John Blair Smith, was heard at the bar of the House three successive days and defeated the bill. This led to entire freedom of conscience in the States.

The recent movement of the church of Scotland, is a specimen of the moral sublime. You see the true church arise, and go forth, leaving their livings, their churches, their glebes, all behind, and undertaking to build new foundations throughout the kingdom, and trust the God of truth for subsistence rather than compromise the honor of Zion's king, or submit to spiritual domination.

That is a specimen of true Presbyterianism.

Such is the bearing of our system, the spirit of our people, and the system of instruction appropriate to the house we shall build on this Rock.

AGREEABLE INTELLIGENCE.—The ship Bowditch, which left Boston in October with thirteen missionaries of the American Board and eight of the Baptist Board, arrived at Madras in safety on the 19th of February. Those only who have felt the emotions of a husband and parent's heart, can conceive of the greeting Mrs. Winslow and her daughter received on their arrival, from a husband and father.—*American Messenger.*

Missionary,

[We give some extracts from the *Missionary Herald*, containing interesting accounts.—Eds.]

SANDWICH ISLANDS.

LETTER FROM MR. COAN, SEPTEMBER 1, 1848.

Hilo and Puna.

On returning from our last general meeting, I found that the religious interest which had been gradually rising among my people during the previous year, had not subsided, but was rather on the increase. I soon made a tour through Hilo, and found the natives every where assembled in crowds to welcome the return of their missionary. Their houses of worship were carpeted with mats or fresh grass; food had been provided in abundance; and all classes were waiting to hear the Word. Harmony and love prevailed in the church, and the disciples "had a mind to work."

Returning from Hilo, I visited Puna. Here the interest was deeper and more extensive than in Hilo, affecting nearly the entire population, and strongly reminding me of those glorious and memorable years which reached from 1836 to 1840. Our meetings were every where full and solemn; and many followed from village to village to hear the gospel.

On approaching a place near the middle of Puna, about sunset on Saturday, I found several hundreds, men, women and children, arranged in single file, and prepared to tender their welcome. As soon as I arrived at the house, the whole line moved forward in perfect order, each one presenting a small fish or a bundle of native food, and each one wishing to shake hands and express his "aloha." The whole company were thus led up, one by one; and then all wheeled and marched off to their place of worship. Late as it was, and weary as I was, I went thither and preached the Word. I afterwards found that they had deposited three hundred and seventy fish (mostly flying fish) and ninety-three bundles of food as a personal present, besides what they gave as a monthly concert contribution. After distributing among the natives who accompanied me what food and fish they needed, I recommend-

ed that the rest should be sold at a low rate, and the proceeds thrown into the funds of the monthly concert; which was done.

This is the station where a most interesting work of grace commenced in the autumn of 1836; and from this point it spread until it covered the whole field. It was in this region, and at the time alluded to, that the people so pressed upon me to hear the Word of God, that I had no leisure so much as to eat; and on one day I preached three times in as many villages before breakfast. It was here that hundreds thronged my path whenever I moved from village to village, many following me from place to place, sometimes to the distance of forty miles, to hear the gospel from day to day. Hundreds of those who then wept and trembled before God, are now the most humble, docile and devoted members of the church. Multitudes remember and often quote the text that first alarmed them and led them to the Lamb of God.

A somewhat similar interest was manifested at nearly all the stations in Puna, on the occasion of my late visit. This interest still continues; and the prospects of the church have never been more encouraging than at the present time. Let God be praised for all; "for his mercy endureth forever!" He will not forsake the work of his hands.

NESTORIANS.

LETTER FROM MR. STOCKING, FEBRUARY 21, 1849.

The Seminaries—Mar Yohannan.

The narrative of the remarkable work of grace, now in progress among the Nestorians, is still farther contained in this communication of Mr. Stocking. Nothing has occurred in the history of modern missions, which is more intensely interesting than this simple recital of what the Lord has done by his mighty power:

In the last communication from Mr. Perkins, the characteristics of the revival in the male seminary at Seir were mentioned; and also the fact that there was a similar state of feeling in the female seminary. The depth and power of the work in both these institutions have manifestly increased. Convictions of the awful nature and evil of sin, as committed against a holy God and against his perfect law, have been deep and pungent. All who were formerly awakened, have passed through a season of deep and bitter repentings in view of their

backslidings, and have received a baptism of the Spirit, such as we have seldom, if ever, witnessed here or elsewhere. And with their awakening and renewed repentance, there has been a spiritual resurrection of the dead in trespasses and sins, in the midst of them and around them.

Mar Yohannan has become hopefully the subject of renewing grace. For a number of days he appeared to be in deep distress, struggling with the convictions of an enlightened conscience and a proud heart; but though hitherto so formal and heartless, and like a strong man having his goods in peace, he has seemed finally to be overcome. He now stands up before his people, apparently an humble, penitent and earnest preacher of the gospel, confessing himself to be the greatest sinner in his nation, and, in his own expressive language, "covered with their blood from the crown of his head to the soles of his feet." One of his first acts, after he had found peace for a distressed mind, was to go to Mar Shimon, the Patriarch, and preach to him the gospel he had opposed. He is now laboring, from day to day, to lead his people to the cross of Christ.

Deacon Isaac—The Priest of Charbash.

Deacon Isaac, the most intellectual and influential brother of the Patriarch, whose name has frequently been mentioned in our communications, appears to be a penitent and sincere believer in Jesus. Our pious natives behold with wonder and admiration the change in this man. By nature proud but frank, and disdaining every thing like hypocrisy, he now seems to be humble and very much afraid of self-deception. And though he is competent, by his superior knowledge of the truths of revelation, to teach the more intelligent of the people, he feels that he is benefitted by the conversation and prayers of the humblest pious child. His habits are entirely changed from those of a prayerless and worldly man, to one who daily commends himself and family to God, with the reading of the Holy Scriptures. He bears testimony in public and in private to the power and excellency of the gospel of Christ; and promises to become an able and valuable helper, both here and in the mountains. His great apprehension now is that he may not endure to the end.

A vacation occurring in the seminary at Seir, two of the

teachers and a number of the pupils, belonging to Geog Tapá, repaired thither on Saturday, hoping to witness special tokens of divine favor; and on their way they had a prayer meeting, in one of the lodges of the vineyards through which they passed, for a blessing on their labors. The meeting in the church at evening prayers, where about two hundred were assembled, was of considerable interest. Addresses to the congregation were made by the teachers from the two seminaries and other young men; some of whom appealed most tenderly to their parents and friends, entreating them to forsake their sins and turn unto the Lord. To them the scene which followed was one of thrilling interest. The whole congregation appeared to be moved, and those unaccustomed to weep were much affected. On Sabbath morning a special messenger was sent to the city, requesting Mar Yohannan and myself to come to the village and aid them in the services of the day. On reaching the place we found a large assembly at the house of Mar Elias, listening to an exhortation from Priest Abraham. Mar Yohannan was called upon to address the assembly; which he did in an affecting manner, not having before seen them since the change in his own feelings. He spoke of himself as the chief of sinners, as having led more souls to destruction than any other of his people; and as being all covered with their blood. In regard to the sheep or people of his diocese, he said, the fattest he had eaten; the poorest he had cast away; the lame, the maimed, the sick, he had wholly neglected. He declared that an awful weight of sin rested upon him; and he entreated them no longer to look to their bishops for salvation; but to repent immediately and turn to God. At the close of an earnest appeal, the younger priest Abraham, the acting priest of the village; arose and made a most humble confession of his sins as their priest, in leading them quietly along in carnal security and unbelief, and, next to the bishops, as stained most deeply with their blood. In a most pathetic manner he entreated them, one and all, to attend to the salvation of their souls. This priest has been recently awakened for the first time; and he now gives evidence, by an humble and consistent Christian life, and by his efforts to save the souls he has been leading to ruin, of having come to an experimental knowledge of the truth.

THE
Calvinistic Magazine.

[NEW SERIES.]

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

Vol. IV.

June, 1849.

No. 6.

The Believer Possessor of all Things.

A SERMON,

BY THE LATE REV. GEORGE A. MATTHES.

I COR. 3: 22, 23.—*"All are yours, and ye are Christ's, and Christ is God's."*

It has ever been one of the imperfections of human nature to glory in men. The Jews prided themselves in their descent from Abraham, and thought God's covenant mercies their own exclusive right on that account. This error soon showed itself in the Gospel church also. The christians at Corinth gloried in their ministers, to the dishonor of God and the injury of piety in their hearts. The Apostle rebukes them, and says, "While one saith, I am of Paul, and another, I am of Apollos, are ye not carnal?" He then teaches them that those in whom they gloried were but feeble ministers, planting and watering, while God alone gave the increase. He carries on the same general thought until the verse preceding our text, where he draws this inference from his previous argument, "Therefore let no man glory in men." Then comes our text, containing an additional reason to enforce this inference, viz: that all things belong to christians—that even the ministry is ordained for their faith and sanctification. They are too much honored and blessed, therefore, to glory in men. In speaking on these words, we will,

- I. Show in what sense it is that Christ is God's.
- II. In what sense believers are Christ's.
- III. In what sense all things belong to believers.

I. Then, in what sense is Christ God's?

Certainly not in any sense which would rob Christ of his

divine equality with the Father, and make him a mere creature. For if Christ be a created being, the Scriptures cannot be relied on, since they ascribe to him the same perfections and works which they attribute to the Father.

It is true, Christ, as to his divine nature, is called the Son of God, not because he was inferior to the Father, but because he was eternally appointed to the work of Mediator. Although the Father and the Son were equal, yet the Father, according to previous covenant arrangements, had a right to appoint the Son to this work; and the Son, on the same principle, was bound to undertake this work when appointed by the Father. In this way Christ was the Son of God in his divine nature, and yet in that same nature he was equal with the Father. This leading ground of Christ's Sonship comprehends under it all those names, titles, offices and works of Christ which seem to argue his inferiority to the Father. Wherever Christ is spoken of *so*, as to show that he is under the authority of the Father, or in any way dependent upon him, it is to be explained as growing out of his appointment by the Father to the work of Mediator. Let us notice a few passages which seem to show Christ's dependence and subjection to the Father, and the senses in which he is God's. Heb. 10: 5—"Wherefore, when he cometh into the world, he saith, sacrifice and offering thou wouldest not, but a body thou hast prepared me." The Apostle here represents Christ as addressing these words to his Father when he entered this world in human form. If Christ was not mistaken, then, in this address, his human body was prepared or created for him by his Father; Christ, then, as to his material body, was the creature of God. But so far as he was God's creature, so far was he inferior to God and dependent upon him. Here then is one sense in which Christ is God's—he is God's creature.

Take another passage, Isaiah 42: 1—"Behold my servant whom I uphold,—I have put my spirit upon him: he shall bring forth judgment to the Gentiles," &c. We are sure that these words refer to Christ, because St. Matthew quotes them, and applies them directly to Christ.—(Chap. 12.) Again, these words allude to Christ, not as God absolutely and alone, but as God and man united in one person, carrying on his great mediatorial work. Now as Christ, in all this work, is under

the appointment and direction of his Father, therefore he may be regarded in this sense as inferior to the Father, and as rendering service to him. Hence, in this passage, he is called God's "servant." Here then is another scripture sense in which Christ is God's; he is God's "servant."

Observe next, that Christ, according to Scripture, is the prophet of God. Acts 3: 22, "For Moses truly said, a prophet shall the Lord your God raise up unto you of your brethren, like unto me, him shall ye hear in all things, whatsoever he shall say unto you." These are the words of Peter, in which he repeats the substance of a prophecy of Moses, recorded in the 18th chapter of Deuteronomy. This prophecy is allowed to be one of the clearest predictions which Moses ever uttered concerning Christ. And Peter, in quoting it, applies it to Christ, in his address to the Jews. Here then is clear Scripture proof that Christ is a prophet. If it should be inquired, what Christ does in his capacity as a prophet? we reply in the language of our Confession of Faith—"Christ executeth the office of a prophet, in his revealing to the church in all ages, by his word and spirit, in divers ways of administration, the whole will of God, in all things concerning their edification and salvation." Our Confession here plainly teaches that the whole will of God, as we have it in the Bible, was made known to mankind, not by the Father himself, but by Christ, acting as the prophet of God. Our Confession sustains all this by references to Holy Writ, which we need not repeat. But it may be asked, how Christ made known the Scriptures to us, since we are taught that these Scriptures were revealed by the inspiration of the Holy Spirit? We answer, this difficulty is entirely removed by observing that Christ, in filling up his prophetic office, reveals to us the Sacred Scriptures *through* the agency of the Holy Spirit. Now, since Christ was raised up and clothed with his prophetic office by the Father, it is proper to say that he is God's prophet. Here seems another sense, then, according to the Scriptures, in which Christ is God's—he is God's "prophet."

We remark next, that Christ is also a priest, under the designation of his Father. This has been admitted and believed by all christians in all ages. The writer of the epistle to the Hebrews uses these words concerning Christ's priesthood—

“The Lord sware, and will not repent, thou art a priest forever after the order of Melchisedec.” The plain import of this seems to be, that God the Father, by an oath, conferred an everlasting priesthood on his race. But that Christ received his priesthood from the Father, is taught by the Apostle also in another place, where he says of the priest’s office, “No man taketh this honor unto himself, but he that is called of God, as was Aaron;” and then applies this to Christ, to show that *he* did not assume the honor of the priesthood, but was called to it of God. Certainly, then, we may affirm that Christ is constituted a priest by his Father. Christ’s work as priest is brought to view in our Confession under the following words:—“Christ executeth the office of a priest in his once offering up himself, a sacrifice to satisfy divine justice, and reconcile us to God, and in making continual intercession for us.”—[See ans. 25 ques. Short. Cat.] This language, sustained as it is by the Bible, shows us the great work which Christ, as a priest, performs, presenting in the offering of himself, such a satisfaction to the divine government and justice, as to place guilty men in a condition to be reconciled and saved, and then to intercede for them, on the ground of the offering which he made. Christ was appointed a priest by the Father to do all this great work for dying sinners. Christ then is God’s, in the sense of being his appointed priest, thus to make atonement and intercession between himself and guilty men.

In the next place, Christ is invested with kingly authority by the Father, as the Scriptures teach. Isa. 9: 6, 7—“For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given, and the government shall be upon his shoulder, and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, the Mighty God, the Everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace. Of the increase of his government and peace, there shall be no end, upon the throne of David and upon his kingdom to order it and to establish it.” That this language alludes to the peaceful and righteous reign of Christ as a king, is evident from the face of it—it sets forth his kingly authority—it points to the functions of his kingly office. And that Christ was made a king by his Father, is evident from the 2d Psalm, where God himself says of Christ, “I have set my king upon my holy hill of Zion.” Christ’s work as king is thus brought to view by our Confession of

Faith, (see an. 45 ques. larg. cat.)—"Christ executeth the office of a king in calling out of the world a people to himself, and giving them officers, laws and censures, by which he visibly governs them; in bestowing saving grace upon his elect, rewarding their obedience, and correcting them for their sins—restraining and overcoming all their enemies, and powerfully ordering all things for his glory and their good; and also in taking vengeance on the rest, who know not God, and obey not the Gospel." This language may be called an epitome of what the Scriptures say on this point. According to it, Christ's kingly work consists of two great parts—first, in exercising a suitable government over his elect people and church, and in finally crowning and rewarding them in heaven. And secondly, in subduing and consigning to punishment all those who know not God, and reject and disobey the Gospel. God set Christ as his king on his holy hill, to administer this government over saints and sinners. Christ, then again, is God's in the sense of being his appointed king, thus to rule and reign. The sum of what we have now said is, that Christ is God's Son as to his divine nature—God's creature as to his human body—God's servant, his prophet, priest, and king, in executing the plan of salvation. In all these respects, Christ, in the language of the text, "*is God's.*"

One more remark before we dismiss this part of the subject. Since Christ, as Mediator, doing the work of prophet, priest, king, &c., acts under the authority of the Father, it may be asked, in what sense, then, is he *equal* to the Father? We answer, in the highest possible sense—in essence, perfection and divinity. Christ is inherently and eternally equal to the Father, and one with him in the Godhead. But in the offices which he fills, in executing the plan of salvation, he acts under the authority of the Father. Christ is equal to the Father in *divinity*, but subordinate to him in *office* and in *work*. And these two are not inconsistent.

Let these remarks suffice on the first part of our subject.

II. In what sense is it that believers are Christ's?

1st. Believers are Christ's by creation. This is clearly established by the Scriptures. John 1: 3—"All things were made by him, and without him was not any thing made that was made." This language is used concerning the "*Word,*"

who is Christ himself. The creation of *all* things, then, is here ascribed to Christ. But if Christ created *all* things, then he created man; and if he created man, then he created believers, who are one portion of mankind. Believers, therefore, are Christ's by creation.

2d. Believers are Christ's, also, by a new creation to spiritual life and holiness. It is true the Holy Spirit is the efficient agent that regenerates the heart. It is *his* influences which produce this great moral change in sinful man. But let it not be forgotten that Christ *died* to procure these regenerating influences of the Spirit; and then, on the ground of his sufferings and death, intercedes that the Spirit may be sent to work this change. That powerful influence of the Spirit, therefore, which regenerates the heart, is procured in all cases by the death and intercessions of Christ. And this great fact gives to Christ the most solemn and inviolable right of property in every believer—in every new-born soul. Believers, therefore, are Christ's, in the high sense of having experienced, through *his* work of mediation, a new creation to holiness and good works.

3d. To expand or amplify this thought somewhat, we remark that believers are Christ's, by the right of purchase. They by nature were children of wrath even as others—once they were dead in trespasses and in sins—marshalled under the dark banners of Satan, and led captive by him at his will. This is originally the condition of all who become believers. But Christ paid his blood to purchase them from this captivity, and clothe them with the liberty of the gospel. In proof of this, read Acts, 20: 28—“Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock over which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the church of God, which he hath purchased with his blood.” This is part of an address delivered by Paul to the elders, or in other words, to the ministers of the church at Ephesus. The Apostle exhorts them to fidelity in their pastoral duties—especially to feed the church of God, which he has purchased with his blood—the church of *Christ*, which *he* purchased with his blood; for *Christ* is truly God, as well as man, and it was *his* blood that flowed for the church. Language could not be used that would more literally teach that believers are Christ's by the right of purchase.

4th. Believers become Christ's brethren through their adoption into the family of God; and this adoption takes place through Christ. John 1: 12—"But as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God." The word *power* here, means privilege. To receive Christ is to believe on him. This text, then, shows that Christ grants to those who believe on him the privilege of becoming the sons of God, or of adoption into God's family. Eph. 1: 5—"Having predestinated us unto the adoption of children by Jesus Christ." Gal. 4: 4, 5—"But when the fullness of time was come, God sent forth his Son—to redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons." Both these texts represent Christ as procuring for believers their adoption into the family of God. On the ground of this adoption, Christ calls believers his brethren. John 20: 17—"Jesus saith unto her, Touch me not, for I am not yet ascended to my Father; but go to my brethren, and say unto them, I ascend to my Father," &c. Christ calls his disciples his *brethren*, because they were the adopted children of God. And the same is true of all Christ's followers. Believers, being thus the brethren of Christ, members of the same family with him, are represented as being also joint-heirs with him. Rom. 8. 17—"And if children, then heirs, heirs of God, and joint-heirs with Christ." A joint-heirship with Christ is here ascribed to believers, because they are the children of God; or which is equivalent, because they have been adopted into the family of God. Believers then, are Christ's, in the sense of being his brethren through their adoption into the same family with himself.

We see, then, that believers are Christ's by creation, by regeneration, by the right of purchase; and they are his brethren and fellow-heirs, by their adoption, *through him*, into the family of God. Believers then, are Christ's, in the highest, most emphatic, and most endearing senses.

Let these remarks suffice on the second part of our subject.

III. In what sense is it, that all things belong to believers? This sentiment, as expressed in the text, means that all things which have an influence on believers, shall result in their happiness. In the verses preceding our text, the Apostle enumerates those things which belong to believers. He says—

“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;”—all that the Apostle mentions shall be made subservient to the well-being of believers. We have this same sentiment expressed in different language, in Rom. 8: 28—“And we know that all things work together for good to them that love God—to them who are the called according to his purpose.” Paul, and Apollos, and Cephas, belong to believers; that is, ministers with their gifts, talents, piety and labors, are designed for the upbuilding and perfecting of the saints. They are the grand instruments, under God, of training the church militant on earth to join the church triumphant in glory. In this sense ministers belong to believers.

But the “world” also is theirs; that is, God exercises his providential government over the world for the great purpose of gathering in and redeeming his church and people. He upholds the present course of nature, directs the seasons, and orders the revolutions of worlds, in order that his chosen people may be collected from the four quarters of the earth, and brought safely home to heaven. In this sense, the world belongs to believers. But it is theirs also in another sense. That is, they shall possess and enjoy as much of it as is needful for them. There is a promise to this effect from the Saviour to his disciples. Matt. 6: 33—“But seek ye first the kingdom of God and his righteousness, and all these things shall be added unto you.” That is, first be a christian, and all needed temporal blessings shall be granted to you.

David testifies to the same thing, where he says of himself, “I have been young and now am old, yet have I not seen the righteous forsaken nor his seed begging bread.” These texts show that the world belongs to believers in such a sense as that they shall enjoy as much of it as is really needful for them.

“Life,” also, is the believer’s own, in a peculiar sense. The unbeliever, it is true, lives, but it is for his own destruction, since he despises and rejects the gospel. But believers live for their present and future well-being. Life to them is the season for making sure their heavenly inheritance. Life, then, is the believer’s, in the peculiar sense of being for his advantage, both here and hereafter. “Death,” too, is the believer’s. He has a delightful *interest* and *property*, even in death, which

is so commonly regarded as a calamity and curse. Death is that which ends the believer's pains and sorrows, and removes him to that state where no wave of distress will reach him forever—it is his entrance on the enjoyment of eternal repose and felicity. "It is that advantageous circumstance in the believer's history, which removes him from a world of woes and ills, and translates him to a world of glory." Death, then, is the believer's, in the sense of its being for his highest advantage and happiness.

Things present and things to come, are also the believer's. That is, all events which are now taking place, or which may hereafter happen to believers in this world, shall result in their happiness both here and hereafter. The apostle amplifies this same thought in Rom. 8: 38, 39—"For 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 us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord."—This language does prove positively that nothing whatever shall militate against the believer's happiness so far as to separate him from the love of God. This falls in precisely with the sentiment of the text—that all creatures, agencies, powers and events, present and to come, are in some way to promote the believer's final well-being. They are all *His*, in the sense of being auxiliary to his present enjoyment and to the future glory which awaits him.

And we may add here, that all the resources of God himself are to be employed for the believer, as often as necessity requires. This is proved by the pledges and assurances of protection which God has given to his people. He has promised never to forsake them, but to bestow upon them eternal life—to permit them to dwell in his peaceful presence forever. These promises are variously expressed, and many times repeated in the Sacred Volume. If God is a God of truth, then all the boundless resources of his wisdom, goodness and power, would be employed before one promise of his could be broken, or one child of his be plucked from his hand. The whole energies of the Godhead, then, so far as needful, are the believer's, in the sense that they are pledged to him for his protection and salvation. How true is it, then, in the sense explained,

that all things are the believer's. A few remarks and we are done.

1. Our subject carries a rebuke to those who glory in men—Christians early became guilty of this error. They placed, in some instances, a sort of idolatrous estimate on their ministers, and were ready to call themselves after the *names* of these ministers, one declaring he was of Paul, and another that he was of Apollos. The apostle rebukes this error in the plainest terms. The whole chapter, from which our text is taken, is an argument against it, and our text itself is a part of this argument. Let us then inquire whether this rebuke of the apostle may not be applicable to us? Is it certain that an improper attachment to ministers has not been *one* means of dividing us, and getting up that unhappy state of feeling which separates us from God's blessing? These questions certainly require to be answered.

But observe particularly, that it was the apostles themselves in whom the early christians gloried—it was not ordinary ministers *alone*, but inspired teachers and apostles, whom they overrated. And yet they are sternly rebuked by the Spirit of inspiration. What shall we say, then, of that idolatrous glorying in *political* men, which, like a mania, is overrunning our country and withering the piety of our members? Are these men better than the apostles, and is it therefore right thus to glory in them?

If Paul was here, would he sit still and see professors mingling in some disorderly crowd, singing and shouting the praises of some man as if he were a God and not a man? We hesitate not to say, that he would lift his voice in terms of remonstrance far stronger than when he rebuked the Corinthians for glorying in their ministers. My christian friends, let us not forget that there is a way, consistent with religion, of enjoying our rights as citizens, without glorying in man—without rendering any idolatrous worship to a favorite candidate.

2. Our subject furnishes ground for glorying in Christ. He is the great days-man, between God and guilty men, appointed to carry on a benevolent system of mediation, expressly to reconcile us and our offended Sovereign. He is a prophet raised up of God to enlighten us and to instruct us, by his word and spirit; in that heavenly wisdom without which there

is no salvation. He is a priest, called of God to make atonement for our sins, to advocate our cause, and to intercede for us at his Father's right hand. He is a king, placed by God on Zion's holy hill, to administer the divine government over the world, to give laws and regulations to his church and people, to protect them from every danger and enemy, and finally, to reward them in his upper kingdom, while he excludes and punishes all those who disobey the gospel. Does not Christ then sustain the most interesting relations to us? Is he not bound to us by ties the tenderest and most endearing? O, then, let us ever glory in him as our best friend—as our kind Redeemer.

3. In order to this, my christian friends, let us consider that we are Christ's most emphatically. He created us by his power, bought us with his blood, regenerated us by his Spirit, procured for us our adoption, and owns us as his brethren. He therefore has the most perfect right of property in us. And shall we forget him to whom we thus belong, and place our glorying in men? Who is there that has, or can have, such claims upon us as Christ has? And what black ingratitude is it to think more, as some men do, of a talented politician than of Christ—to be more grieved at his defeat for office than at the reproaches which sinners cast on the Saviour, and to do more to honor our favorite candidate, than to honor our blessed Redeemer? Is this the case, my friends, with any of us? Oh, how totally unprepared to dwell where Jesus is, if this is our condition!

4. Observe, that it is owing to Christ's government over the world that all things are to work together for the believer's good. It is Christ who makes life and death, and things past, present and to come, conspire to augment the happiness of his children. And this certainly increases our indebtedness to him if we are his children. But look beyond time, and anticipate the enjoyments which, as christians, you expect to realize. View that bright crown which you will wear, and those white robes which will adorn you. Think of your dear kindred and friends whom you will meet there, and of the anthems of praise which you and they will sing forever. And then remember that all this was purchased for you by Christ, and will you not then glory in him as your Saviour and your all? May God grant that we may ever bear in mind that we are not

our own, that we are Christ's, and expect to dwell with him forever, and to his name shall be the praise. Amen.

Characteristics of Presbyterianism.

The following extracts are from a discourse by Rev'd. Alex. Vancourt of St. Louis, published in the Religious Herald of that city:

We believe those doctrines to be true, and in accordance with the Word of God, which are usually termed "Calvinistic." We are not distinguished in this respect, for we are only one of the members of the very large Calvinistic family. A serious mistake prevails on this point to a very large extent, and among some whose information we would suppose was more accurate. It is imagined by many that the Presbyterian Church is about the only Calvinistic body in the world; that this feature is the only one which distinguishes us from other denominations; and that a sermon on Presbyterianism consists necessarily of a defence of Predestination and Perseverance. It is true that we hold to these doctrines just as far as the Scriptures warrant us in so doing. It is true that we are never unwilling to prove and defend them, because they are the truth of God. And it is true that the task of proving and defending them, somehow or other, usually falls to us, as does the task of contending for many a truth, when much is to be risked in the shape of popularity. But Presbyterianism is not Calvinism. The Calvinistic doctrines are found just as fully in the Creeds and Confessions of the Reformed Churches of Europe, the Established Church of England, the Wesleyan Methodists of Wales, and by the Congregational, Baptist, Protestant Episcopal, Dutch Reformed, Dutch Lutheran, and a number of other Churches of our land, as in those of the Scottish or American Presbyterian Churches. It is a notorious fact, and some whom we know should be ashamed to be ignorant of it, that at the time of the Reformation, while the Church of Rome remained Arminian in obedience to the Council of Trent, the entire Christian world became Calvinistic. In Germany, France, the United Provinces, and Great Britain, these sentiments were general. The fact that in any of these countries,

many Churches became Arminian subsequently, merely proves that those Churches are "fallen from grace."

When it is stated that we hold to the Calvinistic doctrines, we do not mean that *every opinion* held by that distinguished and godly reformer is adopted by us. While *the system* of doctrine called after his name is adopted by our Church in distinction from any other system, yet some of the opinions held by him we distinctly repudiate. He holds, or *seems* to hold, that a positively evil influence is exerted on the sinner in Reprobation, while our Confession teaches that the reprobates "harden themselves, even under those means which God useth for the softening of others;" also that the "dishonor and wrath" is for their sin inflicted." Calvin thinks the command, "Remember the Sabbath day," to be virtually abrogated, while we esteem it to be still binding. The system is called "Calvinistic," not because Calvin first framed it, or first wrote out its parts, for it was evidently framed in eternity, and was written out in the New Testament, and was believed and taught by Augustine in the fourth century. But because it was arranged more regularly by Calvin than it had been hitherto, and it stood out so luminously and prominently in the night and confusion of the dark ages, as to bear the appearance of *his system*, while it emanated really from a much higher source.

It is asserted in our Confession of Faith, and therefore known to the *intelligent* opposers of our system, that while we advocate the sovereignty of God and the final perseverance of the saints, yet our own wills are free, the "liberty or contingency of second causes is not taken away," and our own faith is the instrumental cause of salvation, while "it is God that worketh in us both to will and to do of his own good pleasure." Hence the sinner need not wait to ascertain whether his name is in the Lamb's book, but he is to repent, to believe, to obey, and continue "faithful unto death." The doctrines of Predestination and Perseverance have in them encouragement and assistance; for "He which hath begun a good work, will perform it until the day of Jesus Christ." God helps those who help themselves. We do not believe, then, that some are born to be saved, let them do their worst, or that some will be lost, let them do their best, or that Christ died exclusively for the elect; but we do believe that the work of salvation in the hearts of

believers is begun, carried on, and will be completed, by the grace of God, through the atonement of Christ. This, in human language, is our interpretation of the many passages of Scripture, asserting individual election and God's sovereignty.

We believe in the freedom of the conscience in all matters appertaining to religion. We are not alone in this tenet, for many a sister Church believes in it, as fully as we do. But it held a prominent place in our standards at a very early period; and there it stands at the present day in the following terms: "God alone is Lord of the conscience; and hath left it free from the doctrines and commandments of men, which are in any thing contrary to His word, or beside it in matters of faith or worship. Therefore they (the "Presbyterian Church in the United States of America,") consider the rights of private judgment, in all matters that respect religion, as universal and inalienable; they do not wish to see any religious constitution aided by the civil power, further than may be necessary for protection and security, and at the same time be equal and common to all others."

In perfect correspondence with this opinion, has been the conduct of the Presbyterians for centuries, "our enemies themselves being judges." Monarchy, both in Church and State, they have ever opposed, and with lawful weapons. Kingcraft and priestcraft they have ever held in abhorrence, and for the best of reasons. Churches without (prelatical) bishops, and States without kings have been planted by their instrumentality, and watered by their tears and blood. Presbyterians could starve, they could fight, they could endure ridicule, they could die for conscience sake, but they could never tamely submit to human control in matters of conscience.

The Huguenots, the Covenanters, the Puritans, the Free Church of Scotland, illustrate the views of Calvinistic Presbyterians more fully than any labored argument can do. Says Bancroft, "The faith of Calvin has ever been feared as the creed of Republicans." "The precious spark of liberty had been kindled and was preserved by the Puritans alone," says Carte, "a writer never accused of favoring the Puritans."—"Popular liberty, which used to animate its friends by appeals to the examples of ancient Republicans, now listened to a voice from the grave of Wickliffe, from the ashes of Huss, and

from the vigils of Calvin." "These rigid Calvinists, (speaking of the Puritans,) of whose rude intolerance the world has been filled with malignant calumnies, subscribed a covenant, cherishing, it is true, the severest virtues, but without one tinge of fanaticism." "And," says the same historian, "it (the conduct of the Puritans) was an act of piety, not of sturdiness; virtue, not superstition; inquiry, not fanaticism. The people were enthusiasts, not bigots. The Church * * * did not ask the assent of the king, or recognize him as its head; it used no liturgy; it rejected unnecessary ceremonies, and reduced the simplicity of Calvin to a still plainer standard." "These are but a few testimonies to the peculiar interest felt in the cause of "liberty of conscience," by the Presbyterian Church. This interest was exhibited in their staunch defence of *popular* liberty. We have the authority of the late Chief Justice Tilghman, for stating that the framers of the Constitution of the United States were greatly indebted to the standards of the Presbyterian Church in Scotland, in modelling that admirable instrument, under which we have enjoyed more than half a century of unparalleled prosperity."

We believe in the high importance of training aright our youth. No church in the world has ever aimed at a higher degree of excellence in this department than the Presbyterian Church of Scotland, and her daughter in this country is endeavoring to imitate her example. While instructing the mind does not necessarily benefit the heart, yet "Truth is in order to godness." A christian parent is not only to dedicate his child to God in the ancient and unrevoked Abrahamic covenant; but after this, he is to evince his sincerity by training that child in the way he should go, believing that the blessing of God will rest upon the prayerful use of means. After the child has been publicly and solemnly placed by the act of the parent in the school of Christ, he thereby claiming the benefit of his own citizenship in behalf of his child, the duty is but begun. The child is to be instructed in the doctrines of the Church, in the truths of the Bible, in the history of Christ's cause, in the duties of the christian, and in preparation for a better world. After being instructed, as Samuel and Timothy were, the prayers of the parent bid fairer to prevail with God, that their future life may be as were the lives of Samuel and Timothy.

From the Presbyterian Record.

Baptism.

TO WHOM IT SHOULD BE ADMINISTERED.

According to the order proposed, we shall now proceed to consider who are the *proper subjects* of baptism. This has been a fruitful subject of controversy, and has distracted the church for many years. We assert that *all persons included in the covenant of grace*, are *proper subjects* of baptism. This will include all the *faithful*, with *their seed*; or in other words, all who *believe* in the Lord Jesus Christ, and *their children*. This we *assert*, and our Anabaptist friends *deny*. To the law and to the testimony then, we must have recourse. and see what it says on the subject. In Acts 2: 38, 39, it is said, "Repent ye, for the remission of sins, and let every one of you be baptised, in the name of Christ, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost; for the promise is to you and your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call."* Now, I would ask, what promise is it that is here referred to? It may refer either to the *general* promise made with Abraham, or the *particular* promise spoken of by the prophet Joel. In either case, the influence will be the same. Let us first consider it in reference to the *original*, or *general* promise made with Abraham. This is recorded in Gen. 17: 7, "And I will establish my covenant between me and thee, and thy seed after thee, in their generations, for an everlasting covenant, to be a God to thee, and to thy seed after thee." And in verse 10th we are told what this covenant is, "This is my covenant which ye shall keep between me and you, and thy seed after thee; *every manchild among you shall be circumcised.*"

This, I think, ought to prove to the satisfaction of every person, that *baptism has come in the room of circumcision*; and if so, then it follows beyond all controversy, that *children ought to be baptised*. Some seeing the force of this argument, and the conclusion which would necessarily follow, have denied that baptism has come in the room of circumcision; but they have never been able to prove that this is not the case,

*I have translated this passage differently from what it is in our translation. My reason for so doing, shall be given in another place.

and we are sure that they never can. It is as plain as Scripture can make it. In the first place, the promise, or covenant, is made with Abraham and his *seed*; and we are told plainly what this covenant is, viz: *circumcision*. Then the apostle Peter, in his sermon on the day of Pentecost, quotes this passage, and gives it as a reason why they should be baptised—“*because the promise was to them and their children.*” Now, if any are disposed to deny this, we would ask them, what promise is it, which Peter refers to here, if it is not the promise made to Abraham? If it should be said that it refers to the general promise of a Messiah, we reply that this will not keep them out of the difficulty at all, for the “promise, (whatever promise it might be) was to them and their children;” *in consequence* of which they were *to be baptized*. Peter therefore commanded that all who believed on the day of Pentecost, should be baptized. But why, or on what account, did he command this? Why, it is expressly said, “Because the promise was to them.” But was the promise to them *only*? No, verily, it “was to them, and *their children.*” Now, if those who *believed*, had a right to be baptized, *because* the promise was to them, had not the *children* the same right, inasmuch as the promise was to them, as well as to their parents? Both were equally included in the covenant, and consequently both were equally entitled to the blessing promised in that covenant, that is, to the ordinance of baptism. This appears so plain, that really we cannot see how any can deny it, unless they are blinded by prejudice. It is astonishing how some will pervert Scripture, and misconstrue the plain declarations of God’s word, in order to carry a favorite point.

Baptism, we affirm, has come in the room of circumcision, and this, we think, has been fairly proved. If baptism has not come in the room of circumcision, we would ask, what has come in the room of it? Circumcision was evidently a *sign* or *seal* of the covenant which God made with Abraham, and in him, with all the faithful of every age. In proof of this, see Rom. 4: 11—“And he received the sign of circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of faith.” Now, if circumcision was a seal of this covenant, what has become of this seal? Is it lost, or destroyed? Circumcision is done away, and does it follow that God has left no seal of that covenant which he was gra-

ciously pleased to make with his people? If this be the case, the gospel dispensation is not equal to the dispensation under the Old Testament. God's people are not on as firm ground under Christ as they were under Moses. They have had no sign, seal, or evidence of any covenant existing between them and their God! This surely is no enviable condition for Christians to be in. But we say that God *has* left a sign or seal of his covenant with his people, and that sign is *Baptism*; and it lies on our opponents to prove it otherwise.

The Abrahamic and Christian covenants are the same; for we have no account of any new covenant being made, or a different plan of salvation being pointed out; and circumcision and baptism are signs or seals of the same covenant. Now, if baptism be come in the room of circumcision, which, we think, has been made very clear, then it follows incontestibly, that children are to be baptised; for they have the same right to baptism, under the gospel, that the children of the faithful had to circumcision under the Old Testament dispensation.

But here we are sometimes met with an objection; and we know that it is a very formidable objection with many, viz: children are entirely ignorant of the nature of the ordinance; and inasmuch as they are incapable of acting faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, what benefit can they derive from it? To this we would answer, that our not understanding a thing is no reason why we should not comply with it when it is plainly commanded. If this were the case, we would perform very few duties. Is it to be supposed that children understood the nature and design of circumcision? And what would we have thought of Abraham, if he had made the same objection, and refused to circumcise his children, merely because they could not understand it? Would that have been an evidence of piety and obedience in him, who, on account of his strong faith, was styled "the father of the faithful?" Yet he would have had as much reason to object to the circumcision of his children, on the ground that they could not understand it, as we have to object to the baptism of our children, on the same ground. Indeed, if this objection had any weight in it, it would exclude all infants from heaven; for it is said that "without faith it is impossible to please God." And again, "He that believeth not shall be damned." But we all know that chil-

dren are incapable of acting faith in the Lord Jesus Christ; and does it follow that they are all lost? Yes, according to the reasoning of our opponents, this conclusion would inevitably follow. But this is too shocking to the pious mind to think of, as well as repugnant to the plain declaration of Scripture; for it is said that "it is not the will of God, that one of these little ones should perish."

We find that little children were the objects of Christ's care and compassion when on earth. He took them in his arms, laid his hands upon them, and blessed them, and declared that of such is the kingdom of heaven." He even rebuked those who were opposed to bringing little children to him, from an apprehension that it was unnecessary. He said, "Take heed that ye despise not one of these little ones; for I say unto you, that in heaven these angels do always behold the face of my Father who is in heaven." And again he said, "Suffer little children to come unto me and forbid them not; for of such is the kingdom of heaven." Now, if little children were in no sense interested in the merits of the Saviour, and consequently not fit subjects for the kingdom of heaven, why should our blessed Lord make them such peculiar objects of his attention and compassion? We can account for this on no other ground than that children, dying in infancy, are saved through the atonement of the Lord Jesus Christ. Now, we cannot understand how children are united to Christ, and consequently saved by him, when they are incapable of acting faith in his name; yet this is no reason why we should not believe it. The truth is, we are creatures of very limited capacities; but God's wisdom is infinite, and his power unbounded, therefore where we cannot understand, we should admire and adore, and not attempt to bring down the works of God to a level with our understandings; for "his ways are above our ways, and his thoughts above our thoughts." Whatever therefore we know to be a commanded duty, that we should do without the least hesitation. This objection therefore to the baptism of children, has no weight, even on the supposition that we cannot understand how they may be benefitted by it; but much less when we say, that observation proves that, in many instances at least, it has a happy influence on the mind. Although baptism, as well as other means of grace, may sometimes fail, yet

we find that in proportion to the number, there are more persons become pious, who have been baptized in infancy, than of those who have not. But if we abandon the practice because we sometimes see it fail, we might as well, on the same ground, abandon the duty of religious instruction altogether, because we sometimes see it fail.

But if our blessed Saviour considered children fit subjects for the kingdom of heaven, shall we consider them unfit members of the church on earth? Children are evidently included in the covenant made with Abraham, and in him, with all the faithful; and as such, have a right to the ordinance of baptism. When we see our Anabaptist friends forbidding children to be brought to the Saviour in baptism, it reminds us very much of those morose and unfeeling persons, who, in the days of the Saviour, forbid children to be brought to him, and no doubt, if he were on earth now, they would meet with the same rebuke.

J. R. B.

From the Presbyterian Herald.

Prayer.

ITS CHARACTERISTIC—PERSEVERANCE.

It is somewhat wonderful, that God sometimes not only delays to answer prayer, but when he comes, his first appearance is often that of an enemy. This was peculiarly Jacob's experience at Penuel. Whilst kneeling in earnest prayer, alone at the hour of midnight, he feels the hands of a man grasping with him in conflict. God had come to bestow the blessing, but Jacob must wrestle for it more earnestly still, and continue the conflict "until the breaking of the day."

Such too is often the experience of christians. They pray for the revivings of the spirit, "that they may rejoice." But it is most generally the case, that God comes first with the most overwhelming convictions of sin. Instead of rejoicing, they endure the deepest agony, and it is thus they are taught to wrestle in prayer. However much they may have desired the blessing before, they are now doubly anxious, and feel like Jacob, "I cannot let thee go." God said to Jacob, "Let me go," and so he often says to the christian. I have no doubt

it is the experience of christians generally that when some object has been upon their mind for some time, for which they have prayed with more than usual earnestness, they become discouraged. They feel as if they must give it up, at least for the present. God, by permitting such thoughts to arise, is saying plainly, "Let me go." And how often it is the case that they do let him go, and thus fail of the blessing. God says "Let me go" only to excite greater desires and greater earnestness. If our desires are not supreme, we are not in a situation to receive the blessing, and therefore he delays. This however does not prove that he is unwilling to answer. A father might tell his child, when pleading for bread, "to let him go;" yet it would not prove that he was unwilling to grant the request. He might do it to test the child's sincerity. Or if the child had been disobedient, he might only intend to test the genuineness of his repentance, or to deepen his impressions of the guilt of disobedience. So God deals with us. If our faith and confidence in his character are as they should be, and our desires supreme, we feel like Jacob, that we cannot let him go. It is often the experience of the christian that though discouraged by delay, yet when the thought of giving it up arises in his mind, it is agonizing in the extreme. He feels he cannot live without it, and the language of his heart is, "I cannot give it up." He resolves to continue with increased earnestness, and returns to a throne of grace, looks again at all the promises; lays hold of them with renewed effort, and with a full purpose to continue in wrestling with God until the blessing comes. This is *perseverance*, a most important characteristic of prayer.

God's promise cannot fail, but the fulfilment of it is consistent with some delay. This is most unequivocally taught in the case of Jacob, as well as by Christ himself. The case of the man who went to a friend to borrow "three loaves;" the case of the unjust judge and the poor widow, and others, teach it as plainly as any truth can be taught. Therefore it is our duty, or rather privilege, to continue importunate, assured that God will hear us, "though he bear long with us."

This perseverance however, is not a mere continuance in prayer, or a resolution to continue. It must be accompanied by that confidence in God, his promises, and his character.

that will lead the suppliant to lay hold of them all as the ground of his importunity. It is, as it were, holding God to his word. A feeling that leads the suppliant to say with the fullest confidence, "Father, thou hast given a promise which I know cannot fail—thou didst intend to fulfil it—I know thou art good and merciful—I cannot go without the blessing—if I perish, here—here I must remain till death or the blessing comes." It is thus in the true spirit of prayer, he plants himself down with a feeling that he can go no where else, but must continue there, venturing every thing on the truth of the promise, and the willingness of God to fulfil it. So felt Jacob. So felt the spouse in the song.—(Song Sol. iii. 4.) "I held him and would not let him go." So felt the Syrophenician woman who came to Christ pleading for her daughter. "Jesus, thou son of David have mercy on me. My daughter," &c. "But he answered her never a word." How discouraging! How plainly he was saying, "Let me go." She went to the disciples, and they turned against her. "Master send her away, she cryeth after us." His answer was more discouraging still. "I am not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel." That seemed to cut her off entirely. She was a stranger. We may imagine the workings of her heart. "I know that I am not of the family of Israel, but is not this He who was promised to be a light unto the Gentiles? Has he not extended his mercy to others who are not Jews? And O, how can I go back to my house, without a blessing on my poor child! It is just such a blessing as he is accustomed to bestow. He cannot mean to deny me—I cannot let him go." Such no doubt were the workings of her heart—such her supreme desire, and such her strong faith. It brought her again to his feet in deeper humility, and more intense desire than before. "Then she came and worshipped him saying Lord help me." He intended to answer her prayer, but put her faith to a test still more severe. "It is not meet to take the children's bread and cast it unto dogs." That not only seemed a denial, but a denial accompanied with reproach. And if she had lacked humility in the smallest degree, or had the least stirring of pride, or lacked in faith, she would have gone without the blessing, and would have said that he was not the kind, compassionate Saviour which he was represented to be.

But her answer shows every characteristic of true prayer.—*“Truth Lord, but the dogs eat of the crumbs that fall from the children’s table.”* As if she had said, “I know I am a dog—unworthy of any thing that belongs to a child—but of thine infinite mercy grant me only a crumb!” This was true prayer and true perseverance. O! if we could but unite with the feelings and exercises of that poor woman, the Saviour would say to us all, as he did to her, “Be it unto thee even as thou wilt.”

I have now closed what I have to say on this most important subject. I did not expect to say so much, but the subject seemed to expand as I proceeded. And in conclusion I would only ask the reader if he has ever found upon himself all these marks of believing prayer? If he has, I think I may venture to tell him, that he knows by sweet experience, that prayer has power with God. These, so far as I can discover from the Bible, are the essential attributes of that “effectual, fervent prayer, that availeth much.” Many reflections crowd upon me in view of this important subject; but I will only indulge in two.

1st. How much is offered to God as prayer, that is not prayer—possessing scarcely a single attribute that God requires in prayer. And if it is not prayer, what is it? Yet what else can it be? I know of nothing else that it can be. It is awful to think that any one professing to pray, is only mocking God with profanity. But I cannot see how it can be otherwise. If it is not prayer it must be profanity. Let this thought urge us to examine ourselves more closely and see that even our prayers may not rise up in judgment against us.

2d. How much christians might prevail to bless their families, the church and the world. When this spirit of prayer becomes general in the church, we may expect to see the world subdued to the empire of Christ. For want of it, a miserable race are going down to death. It is cruel ingratitude to him who suffered on Calvary, and to the blessed spirit of God who has done so much for us and promises to do so much more.—O! if the church could desire enough, expect enough, and ask enough, what it might accomplish cannot be told. Has not God said, “concerning the work of my hands command ye me?” And might not believing prayer draw the creation up

to God, and hold it there by the bond of eternal confidence? Children of God lift up your heads in hope. Heirs of the promises take a strong hold of your Father's covenant; and you shall hear the blessed response, "Be it unto thee even as thou wilt."

W. D. S.

From the North British Review.

Sermon of Chalmers in the Country.

We remember well our first hearing Dr. Chalmers. We were in a moor-land district in Tweeddale, rejoicing in the country, after nine months of the High School. We heard that the famous preacher was to be at a neighboring parish church, and off we set, a cart full of irrepressible youngsters. "Calm was all nature as a resting wheel." The crows, instead of taking wing, were impudent, and sat still; the cart-horses were standing, knowing the day, at the field gates, gossiping and gazing idle and happy; the moor was stretching away in the pale sunlight—vast, dim, and melancholy, like a sea; everywhere were to be seen the gathering people, "sprinklings of blithe company," the country-side seemed moving to some one centre. As we entered the kirk we saw a notorious character, a drover, who had much of the brutal look of what he worked in, with the knowing eye of a man of the city, a sort of big Peter Bell—

"He had a hardness in his eye,
He had a hardness in his cheek."

He was our terror, and we not only wondered, but were afraid, when we saw him going in. The kirk was full as it could hold. How different in looks to a brisk town congregation. There was a fine leisure-lineness and vague stare; all the dignity and vacancy of animals; eyebrows raised, and mouth open, as is the habit with those who speak little, and look much and at far-off objects. The minister comes in, homely in his dress and gait, but having a great look about him, like a mountain among hills. The High School boys thought him like a 'big one of ourselves;' he looked vaguely around upon his audience, as if he saw in it *one great object, not many*. We shall never forget his smile; its general be-

nignity; how he let the light of his countenance fall on us. He read a few verses quietly; then prayed briefly, solemnly, with his eyes wide open all the time, but not seeing. Then he gave out his text; we forget it, but its subject was "Death reigns." He stated slowly, calmly, the simple meaning of the words, what death was, and how and why it reigned; then suddenly he started, and looked like a man who had seen some great sight, and was breathless to declare it; he told us how death reigned—everywhere, at all times, in all places; how we all knew it, how we would yet know more of it. The drover, who had sat down in the table-seat opposite, was gazing up in a state of stupid excitement; he seemed restless, but never kept his eye from the speaker. The tide set in—every thing added to its power—deep called to deep—imagery and illustration poured in; and, every now and then, the theme—the simple terrible statement, was repeated in some lucid interval.

After overwhelming us with proofs of the reign of Death, and transferring to us his intense urgency and emotion, and, after shrieking, as if in despair, these words, "Death is a tremendous necessity!"—he suddenly looked beyond us, as if into some distant region, and cried out, "Behold a mightier!—who is this? He cometh from Edom, with dyed garments from Bozrah, glorious in his apparel, speaking in righteousness, travelling towards men in the greatness of his strength, mighty to save." Then, in a few plain sentences, he stated the truth as to sin entering, and death by sin, and death passing upon all. Then he took fire once more, and enforced, with redoubled energy and richness, the freeness, the simplicity, the security, the sufficiency of the great method of justification.—How astonished and impressed we all were. He was at the full thunder—the whole man was in an agony of earnestness, the drover was weeping like a child, the tears running down his ruddy, coarse cheeks—his face opened out and smoothed like an infant's, his whole body stirred with emotion. We had all been insensibly drawn out of our seats, and were converging towards the wonderful speaker. And when he sat down, after warning each one of us to remember who it was, and what it was that followed Death on his pale horse, and how alone we could escape, we all sunk back into our seats. How

beautiful to our eyes did the thunderer look—exhausted—but sweet and pure! How he poured out his soul before his God, in giving thanks for sending the Abolisher of death! Then, a short psalm, and all was ended.

We went home quicker than we came—we did not recount the foals with their long legs and roguish eyes, and their sedate mothers; we did not speculate upon whose dog *that* was, and whether *that* was a crow or a man in the dim moor—we thought of other things. That voice, that face; those great, simple, living thoughts; those floods of resistless eloquence, that piercing, shattering voice—“that tremendous necessity.”

From the Home Missionary.

Oregon and California

THE attention of the Executive Committee [of the American Home Missionary Society] has, for some years, been turned to the Pacific coast, as likely to require the philanthropic regard of the friends of religion on this side of the continent. In the twenty-first Report, it was announced, that a mission had been projected to that region; and the next year, that two missionaries had been approved for this service; and that one of them, Rev. GEORGE H. ATKINSON, with his lady, had already sailed for Oregon. The other, Rev. HORACE LYMAN, with Mrs. Lyman, embarked for the same destination on the 22d of November last. It was judged proper to appoint no others to this field, until these should have explored the country, and made report of the demands and facilities for missionary labor. Letters from Mr. Atkinson have been received, announcing his safe arrival at Oregon City, June 20th, 1848, and his cordial reception there, with flattering prospects of usefulness opened before him. At the date of his last communication, his impressions of the country and its inhabitants were such as to excite the regret of the Committee, that their resources would not admit of an immediate enlargement of this most promising mission. The whole territory, containing 341,463 square miles, is supposed to possess, in its natural products and resources, and in its advantages for commerce with the Pacific, the elements of a great and prosperous state. Already, some 16,000 or 18,000

people had crossed the mountains to take up their abode there, and others were rapidly coming in.

In the mean time, the late treaty with Mexico added the region of Upper California to the responsibilities of the American churches. Immediate counsels were had for an early occupation of this field also. It was foreseen that the maritime portion of California, under the protection of a free and stable government, must attract to itself a large population; and especially, that its magnificent harbor must eventually become the *entrepot* of a commerce rivalling that of London or New York. The establishment by the United States government of a line of steamers on that coast, promised to hasten these results. Arrangements were accordingly made to send forward two pioneer missionaries, by the earliest possible conveyance. As intimated already, in a former part of this Report, Rev. JOHN W. DOUGLAS and Rev. SAMUEL H. WILLEY embarked from New York on the first of December, and proceeding by way of the Isthmus of Panama, arrived in California in the latter part of February. The details of their operations since their arrival, have not yet reached the Committee.

The acquisition of this territory by the United States, has already, in a single year, proved to be one of the most remarkable events of the age. This is not merely on account of the transfer of some 439,000 square miles from one government to another, but because of subsequent events, from which the most surprising social and moral results are likely to follow. The growing ascendancy of the English in China and the Asiatic Islands, simultaneously with the transfer of California to our people, completes the control of the four great coast lines of the Northern Hemisphere, by two Protestant nations, speaking the same language, and one in all the great features of their character. The bearing of this fact, coming to pass just as steam is giving ubiquity to commercial adventure, cannot but be direct and powerful on the conversion of the Pagan tribes. And the circumstances that preceded and have followed our possession of California, show that herein a great trust is committed to us by Providence, for the benefit of a new empire, about to arise in the Pacific world. God kept that coast for a people of the Pilgrim blood; he would not permit any other to be fully developed there. The Spaniard came

thither a hundred years before our fathers landed at Plymouth; but though he came for treasure, his eyes were holden that he should not find it. But in the fullness of time, when a Protestant people have been brought to this continent, and are nourished up to strength by the requisite training, God commits to their possession that Western shore. But will they throw into this great enterprise such vehemence—give it such a body and soul—as the divine purposes require? To insure this, also, Providence is at no loss for means. “He spake, and it was done.” The cloud, which for all past time has concealed the wealth of that golden coast, is lifted up; and instantly the heart of the nation throbs at the sight, with a pulse that is felt to its farthest extremity. The world has never seen a voluntary migration of such materials as these. In four months from the first of December, 17,300 persons sailed from our Atlantic ports to California; and it is estimated that from 20,000 to 40,000 more will have started overland for the same destination, before the first of July. These carry with them an amount of property, education, professional and mechanical skill, and of enthusiasm, never before combined in any similar movement. This enthusiasm imparts its own fervor to science and capital; it seizes upon and converts to its own purpose all physical and moral energies; and ere long, will bore through mountains, and drive the car of commerce from sea to sea. Additional crowds, that defy all estimate of their numbers, are going there from other portions of the globe. Was there ever an epoch in the history of missions, which carried with it such a divine endorsement of its importance; which seemed so to preclude all doubt and hesitancy, and to demand such prompt and efficient action? The Committee wish to send out additional laborers with all practicable despatch; and now wait *only for the requisite pecuniary means*. These laborers are needed immediately; and, there is reason to believe, would be cordially welcomed; and in a few years will be liberally sustained on the ground. Oregon and California are rising into maturity without the usual period of pupillage and dependence, full-grown sovereignties, replete with all other elements of greatness; let not the power of the Gospel be wanting to baptize their civilization into the name of Christ. Then will the cities and villages that shall line their

coasts and overspread their valleys become the abodes of regenerated men, and sources of light and salvation to the thousand Isles of the Sea that lie beyond.

CONCLUSION.

Meanwhile, the *immigration* from abroad is rapidly becoming a portentous fact; and whether the portent be for good or ill, depends on the way in which we meet it. The number of foreigners arriving here in 1848, through the Atlantic ports and through Canada, is estimated at 300,000; and the causes that operate to stimulate emigration from Europe are in undiminished action. There is no rest to the bosom of the weary old world. Tossing to and fro, change without relief, war, pestilence and starvation are dissolving the ties of kindred and country, and other hundreds of thousands are about to precipitate themselves upon our shores. "Eviction" by judicial process, and by the still more terrible mandate of famine, is rapidly transferring the question, "What shall be done with the Irish?" from Great Britain to the United States. It cannot be too much to estimate the total immigration of 1849, as equal to 1,000 for every day throughout the year. Should our Government send out its surveyors to the frontier, to run out the boundaries of *five new states*—such as Iowa or Missouri;—the foreign immigration of *this year* alone would give to every one of them a population large enough to bring it into the Union, and to elect a representative to Congress. And what shall be the next year?—and the next?

Nor do such facts as these, even, reveal the limit of our destiny, or exhaust the argument by which we are pressed on to its accomplishment. There are ulterior, and not very remote tendencies, that it is wise for us to contemplate. Out of the marvellous changes of the age, a new order of things is arising, Providence is more obviously taking the work of human progress into its own hands. An era of missions has commenced, not planned by men, nor conducted on human principles—missions, not of individuals, but of nations; offshoots from the leading races, transplanted in such masses, and with so much of the sap and vigor of their parent stocks, as to take root and gradually engross the soil. This is seen in the growing numbers and power of the British in the East, where their colonies

are rapidly crowding out the original inhabitants, with their laws, social customs and languages. It is seen in the displacement of the Indians of this country by our Anglo-Saxon fathers; and in the encroachments we are now making on the Spanish race on our south-western border. Such an example is New Mexico, which has recently been brought under our national rule as a result of the aggressive power of trade, carried on for several years across the prairies. It is a novel spectacle—and one which carries its own argument with it—to see a *Spanish* race under a government which does not shield it from the free access of Protestant Christianity! And how long shall such a door stand open—open to us, especially—and no entrance be made on behalf of the Gospel? Similar inroads of people from the British and American stock, begin to appear in the leading ports and towns of Central and Southern America. Theirs is the enterprise and the capital that already cause the remote rivers of that magnificent region to foam beneath the wheel of the steamer. “A Yankee saw-mill performs its office, fifteen hundred miles from the mouth of the Amazon; and a ‘Down Easter,’ who once wielded his axe on the banks of the Kennebec, fulfils the same mission on the shore of the Rio Negro. There are no laws, no institutions, no hostilities to innovation, which can stand against trade.” This ascendancy of the vigorous over the feeble nations is not necessarily wrong, it is the natural superiority and irresistible progress of freedom, knowledge and enterprise, when brought into contact with ignorance and inactivity. What an argument is this, that our Home population—which cannot be *kept* at home—should be of such a kind, that, with themselves, they shall transfer the elements of regeneration to the countries which they enter by their traffic and control by their influence!

In this view of the enlarging sphere of American activity, may we not find some consoling explanation of the design of Providence in sending so many foreigners to our shores? As physical barriers are now so generally removed, and the whole world is coming into a condition of preparedness for receiving a christian civilization, is it not probable that a race will be raised up for this world-mission, whose character shall contain those selected elements which are most needful to make a complete missionary people? Let there be a mixture

of the peculiarities of different races. For example; let the high resolve and energetic will of the Briton, which yields only to itself, with the wide and philanthropic scope of aspiration developed in our Pilgrim Fathers—form the basis of the combination. Add to this the reflection, discrimination and patience of the German mind, fruitful in the adaptation of means to ends. Let France add something, but Ireland more, of the fire of enthusiasm to quicken those elements into action. Thus would there be formed a *composite character*, more aggressive and efficient than either of the materials from which it is made up. But *where* could such a union take place? In Europe they cannot be separated from their present combinations, nor is there a space there where they could commingle. There is nowhere a common receptacle into which they can be poured, but the broad expanse of our own Mississippi Valley. For such an end as this, it has been kept in reserve for so many ages. For this, the materials are gathering, and beginning to act upon and modify each other, just as that grand movement is commencing, whose progress they will soon be wanted to assist.

In such a consideration of the uses which Providence is making of our country and our people, the duty assigned us becomes something more than merely to provide for a few hundred thousands, on the verge of the organized states. When the bearings of our work are justly considered, the distinction between Home and Foreign missions disappears. The enterprise of evangelizing this land becomes, in effect, and on a grand scale, A MISSION TO ALL MANKIND. And if the present generation are wise to understand and faithful to fulfil this divine appointment, the whole world will feel the blessing of it; and our children and our children's children will praise God on our behalf, saying, "THOU HAST INCREASED THE NATION, O LORD, THOU HAST INCREASED THE NATION; THOU ART GLORIFIED; THOU HAST REMOVED IT FAR UNTO ALL THE ENDS OF THE EARTH."

One great test of the character of a Christian preacher, is the adaptedness of his preaching to produce in the mind of the hearer a genuine conviction of sin.

Mohammedanism and its Results.

At a late missionary meeting in New York, Rev. Mr. Calhoun, missionary, stated that in all Syria, with a population of a million and a half, not a single *newspaper* is published. And in the entire region in which the Arabic language is spoken, comprising Syria, Arabia, Egypt and the Barbary States, including a population of 40,000,000, there is only one, if indeed one newspaper in that language, and only three or four in French or English. In all Turkey, with a population of 60 to 70 millions, there is but one in the Turkish language, and that conducted by an Englishman. Such facts, he said, illustrated the character of Mohammedanism—a religion which has no tendency to improvement, either in intellect, morals or consistency.

In the Turkish dominions, as well as in several other heathen countries, the first newspaper was started by American missionaries, and it is an interesting fact, that Greek, Armenian and India journals, and it may be added, those of China, Africa, and the Sandwich Islands, also are now copying religious as well as political intelligence from American daily papers.

The missionaries, he said, had already translated elementary school books and standard evangelical authors, as well as the Scriptures, into various languages of the East, and these were regarded with favor.

They had also, besides preaching the Gospel in connection with most mission stations, founded permanent seminaries, which he considered a most important instrumentality for furnishing future Christian ministers and teachers in Pagan nations, and bringing them to a full enjoyment of our high privileges.

“We should be cautious,” says Coleridge, “how we indulge in the feelings of a virtuous indignation. It is the handsome brother of anger and hatred.”

So long as we are among men let us cherish humanity, and so live that no man may be either in fear or in danger of us.

THE
Calvinistic Magazine.

[NEW SERIES.]

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

Vol. IV.

July, 1849.

No. 7.

Reminiscences of our Venerable Church.

JOHN NEILSON, ESQ., AND REV. HUGH MCKAIL.

It is not pleasant to dwell upon scenes of horror. It is melancholy to let the thoughts rest upon acts which disgraced the characters of men who *professed* protestant christianity: We sometimes feel as if it would be better to let the past be buried in oblivion. But would this be justice to the memories of those who laid down their lives for Christ's sake? Would it be justice to our Presbyterian fathers, to keep silence on the subject of their early struggles, and their triumphs at the stake or on the gibbet? Do we not need to have our hearts warmed and elevated by the recital of what the Redeemer has done to manifest his love to his followers in every age and in every nation? We thank God for the pure standards of our church: *We love them*, and we feel that it is no common privilege to be permitted to refer to historic records, which are undisputed and indisputable; as vouchers for the influence they exerted in days gone by.

He is the freeman, whom the truth makes free,”

and it cannot be doubted that had the Bible continued sealed, and had not men been enlightened by the Spirit of God, to know what were their *just rights* in spiritual things, there never would have dawned upon the world either true liberty or civilization. The present state of civil liberty in every christian land, is the *effect*, not the cause of religious freedom. Had Luther never studied the Scriptures in his cell—had Knox, Melville and others, not borne the Bible at their girdles, ready at any moment to shew chapter and verse, in proof that Christ *alone* might rule his church, we question whether at this day

there would have been a gigantic republic or even a limited monarchy on the face of the globe. Sitting under our own vine and fig tree, may we not often profitably and with gratitude cast our eyes back to the times of struggle, and to the men who, daring to stand erect before princes, triumphantly gave proof that the Lord sustained them and blessed their efforts for spiritual freedom.

The Presbyterian who wanders in the land of the Covenanter, must have but little knowledge of his church, or little feeling in his heart, if his eye can roam from object to object unmoved. The caves, frequently used as hiding places—the rocks, the stones, which often held the bread and wine of communion—the tangled wood, the bonnie broom, the blooming heather, all are monuments of the Covenanter. Imagination gives even to the mountain echoes, to the murmuring brooks, to the rushing river, to the roaring sea, voices in remembrance of those

“Whose blood was shed

Like water in the glorious cause of Christ their living head.”

In De Foe's "Memoirs of the Church of Scotland," a work which all consider as of standard value, a summary is given of the sufferings of the Covenanters, during twenty-eight years' persecution, when that creature of Laud, the apostate Sharpe, held sway. He says, "that in this persecution, as has been collected from the accounts both public and private, above 18,000 people suffered the utmost extremities which their enemies could inflict;" sometimes by banishment, at other times by outlawry, by wounds and death on the battle-field, by being shot down in cold blood, or in the last resort, by ignominious execution.

The ejected ministers being gone, their places were filled, as Bishop Burnet attests, by worthless, ignorant curates. Was it to be supposed that the people would attend such a ministry? They did not. The pastors who were compelled to leave, were such as had been placed in their parishes since 1649. But as there were many aged ministers who had entered previously to that time, the wicked law did not include them. They were for the present left unmolested. We may suppose how earnestly they worked while it was yet day. The ejected ministers had been driven not only from their churches and

homes, but in most cases far from the neighborhood of their beloved flocks. Still there were some who, not being so conspicuous, were permitted to remain in the places where they had labored, so that they left the churches and manses. It was at the humble dwellings of these ejected ministers that the bereaved people collected in crowds to join in the morning and evening family worship. Soon the numbers who attended were so great that no room could be found large enough for their convenience, so they were obliged to go out of doors and worship under heaven's canopy. This was the origin of conventicles, or field meetings, against which we soon find the levelled rage of persecution.

An act was passed imposing heavy fines on any who did not attend the ministry of the curates, and to secure the enforcement of this act, infidel and mercenary officers were sent about with companies of soldiers, whose rioting and drunkenness, and other horrid perpetrations, spread misery and devastation wherever they went.

The year 1666 was one of deep mourning in Scotland. For six years previous, prelacy, sanctioned and upheld by the government, had been trampling under foot the dearest rights of a people *conscientiously* Presbyterian. The west and south of Scotland were filled with the unprincipled mercenaries of Sir James Turner, and fines, abuses, and every possible oppression were perpetrated. From early in the spring for seven months did the people in this region suffer every species of barbarity without making any important resistance. At length the time came when this patient endurance must have an end. The circumstances of the first outbreak were these. Four countrymen of upper Galloway were told that an aged man was in the hands of soldiers who were maltreating him, in order to compel him to pay a ruinous fine. They hastened to the spot, and delivered the aged christian from the ruffian hands of those who were perpetrating in their cowardice the most savage cruelty on his person. A struggle ensued between the four Covenanters and the soldiers, till one of the latter being wounded, the others fled for assistance. The four countrymen at once saw their danger, and they determined that they would neither flee nor submit. "To arms!" they shouted, for this was now their only resource. The people of the village and

neighborhood joining them, they marched upon Dumfries and soon made Sir James Turner and the soldiers there with him their prisoners.

It was hoped that the whole country would simultaneously rise to arms. But there had been no preconcerted plan. Many of the leading gentlemen had been previously taken up on suspicion. The spirit of the west country seemed almost broken, and ere any decided impression could be made by the insurgents, the prelates had taken the alarm, and large additional forces had been sent to the counties where this movement had been made. Edinburgh, Glasgow, and other chief cities and towns, were doubly garrisoned, and preparations made as if to meet a foreign foe, while a large army was sent to overpower the little band of insurgent Covenanters.

Soon were these heroic christians made to feel that their case, in a temporal point of view, was desperate. Still they knew that they could not have done otherwise than attempted the enterprise; and now, they said, "we will follow on till God shall do his service by us; and, though we should all die at the end of it, we think the giving of a testimony enough for all." Thus spake this dauntless band, as, after publicly renewing their covenant with God at Lanark, they marched through the then pathless moors between that town and Bathgate. At the latter place they halted for a night's shelter; but being disappointed, they were compelled to proceed without food or repose, during the whole night, while the rain poured in torrents upon them. The enemy was very near, but they had thus far avoided an engagement, hoping that their numbers might be augmented. Towards evening on the 28th of November, they found themselves on a ridge of the Pentland Hills, five miles from Edinburgh. There they saw that an engagement must take place between them and the royal troops. To the best of their ability they chose their ground, and each man, with his heart lifted to God, wielded in self-defence such weapon as he had. Four times did this handful of brave men beat back their assailants; but at last, disabled by overwhelming numbers, they were compelled to give way. Night closed in, favoring by its darkness the few that escaped of the wearied and sad-hearted Covenanters.

Thus was suppressed this unpremeditated insurrection,

commonly called "The rising of the Pentland." Although the humanity of these noble christian soldiers had been shown to Sir James Turner and his mercenaries, whom they had captured at Dumfries—although that officer's life had been saved by the intercession of Mr. Neilson, whose large property in Galloway and Ayr he and his men had almost entirely destroyed, yet all who were taken prisoners were put to death in a cruel manner; and Mr. Neilson and the Rev. Hugh McKail were singled out to endure, previous to their execution, the awful torture of the "boot," because they were supposed, from their rank in life, from their religious standing and influence, to be the chief instigators.

The cowardly persecutors, trembling under the lash of their guilt, could not believe but that this insurrection was only the beginning of fearful things, and that these men were in communication, not only with other individual leaders in Scotland, but that they might even have engaged aid from foreign countries. Hence, Bishop Sharpe and his coadjutors, determined to proceed in a manner almost too disgraceful to be put on record. For it is a fact well attested, that a letter from the King prohibiting any more lives from being sacrificed at this time, *was by them suppressed*, until after the cruel torture and death of John Neilson and Hugh McKail.

Hugh McKail was a young and devoted preacher, who had not been long licensed, before he was forbidden to preach. His last public sermon was delivered on the same day the ejected ministers were compelled to leave their respective charges. In this sermon he had said something about the persecutions of Christ's church in all ages, by a Pharaoh on the throne, a Haman in the state, and a Judas in the church. Although he made no application, yet Archbishop Sharpe hearing of it, took the words as personal, and sent his emissaries to lay hold of the young preacher. Being compelled to hide during the storm of man's wrath, McKail comforted himself by doing his Master's work of love in the highways and hedges, in the sick chambers, by the bed of death, and wherever a word might be said for Christ. At last, the blood-hounds tracking his steps more closely, he left his native land and took shipping for Holland. Here he was not idle, but with his heart yearning for his kindred and country, and especially for his bleeding

church, at the end of a few years he felt that he must again rush to the post of danger. Just before "the rising of Pentland," Mr. McKail arrived in Scotland, and at once joined the insurgents. On that weary night of marching, previous to the engagement, many were compelled by exhaustion to lie down by the wayside. Of delicate frame, and with a constitution shattered by hardships, young McKail was among the number who on that dark night made his bed on the heather; and, ere the morning, he was a captive in the hands of his implacable foe.

John Neilson had just been taken from the torture to the gibbett, and now the next victim to glut prelati cal vengeance was Hugh McKail. Young, handsome in person, and with a countenance almost heavenly, his appearance in Edinburgh at once excited deep interest; and as he moved towards the place of trial, the muttered curses of the profane on the heads of the persecutors were mingled with the prayers of the pious, who sighed and wept for their dishonored country, as well as for the afflictions of their church.

In order to compel him to make every disclosure, the "*boot*" was fastened upon his left limb. This consisted of four pieces wood bound together by hoops of iron and made to fit the leg. After it was fastened on, wedges were driven in between the wood and the limb until frequently every bone and sinew was broken, and the very marrow mingled with the blood. In vain did the young martyr declare, as Mr. Neilson had done, that he had no more disclosures to make. Wedge after wedge was driven in, until consciousness of his sufferings was relieved by a deep swoon. As soon as he had in a measure recovered, sentence of death was pronounced. In a few days he was carried to the gallows, and there, by the grace of God, he was enabled to give such a testimony for Christ's cause as can never be forgotten to the latest day by those who love their church and true spiritual liberty.

The night before his death, when at supper, Mr. McKail kept his Bible open beside him, and while reading the 16th Psalm he said to those around him, "If there be any thing in this world to be unwillingly left, it is reading the Scriptures." He told them that he felt assured that his sufferings would do more hurt to prelacy, and be more edifying to the people of

God, than if he were to continue twenty years in the ministry. Therefore he rejoiced in tribulation. On the 22d of December, 1666, the youthful martyr ascended the scaffold. With his lacerated and crushed limb it was difficult for him to get up the ladder. An immense crowd had assembled; the High Street was one dense mass of human beings. Every window, to the topmost story of those high houses, was filled with people, and scarcely a dry cheek was to be seen among all that multitude. Hearing the weeping, he said, "Your work is not to weep, but to pray. Every step of this ladder is a degree nearer heaven to me; and that you may know the ground of my confidence, and what my hope is, I will read you the last chapter of the Bible." There was silence. Even the soldiers and the mitred men seemed awed, while they listened to the devoted man reading God's Word from the very brink of eternity! Having finished the chapter, he added, "Here is the glory that is to be revealed to me—a pure river of the water of life, the throne of God and of the Lamb, where his servants serve him and see his face, having his name written on their foreheads; the Lord also giveth them light, and they reign with him for ever and ever. Here, also, is my access, 'Let him that is athirst come, and whosoever will, let him take of the water of life freely.' But this is not all; here is my welcome, 'The Spirit and the Bride say come.'" He continued thus conversing until the clock of St. Giles' gave warning that the hour of his departure was at hand. The rope of ignominy was round his neck, while the sublimity of christian eloquence fell from his lips. "And now," said he, "I leave off to speak any more with creatures like myself, and begin my intercourse with God, which shall never be broken off. Farewell father and mother, friends and relations; farewell the world and all its delights; farewell food and drink; farewell sun, moon and stars. Welcome God and Father; welcome sweet Jesus Christ, the mediator of the new covenant; welcome blessed Spirit of grace, the God of all consolation; welcome glory; welcome eternal life; welcome death! O Lord! into thy hands I commit my spirit, for thou hast redeemed my soul, Lord God of truth."

Thus passed from earth to heaven one of the purest spirits that ever inhabited a tenement of clay, a victim to the tyranny

of prelacy, and a rejoicing martyr for Christ's sole dominion over his church. Ever must the name of this young christian martyr be held in the heart's affectionate remembrance by every true Presbyterian who has heard his story. "Let the lovers of divine truth glory in its past triumphs, assured that its general triumph is hastening on, to the everlasting joy of all its friends, whatever martyr struggles in its cause may yet remain to take place on earth, to prepare its faithful witnesses for the glorious company of its ascended martyrs, and of their crucified and enthroned Lord." M.

The Mountain Herald.

—
BY THE REV. LEVI R. MORRISON.
—

ISAIAH, 52: 7.—*"How beautiful upon the mountains are the feet of him that bringeth good tidings."*

THE messenger of Israel's restoration is, in this language, represented as being most favorably located for spreading the tidings of the close of the Babylonish captivity.

It is a fact, however we are to account for it, that the Bible finds in the mountains most of the material of its history, the imagery of its prophecies, and allegory of its poetry. To account for this, it is not enough to say, it was written by men of mountain homes; for the question occurs, why was that land of mountains selected as the theatre of the revelations of the Bible? Was it a mere exercise of inscrutable sovereignty? Or was there an adaptation in such a land to the purposes for which the chosen nation was separated from the rest of mankind? That the latter was the fact, is sufficiently established by the consideration, that Divine Wisdom usually ordains means naturally adapted to the ends it purposes to accomplish. In this view of the subject there arises a question worthy of much reflection, whether there be such established, general laws, as should invest mountains and their inhabitants with a peculiar importance in the eye of christian philanthropy. It has become apparent, that the great work of Foreign Missions must look to the results of the Home Missionary work for men and means to evangelize the nations. "Convert the West if

you would convert the world," is an axiom, the correctness of which is not disputed; but may not another axiom be proposed, with equal probability of truth—*convert the mountains if you would convert the West.*

We know that in many respects mountains sustain a most important relation to the lower parts of the earth's surface. There gush the fountains of those rivers which float the inland commerce of nations. There are found the minerals that furnish material to the useful arts, and a basis for the circulation of universal trade. There geology discloses her secrets to the eye of science, and there nature superintends her mighty laboratory, condenses her volumes of untainted air, and rolls it down the vale to displace the deadly miasma, and give the breath of life to mortals.

Now, just as these facts are found to affect the constitution and condition of men, we have in them a divine comment on that first of all practical questions—*for what was I made?* On the *natural* are based the *moral* relations of men, with all their responsibilities and results.

We venture now to lay down the following proposition:—

In temperate and torrid latitudes, the inhabitants of mountain districts exert a controlling moral influence upon the inhabitants of the lower portions of the earth surface.

I. We find *by observation* that the causes affecting the physical constitution of men must secure this result.

1.—The mountains are *the home of health.*

This fact being admitted, it will also be granted that there the best perfection of the physical system of man *can be attained*, and without dispute, *is attained*. Grant, for the moment, that a healthy physical system is not necessary to the best development of mental power, and still there is, in this part, a moral certainty, that the mountaineer will stand pre-eminent among men, because the same amount of mental power has more physical energy at command, to mature its thoughts into things and its wishes into events. Besides, who does not know that the mind possessing sound and vigorous organs is itself more vigorous? Who does not know that he has more mental vigor when he is well, than when he is sick?

2.—A healthy race will be a *numerous* race. In a great measure exempt from the malaria and epidemics of the low

countries, their homes must be crowded with active inmates, who demand something to do, and room to do it in. "The land is too narrow by reason of the inhabitants." Around every hearth-stone, and along every valley, swells the cry, "The place is too strait for me. Give place for me that I may dwell." Then

3. The mountain race is *an emigrating race*.

The mass of them are born for emigration. The narrow defiles in which they are born must perpetually pour forth their children, in an increasing tide, to seek a footing in ampler space. Age after age, it is one swelling avalanche of men. They disperse themselves on every plain of every clime. They carry their weight of social influence wherever they go. They imprint themselves upon every city, neighborhood, and country. Their tastes, habits and dispositions will be diffused through all the human family as long as mountain torrents continue to swell the tide of the majestic river. For

4.—The mountaineer is a *strong man*.

The source and circumstances of his existence inure him to habits which conduce to great strength of character. The rocky slope that gives him his frugal subsistence in scanty return for hardy toil, teaches him a lesson of fortitude which will bear him up when other men despair. His calculations will be small compared with his exertions; disappointment will be more easily borne, and success a more powerful stimulant to continued industry; and difficulties, what will he care for them who has clambered over rocks and precipices, till he would almost think his way the worse for their removal? In the same school he learns a lesson of perseverance which will impart cheerfulness and vigor, while others are crying, "what a weariness is it?" There too he is trained to habits of economy, by which the waving harvests of his destined home in the West will accumulate, and add the weight of wealth to his strong voice in every question which comes before the public mind.

And who needs an argument to show him that *strength of character*, more than any other one quality, avails to throw a man forward and upward in society? What community, party, army, clique, or marauding band, but holds it as a first qualification in a leader?

5. The mountaineer is eminently *a man of society*.

His health and spirits, his toils and sports, are well adapted to make him the very embodiment of good nature. They modify his very selfishness into a sort of generous good will to men, which, as a matter of fact, does appear eminently in his general demeanor. And while his strength of character commands respect, his generous nature wins him the friendship and the love of his species, and all together ensures that he shall always impart more of himself to others than he receives in turn from them.

To add weight and efficiency to all we have mentioned, there are the laws of *mental association* or *assimilation*, from which it must result, that the mountaineer will be a sort of *nature's nobleman*, wherever he shall make his abode.

The things with which men are most conversant in their youth, are the models of their character—the arbiters of their forms of thinking, speaking and doing. Through all professions, trades and conditions, we see men formed to the circumstances of their early life. There is one dialect for him who guides the keel, another for him who turns the soil, another for him who smites the anvil, and another for him who hunts the game. On the same principle, the thought, the diction, and the action of the mountaineer partake of the objects around him. He opens his infant eyes on the wonders which give to poetry her loftiest numbers, and to eloquence her boldest images and mightiest power. His earliest familiarities are with nature's widest extremes, holding their connexions through numerous visible gradations. How must his mind be imprinted with living images of the high and the deep, the mighty and the mild, the sportive and the solemn! Here yawns a chasm, there towers a pinnacle. Here dashes a foaming cataract, there leaps a silvery cascade, and there dances a tinkling rill. Here spreads a plain carpeted with green, yonder frowns a hoary precipice. Here hangs a sullen shade, there plays refulgent light. Here the soft zephyr gently fans the vale, yonder the wild spirits of the storm lash their furious chariots along the mountain's brow. And what must he be, to whom these realities, these distant extremes and blending varieties, are familiar as the furniture of childhood's home? Only admit the laws of mind, on which are based the arrangements of the nursery and the schoolroom, and which show us the

effect of those arrangements in the future man, and must not the mountaineer be a man unlike other men? What though he be untutored, unpolished, and rough as the crags around his father's cottage, yet with his thoughts and doings formed to such a model, will he not be recognized among men as the representative of nature's grandest sublimities? and will not thousands do him homage, though they know not why?

If men stand awed before him who climbed the terrible abutment of the Natural Bridge, or lean to hear the story of the traveller who has traced the doings of olden time upon the sculptured ruins of Athens or Corinth, will they find nothing peculiar or striking in him who, as he crossed the mountain, has descended thousands of fathoms through the strata of earth's formation; seen the upturned arcana of dateless periods; talked with thunderings and earthquakes that were heard only by the ear of God, and read the wars of volcanic elements sculptured on the mighty fragments of their ancient prison-walls?

Need we say more to justify the prediction, that the son of the mountain will be felt in society? His strong arm—his clear head—his generous impulses—his chastened enthusiasm, ensure him employment, competence and consequence, wherever he sees proper to go.

That uncouth lad, staring at the cliffs above his head, is not so vacant as you might suppose. His wild thoughts are breaking away from the confines of his native ravine, and sketching the scene of his future adventures. Follow him a few years, and he is the young man whose services are sought for the farm, the factory, or the counting house. Wholly or half welcome, he is in every company—does his own talking and laughing, and stands upon his own honest dignity. He has given a guarantee of his future importance. Presently he is allied to a wealthy family. His mountain generosity and river-bottom means, make him first a favorite and then a dictator. He holds civil office, or says who shall. He sits in the chair of state, or nominates its incumbent. He is the power *on* the throne or *behind* it. He rules among the rulers of the land.

From these observations and deductions, *a priori*,

II. Let us turn to *history*, and see whether it confirms what

observation indicates. We shall not, indeed, find that there never was a great mind or a strong arm but among the mountain-born; for nature has her apparent anomalies as well as her analogies. Nor shall we find that all the men who figure on the page of history, were mountaineers; for many of history's great men are but the things on which the favors of a capricious public mind have concentrated, and many more, the fictions of politico-historical pens, augmented into giants to answer a design. But what we shall find is—*that a large proportion of the men who have given themselves to fame and to posterity, by the intrinsic worth and greatness of their own deeds*—in whom were found the hidden springs of great events, were cradled or matured amidst mountain advantages.

Begin with the nearest great truth of history. Who but Samuel Houston, of the one part—and that an essential part—gave us annexation and the Mexican war, with all its blessings and its curses, its glory and its shame, to say nothing of that hastened *crisis* which makes stout hearts tremble? But Houston is a native of these mountains. And who but Stephen Austin—from Wythe county, Va.,—laid the foundation-stone of that same state of Texas, lighted up the *Lone Star*, on which two envious nations gazed, till they plunged together into the bloody ditch of war. True, there might have been annexation and a war without either Houston or Austin; for the same mountain breasts have nourished other adventurers, as mighty and wild as they, and the same mountain straitnesses have thrust them out to seek their fortune and their fame by deeds of boundless daring.

Again. Little more than half a century has passed since the Cherokee was a name of terror from the Delaware to the Savannah. The Cherokee of the mountains stood as a wall for his brethren of the West, and while *he* stood, they roamed secure over all the plain to the Mississippi. But no sooner was *he* overpowered, than they were beaten everywhere, and crouched, like captive wolves, at their captor's feet. This is true of all the tribes. The hardihood, the arm, the valor was in the mountains.

To avoid points of delicate comparison, let us cross the Atlantic; and, asking only the concession, that many great men, like great cities, are made by the concurrence of circumstances,

or like great rivers, by the confluence of mountain rills, we venture the assertion, that *a large proportion of the lights of learning, the champions of truth, and heroes of battle, sprung from the mountains.*

The deeds of valor which immortalize the story of Scottish patriotism, have made the very name of the Highlands a sound that tingles in the ear of tyranny wherever it is pronounced.

In France, the Pyrenees and Sevens gave to Napoleon* his victories and his fame.

The mountains of Germany nourished the arms which held Europe in dread for ages.

From the mountain glaciers of the north of Europe, leaped the iron hordes which scattered all the plain below like the chaff of the summer threshing floor.

Rome was mistress of the world, because her wild adventurous founders made themselves masters of mountain cradles ere their own mountain energies had time to degenerate.

The strength of Greece lay in the mountainous bosom of Macedonia—the mother of her phalanx, her Philip, and her Alexander.

For many an age the noble-hearted Swiss stood like their own Alps against the encroachments of modern Rome, supported by a world of wealth.

The Persian—invincible at home among his native heights—grew to be master of the world; but sank into effeminacy when the conquest of Babylon opened him a resting place on the plains of Mesopotamia.

Egypt, upon the banks of the Nile, the granary of the world, sank into the basest of kingdoms.

Glance at our own Revolution. Who stood the shock at Guilford? Who won the day at King's Mountain? Were they not those who, without waiting a formal call, leaped to the rescue from their mountain homes in Virginia and North Carolina? Well spake the Father of his country—"Leave me a standard to plant on the mountains of Augusta, and I'll rally the men to save the country."

From this glance at communities, let us turn and look at individual men.

Far beyond the dawn of Grecian story, sat Homer, the father

* Born under the Alps.

of song, and rolled his majestic numbers round the walls of Troy, to awe the critic, to edify the scholar, and guide the soarings of the sons of the Muses wherever literature shall flourish. His birthplace, however, and his home, have found no place in the chronicles of the world, over which his genius shines. Yet, who that has traced his ascent of gods up the Olympic way, or drunk the music of his Olympic thunder, but would assign his location where he could talk with nature on her highest pinnacles, and kindle the torch of his genius at the lightnings of heaven which played beneath his feet?

The muse of Virgil flourished among the Mantuan hills, and but for those hills we scarce had had the poet or the song.

The eloquence of Cicero—that last bulwark of Roman liberty and independence—gushed from the fountains of Arpinum, where Alps and Appenines exchange their icy breath.

John Huss, the Bohemian reformer, caught the first glimpses of the morning star of truth, on his native mountains.

What shall we say of the Waldenses? And what of Ulric Zuingle, who made his Alps gleam with the immortal lustre of truth?

On the mountains of Germany stood great Luther, and hurled the millstones down upon the towers of Rome, and made her ramparts of tyranny ashes under the feet of a disenthralled world.

Calvin, on the Sevenses, collected and arranged the morning rays of the Reformation, drew the line of order upon its chaos of glories, and showed to the world the realities of the faith, in the symmetrical proportions of open day, leaving little for after times to do but to paraphrase his language, and practicalize his theories.

Look at John Knox, of the hills of Scotland. His prayer, and faith, and courage, made the oppressor confess him more terrible than a thousand men in steel. And from that same land of hills has Chalmers just gone up—God's own Chalmers—who marshalled the hosts of heaven to the sounds of Calvary—who led the stars in their courses to storm the battlements of infidelity—who said to the proud minister of royalty—"Hitherto shalt thou come, and no farther," and led the host of God's elect forth from the bondage of civil alliance, and filled all coming time with the memorials of his name.

Now, after all the subtractions which will be required, or all the comparisons that will be instituted by any well-informed man, we venture to submit it for consideration, whether we have not found in mountain homes a good proportion of the men who have stamped themselves for the good and the great upon the face of all subsequent time. To the list we might add many more, but time forbids.

Worthy companions we admit there are, and we bow, but not with deference supreme, to the illustrious names which the low countries can boast. When we speak of the Macedonian chieftain, you may tell us of the Athenian orator. But did the eloquence of the one avail against the valor of the other? Fell not the impassioned diction of the Athenian, harmless as the darts of Priam, at the feet of the Macedonian? Alas! Demosthenes. Thy mightiest elocution is destined to a wretched immortality, tortured by the murderous mimicry of schoolboys, while Philip's word of command wheels thy country and thyself into the ranks of a conquered world. Alas! Demosthenes. What though thy rolling cadence move the voluptuous assemblies of Athens. It is but the skilful operator galvanizing dead patriotism into spasmodic action. What though the crowded populace heave to the gust of thy passion as the waves of the sea. Alas! Demosthenes. It is a sea of gossamer, wrought to a tempest by the breath of flowers. In one mule's burden of Philip's gold there is more argument for the city of lower Greece—in one blast from his mountain horn, there is more substantial eloquence than in all the thunder and lightning of thy phillipic. The Athenian lives in books—the Macedonian in things.

But you ask whom we will set over against Newton, Locke, Milton, Shakspeare, &c. Answer. No one. We would not set the strength of him who turns out the material from the quarries, in antagonism to the skill of him who constructs the edifice; nor compare the ponderous strength that strikes out some huge mass of knowledge, with the plodding toil which shapes that mass to order. They are not exactly subjects of comparison. Still we may ask, who, under God, produced the circumstances under which the great minds of the plains distinguished themselves? I admire Newton none the less, as he stands on the plain and scans the heavens; but I remember,

the reformers first stood on the mountains and swept the mists from the atmosphere of mental vision. So Locke *can* trace the laws of mind, when they have stricken off its fetters and left it free to work. So Milton *can* sing upon the Thames, when Homer has tuned the lyre on the classic hills of Greece. And so Shakspeare *can* dance at Stratford, when Luther has piped for him at Worms.

But let us inquire,

III. Are the conclusions to which we are led by observation and history confirmed by the Bible?

God selected a mountainous country for the home of his chosen family—the nursery of “his mighty ones.” His revealed reasons were just such as mountainous countries generally present, and as are generally adapted to the promotion of human greatness. He calls it, by way of pre-eminence, “*that good land.*” The great “mystery of godliness,” is “God manifest in the flesh.” The preparation of a body for Him, is the paramount item in the councils of eternity. But how is that body prepared? The drama opens by calling Abraham away from the broad plains of Mesopotamia, and maturing his physical, mental and moral constitution, among the mountain glories of Canaan—the home of his distant posterity. When that posterity had, by the orders of Providence, sojourned in bondage four hundred years, and Moses is to be commissioned as their deliverer and lawgiver, he must be weaned away from courtly indulgence and sumptuous fare, and hardened and taught among the distant mountains of Midian. Then the men who are to build the mighty state, of whom it can be said, “Who is so great a people as thy people,” must be led by miracle away from the flesh-pots of Egypt, where men suck weakness from the breasts of the Nile. The Anakim, too fierce and powerful to be endured by the groaning earth, must be smitten by the hand of Omnipotence, and his mountain home—the parent of his might—given to the chosen progenitors of a perfectly developed human nature for the Eternal Son. There they must be hardened by mountain toil, and refined by mountain breezes, and ennobled with mountain greatness, among the sublimities of “the everlasting hills.” There princes must measure their littleness by the side of hills which tremble at the presence of God; and senators learn wisdom among

those emblems of the mountain of his holiness; and executors learn justice of him "who weigheth the mountain in scales, and the hills in a balance." On these heights the seer must stand to discern the things that lie beyond the sight of man; and the prophet, to trace the succession of future destinies; and there must be the place for holy bards to tune the lyre and catch the song of angels on their strings, and roll the anthem of redemption around the spheres of time. There must stand Jerusalem, with her "mountains round about," and her Moriah peering in their midst. "Beautiful for situation, the joy of the whole earth is Mount Zion, the city of the Great King." Do we, then, trace too far the analogies of Jehovah's ways, if we say of these natural towers of his strength, "It shall" literally and extensively "come to pass" that "the mountain of the Lord's house shall be established above the top of the mountains?"

Let us now collect our argument and look at it.

1.—We have seen natural laws, sealed by facts, which must make the mountain race predominant in the westward flood of emigration, furnishing to the young West, every year, a fresh importation of unwasted strength.

2.—We have seen the testimony of history—the more credible because incidental—to the pre-eminence of mountain men in controlling the events of the world.

3.—We have seen that the God of the Bible has shown just such a course of things in relation to the affairs of his church.

Are we not then justified in the conclusion, that the inhabitants of mountainous regions exert, through all time, a controlling influence upon the character and destinies of the world? Admitting this conclusion, one tremendous inference arises—*It is all important that their influence be right.*

Improvement.—1. The mountains are the most interesting objects of prayer.

We have seen there a people, whom none but Omnipotence can rule, pouring themselves out perpetually upon their fellow men, moving like angels of light, or careering like ministers of death. We have been praying that God would purify the sources of moral power, and scarcely knew what we asked. We were thinking of the assemblies of state—the abodes of wealth—the walks of fashion—

the crowded mart—the mere agglomeration—the very sediment, thrown up and left by the stream of events, whose source is far up in rugged recesses, where the wheels of luxury never rolled, and the slippers of fashion never trod. Oh! if God would stretch out the arm of his grace, and sanctify to himself “the strength of the hills,” what streams of righteousness would fill the plains below. Pray for the mountains, and you pray for the world.

2.—We learn the importance of correct theology in the mountains.

The mountaineer is the man to hold on to his principles in theory, and carry them out in practice. He is like himself in his very follies and prejudices. Wherever he goes he finds men more ready to be misled by his errors than corrected by his light. There is life in truth, and death in error. But how much more, respectively, when they have moulded the iron character of the mountaineer to their pattern. Wo to the world when the mountains cease to enquire, “What is truth?” Give to them a pure Gospel, “mighty through God,” and the brief poetry of our text will expand into an anthem of universal joy.

3.—We learn the claims of the mountains on the christian community at large.

The very principle of self-preservation should teach the christians of the plains, that in saving the mountains they save themselves. The rough westerner—that terror to the eastern mother whose children leave her for the west—commenced his career in recesses of whose existence she scarcely dreams, and whose importance christian philanthropy has never weighed. Here he passed the forming period of life, and there, too probably, he lives but to exert an irreligious influence that will live when he is dead, and sink many a dollar of charity’s most precious gold, like lead to the bottom of the ocean.

See those well-meaning men toiling to purify the Mississippi, by filtering at its mouth. They may collect impurities enough, and wonder why the waters continue to come down turbid as before, after all their toil and success; and why, after so much improvement, it still carries so much impurity below their works. Ah, if they had gone to work to improve the fountain, there had been another state of things.

Unusual as it may be now to spend toil and money upon the mountains, posterity will say they were the last spots on earth which should have been neglected. But it is useless to stand here arguing this point with men a thousand miles away. But

4.—We learn the immense responsibility of the mountain christian.

Brethren, any soul is incalculably valuable, but relatively one soul may be worth more than another. If there is a tithe of truth in what we have advanced, then none of our fellow-servants have talents of such worth to account for as we. None of all God's priests and kings have such functions to discharge. If the ground is rough and the material hard, remember the finished article will be worth the more. The admiration of the world may gather around the faithful, accomplished city pastor, but its question of life or death looks to you for a decision. And when that day shall come when the "first shall be last, and the last first," the humble servant of Christ who has toiled among mountain crags, shall hear, as few besides, "Thou hast been faithful over a few things, I will make thee ruler over many things."

We are poor and need help, but if others will not come to the work, we must tax our own energies the higher, for these fortresses of truth must be manned. The mountain church must stand pre-eminent, "the pillar of the truth." And, without envy or exclusiveness, Calvinism—under God the first parent and last hope of civil and religious liberty—the nerve of christian courage—the guarantee of salvation to men—must here sound the trumpet of truth, over the plains below. And when the Calvinism of the plain, like Sampson slumbering in his unconscious might, yields the seven locks of his strength, to be woven in Delilah's web of worldly prudence, and that web is fashioned into a cloak of seeming charity, which the daughters of the Philistines shall scarcely distinguish from their own, the standard of truth, planted on the mountains, must "rally the men to save the country."

Brethren of this Synod—in you, of all the South, the cause of truth must find its last entrenchment. What though you toil unrewarded, and live unknown, and die without a name, and leave your children with no home but the bosom of a covenant-keep-

ing God! Your record is on high, and millions down the western vale shall drink from your hand the waters of salvation, though they know not whence they spring. And when coming destinies shall have unfolded the prophet's philosophy, and his philosophy paraphrased his allegory, earth shall sing, from mountain top to ocean's beach, "*How beautiful UPON THE MOUNTAINS are the feet of him that bringeth good tidings.*"

Reminiscences of Dr. Witherspoon, PRESIDENT OF THE COLLEGE OF N. JERSEY.

Removal to America—Enters upon his duties as President at Princeton, New Jersey—Member of Congress—Signs the Declaration of Independence.

IN 1766, Dr. Witherspoon was elected President of the College of New Jersey, but as his wife was opposed to his removal to America, he declined the Presidency. Her objections to his removal were first, her own unwillingness to leave her friends and her native country; and that he should leave so large a congregation as he then had in Paisley, consisting generally of from 1000 to 1200 hearers, and a much larger number on Sacramental occasions, who were very warmly attached to him; and second, her prejudices against this country, which was then considered in a new and rather unsettled state, especially as regarded the condition and interests of the Church. These I believe were her principal reasons in opposition to his coming to America. But upon more mature deliberation, and from a hope that he might be more extensively useful in training up young men for the Gospel ministry in this new and growing country, he was finally prevailed on by some of his friends there and in this country to signify his willingness to accept; upon which, to the great joy of the Trustees of the College, and the friends of religion generally, he was immediately and unanimously elected a second time President, and arrived with his family in Philadelphia, in August, 1768. His wife got over her objections only by a strong conviction that it was her husband's duty to enter the wide field of usefulness which God had thus opened for him. I have often heard the Doctor say that a hope or desire of being *instrumental in train-*

ing up young men for the Gospel ministry, was the principal motive which induced him to come to this country. I must not omit to state that previous to his acceptance of the Presidency of Nassau Hall, he had been called to settle in Amsterdam, and also either at the Hague or Leydon, and perhaps both, besides receiving a similar invitation to Dublin, all which he refused or declined from a greater partiality for his own country and people.

The Doctor used to relate an anecdote which occurred on his voyage to America, that is worth mentioning in this connection. A violent storm arose and raged with such fury that the captain of the vessel informed the passengers that the ship was about to be immediately lost, and urged them all to prepare for the solemn event which seemed to await them. The Doctor, after having been engaged in prayer and looking around him, observed a sailor upon his knees trying to pray. His prayer was short and pointed enough, and in intensity bears great resemblance to the publican's, abating the smile it must have created. "O Lord," he cried out, "wilt thou have mercy upon us poor damn'd sailors."

On his arrival in this country, he met with the most friendly and highly gratifying reception in New York, Philadelphia, and Princeton, and especially from his brethren of the clergy generally. He was better pleased with the country and its prospect than he expected, when he left Scotland.

As President, he rendered services to the College and the country which will always be remembered with peculiar honor. He labored to promote a high standard of morals as well as to advance the cause of learning, and to establish a system of mild and equitable laws for the institution. It was an object of special study with him to inculcate both by precept and example a strict observance of the Sabbath and a high respect for public worship in all places and under all circumstances in which he might be placed. He presided over the College with great dignity, usefulness and popularity, and was remarkable for his equanimity, urbanity and readiness to communicate instruction. The students universally esteemed him. He was a great advocate for mild equitable laws, such as are addressed to the moral sense, but equally decisive; their rigid execution. It was with feelings of just pride that he often spoke of many

of the graduates of the College under his Presidency, believing as he would state, that the College of New Jersey had turned out in a given time more distinguished scholars in the different professions than any other Institution in the United States, especially as public speakers. This he attributed to the course of studies and the superior system of discipline which had been adopted and matured by himself and those illustrious men, Edwards, Davies, Finley and Burr, who had preceded him.

In speaking of his favorite graduates in the ministry, he always placed the late Dr. Green of Philadelphia in the first rank, and next, Dr. Joseph Eckly, of Boston, Dr. Samuel Stanhope Smith, Rev. J. B. Smith, Rev. Gilbert Snowden, and Rev. John N. Abeel; and among the distinguished statesmen of the day, were James Madison, Wm. Bradford, Henry Lee, James A. Baynard, Wm. B. Giles, Wm. Johnson of South Carolina, Edward Livingston and R. G. Harper.

There is one branch which is usually included in Collegiate courses to which Dr. Witherspoon objected. He was strongly opposed to *Metaphysics* as a College exercise, though he fully admitted its great utility and importance as an after course of study. In this he differed widely from his particular friend and contemporary Rev. Dr. Charles Nisbet, President of Dickinson College, who, on the contrary, was a strenuous advocate of it as a College study.

The conspicuous part which Dr. Witherspoon took in the struggle of the colonies for independence is well known to all acquainted with the history of this country. As a member of Congress from the State of New Jersey, he delivered several important speeches, which carried great influence with them. I may here refer to his speeches on "the expediency or rather absolute necessity of prosecuting the war to a successful termination," on "enlisting as many as possible of the great Powers of Europe in our behalf," and on the "importance of establishing a sound currency to sustain the war and the faith of the nation." This last, in his view, formed one of the most difficult and perplexing subjects that engaged the attention of that enlightened body. I recollect, among other matters, to have heard him state that he delivered a speech in Congress on the subject of a national currency or on the intrinsic value

of specie, on which he afterwards changed his views, and, if I mistake not, the same speech was printed in a renewed form in Carey's American Museum.

It is well known that in the illustrious body of patriots, who, on the ever memorable 4th of July, 1776, signed the Declaration of Independence, Dr. Witherspoon held a distinguished rank. One among his best efforts on that momentous occasion was to remove, not so much the objections as the fears of the timid, as to the result of this great measure, and to prevail on such to sign the Declaration. Among those who persisted to the last in refusing to sign this document was Mr. John Dickinson, of Pennsylvania, who was otherwise considered a highly respected and worthy member. Mr. Joseph Galloway, also of Pennsylvania, was another of this class. These gentlemen and perhaps a few others, believed that the cause was doubtful, and on the event of a failure to establish our independence, the signers must lose their heads.

Statistics of Presbyterianism.

THE following statement respecting the numbers, extent, and influences of Presbyterian Churches, will be read with interest. It is copied from the Edinburgh Christian Witness:

“It is well known to our readers, that Scotland has formed the grand arena on which the exhibitions, the noblest contendings of Presbyterianism, have been displayed. Scotland's Reformed Church has been generally reputed the fairest daughter of the Reformation, and why? Because in her creed, in her government and discipline, she took the Bible as her only guide. And it is worthy of remark, that this very circumstance has given a kind of imprimatur to the whole moral history and character of Scotland, for nearly three centuries. Presbyterianism seems as if it were indigenous to Scotland, every other form of Church government having proved like a tender, a stunted and shrivelled exotic. There are scarcely 200 congregations of Episcopalians, Independents and Baptists, in Scotland, and even of these, there is no small number without regular pastors. The great body of Dissenters are seceders from the Establishment, and have retained Presbyte-

rianism. Of Presbyterian congregations, including the Establishment, and other Presbyterian bodies, there are about 2600.

In Ireland, there are about 700 Presbyterian congregations, embracing about the half of the Protestant population of that beautiful island.

In England there are upwards of 200 congregations professedly belonging to the Presbyterian Church; and in Wales there are about 550 congregations of Calvinistic Methodists, whose form of government very closely approximates to Presbyterianism.

In Holland, the Established religion is Presbyterian, with 1500 ministers, and 1,500,000 adherents.

In France, there are 400 congregations of the Reformed or Helvetic Church, and 200 of the Lutheran—collectively numbering 2,000,000 adherents.

In Switzerland, the established Church is Presbyterian, and the population are almost entirely attached to the national church. Its ministers are estimated at 800 to 1000.

The Waldenses, like their forefathers, are Presbyterians; they have 13 pastors and 24,000 people.

In Hungary, Germany, and Prussia, the great body of the people are Protestant, and belong either to the Reformed or Lutheran Churches—the former thoroughly Presbyterian, and the latter approaching far more closely to Presbyterianism than to any other form, maintaining that Presbyter and Bishop are identical, and that all pastors are equal in office, possessing what are called Superintendents only from human expediency.

If from the Old World we pass into the New, we find Presbyterianism in great strength. The largest proportion of the ministers and congregations of the United States, are Presbyterian—there being about 6,500 churches, and 5,500 ministers—embracing a population of several millions.

We have furnished enough of statistics to show that the Presbyterian body is a large and influential body—a body vastly more numerous than the Episcopalian Protestants, or the Congregationalists, of the Old and New World combined—and not only so, but a body equal, if not superior, to any other denomination of Christians, for soundness of creed, strictness of discipline, and godliness of conversation.”

From the *Missionary Herald*.

Missionary.

MADRAS.—LETTER FROM MR. WINSLOW.

HUMAN SACRIFICES IN GOOMSOR.

MR. WINSLOW has turned aside from his usual course in the following communication. Instead of describing the progress of the missionary work at Madras, he presents a frightful picture of human guilt and degradation in Goomsor, a district which lies partly in the presidency of Madras, and partly in that of Bengal. Much has been accomplished for India by the Christian religion, particularly in mitigating the horrors of heathenism; but the reader will see that there are some "dark places" still, which may be emphatically called "the habitations of cruelty."

"You are doubtless aware that the inhabitants of Goomsor called Khonds, have from time immemorial offered human sacrifices, after a very singular and cruel manner. The oblation is made to 'the earth goddess,' their principal deity. They have also a sun god, a moon god, a god of arms, a god of hunting, a god of births, a god of small pox, a hill god, a forest god, a rain god, a god of fountains, a god of rivers, a god of tanks, and village gods; but the earth goddess is the central object of worship, the most affecting exhibition of which is in the form of human sacrifices.

The earth goddess appears to be worshipped under two distinct characters, not often separately considered, however; namely, that of the supreme power, and that which presides over the productive energies of nature. In the former character, she is said to be worshiped in one case only; that is, when a tribe engages in war, its enemies being of another race. Her name is then invoked, and vows of sacrifices, in case of success, are made. Her nature is purely malevolent; but she does not interfere with other deities, in their respective spheres.

As presiding over the operations of nature, or as the energizing principle, her supposed attributes are the reflected image of the wants and fears of an agricultural population, in an elementary or uncivilized state. She rules the order of the seasons; sends the periodical rain; gives fecundity to the soil;

as also health or sickness to the people. On her depends the preservation of the patriarchal houses and the safety of flocks and herds. She has no fixed corporeal shape; and she is worshipped neither in any temple nor under any symbol or image. In common with inferior divinities, however, she may assume temporarily any form, as that of a tiger, for purposes of wrath. She is propitiated by sacrifices both of men and animals.

Human sacrifices are either public or private. Of the former, every farm should receive, at seed time and ingathering, a portion of the flesh and blood of a victim; and according as the prospect of a crop varies, it should have some intervening oblations. A sacrifice is also required in case of sickness among men or animals, and also in the event of the destruction of the latter by wild beasts. If the 'abbaya,' or priest, is visited with sickness in his family, the failure of his crops, or the loss of his stock, the same thing must be done; as his prosperity is an index of the disposition of the goddess towards the people over whom he presides.

The more private sacrifices are offered in case of any extraordinary calamity, indicating the anger of the goddess towards a particular house; as when a child, watching a flock, is carried off by a tiger. If a human sacrifice cannot then be obtained, a goat is led to the place of sacrifice, and its ear is cut off and cast bleeding upon the ground, as a pledge to be redeemed with human blood at the appointed time within the year.

By recent publications, in connection with a report of the agency which has been employed by the government for more than seven years to put a stop to their sacrifices, it appears that in a small section of the country, three or four hundred innocent victims are annually torn to pieces in this horrid rite. Several hundred have from time to time been rescued. On one occasion one hundred and twenty-four victims, valued at ten or twelve thousand rupees, were voluntarily given up to the agent. And in one year one hundred and forty-two were saved, and were afterward variously distributed; some having been left with the missionaries in Orissa, some having been brought to Madras, whom I saw, and some females having been given in marriage to Khond chiefs."

It is to be regretted that the efforts of the Government have not hitherto been entirely successful in abolishing this horrid

custom. The day must soon come, however, when all such offerings will cease throughout India.

PROCURING THE VICTIMS.

The following description of these human sacrifices, with the usual preliminaries, has been extracted by Mr. Winslow from an account to which he obtained access in India:

“The unhappy persons who are to be offered in sacrifice, are known in the Khond language under the designation of ‘merias.’ They are not usually native Khonds, but are provided by a class of Hindoo procurers, who purchase them without difficulty upon false pretences, or kidnap them from the poorer classes of Hindoos in the low country, either to the order of the priests, or upon speculation. When conveyed to the mountains, their price is determined by the demand, varying from fifty to a hundred lives, that is, of sheep, cows, fowls, pigs, &c. A few are always kept in reserve in each district, if possible, to meet sudden demands for atonement. Victims of either sex are equally acceptable to the earth goddess.—Children, however, whose age precludes a knowledge of their situation, are for convenience sake preferred. Brahmins, who have assumed the sacred thread, being perhaps regarded as already consecrated to the deity, are held to be not quite so acceptable; but the word of the procurer is the only guaranty of fitness in these respects which is required. But whatever be the real class, rank or nation of the victim, it is a highly characteristic feature of the system, pregnant with important consequences, that in all cases it must be bought with a price; an unbought life being an abomination to the deity.

TREATMENT OF THE MERIA.

The meria is brought blindfold to the village by the procurer, and is lodged in the house of the abbaya. He is kept in fetters, if grown up; but he is left at perfect liberty, if a child. During life, he is regarded as a consecrated being, and if at large, he is eagerly welcomed at every threshold. Victims are not unfrequently permitted to attain to years of maturity in total ignorance of their situation; although it is not easy to understand how this ignorance can be maintained. Should one in such circumstances form a temporary alliance with a Khond female, thankfulness is expressed to the deity for the distinction. Generally, however, to a meria youth who thus grows

up, a wife of one of the Hindoo castes upon the mountains is given. Farm stock and land are presented to him; and should a family be the result, it is held to be born to the fearful condition of the sire. The sacrifice of lives which are surrounded by these ties, is often foregone; but should the dread divinity require an atonement not easy to be afforded, the victim father, with all his children, is dragged without hesitation to the altar. It is a rule, however, that persons standing in the relation of direct descent shall not be immolated in the same district.— This is a law so rigidly observed, that when a victim is thought in any degree to resemble a former mature sacrifice, he is always, out of precaution, resold or exchanged. By this means also the risk is avoided of sacrificing, according to the ideas of the Khonds, the same life twice to the divinity.

PRELIMINARIES OF THE SACRIFICE.

All the arrangements, connected with the ceremony of a human sacrifice, are conducted by the patriarch in concert with the priest. The divine will is in every case declared by the latter, as it is communicated to him in visions; and he may demand a victim at any time, even when no visible signs of divine displeasure appear.

From the festivals of sacrifice no one is excluded; and at them all feuds are forgotten. They are generally attended by a large concourse of people of both sexes. They continue for three days, which are passed in the indulgence of every form of gross and indescribable excess. The first day and night are spent exclusively in drinking, feasting, and obscene riot.

Upon the second morning, the victim, having fasted from the preceding evening, is carefully washed, dressed in a new garment, and led forth from the village in solemn procession, with music and dancing, to the meria grove. This grove consists of a clump of deep and shadowy forest trees, and usually stands at a short distance from the hamlet, by a rivulet which is called the meria stream. It is kept sacred from the axe, and is studiously avoided by the Khond as haunted ground. In the middle of it, an upright stake is fixed, at the foot of which the victim is seated, and bound back to it by the priest. He is then anointed with oil, ghee, and turmeric, and adorned with flowers; and a species of reverence, which it is not easy to distinguish from adoration, is paid to him throughout the day.

There is now infinite contention to obtain the slightest relic of his person; a particle of the turmeric paste with which he is smeared, or a drop of his spittle, being esteemed, especially by the women, of supreme virtue. In some districts, small rude images of beasts and birds in clay are made in great numbers and stuck on poles; but of the origin or meaning of this practice there is no satisfactory explanation.

On the third morning, the victim is refreshed with a little milk; while the licentious feast, which has scarcely been intermitted during the night, is vociferously renewed. The acceptable place for the intended sacrifice, has been discovered, during the previous night, by persons sent out for this purpose. The ground is probed in the dark with long sticks; and the first deep chink that is pierced, is considered the spot indicated by the earth goddess.

THE CONSUMMATION.

As the victim must not suffer bound, nor on the other hand exhibit any show of resistance, the bones of his arms, and, if necessary, those of his legs are now broken in several places. The priest, assisted by the abbaya and by one or two of the elders of the village, then takes a branch of a green tree, which is cleft in the middle for a distance of several feet. They insert the meria within the rift; fitting it in some districts, to his chest, in others to his throat. Cords are next twisted round the open extremity of the stake, which the priest, aided by his assistants, strives with his whole force to close. All preparations being now concluded, the priest about noon gives the signal, by slightly wounding the victim with his axe. Instantly the promiscuous crowd, that erewhile had issued forth with stunning shouts and pealing music, rush with maddening fury upon the sacrifice. Wildly exclaiming, "We bought you with a price, and no sin rests on us," they tear his flesh in pieces from the bones! And thus the horrid rite is consummated. Each man then bears away his bloody shreds to his fields, and from thence returns directly to his house.

For three days after the sacrifice, the inhabitants of the village which afforded it, remain dumb, communicating with each other only by signs, and remaining unvisited by strangers. At the end of this period, a buffalo is slaughtered at the place of sacrifice, when all tongues are loosened."

The latest intelligence in regard to the efforts of the Government for the suppression of the rite above described, is derived from the *Friend of India* of January 25, 1849, which says:—“We are happy to be able to state, on authority which we believe to be unexceptionable, that the government agent now in Chinna Kimedya, has already experienced a very encouraging degree of success in his efforts. He has received one hundred and six merias, and in our opinion deserves great praise for the cautious and judicious measures he has pursued, and which have so abundantly prospered. The commissioner is, of course, accompanied by troops; but we are happy to be able to state, that not a hut or a fruit tree has been injured, and not a single individual hurt. The hills of Chinna Kimedya are wild and inaccessible, and the people are believed to be more than ordinarily ferocious; but they appear to have submitted to our wishes. The last full moon had been fixed upon for a great sacrifice, to anticipate the agent’s arrival; but he was happily in the midst of the tribe twelve days before the appointed time.”

Silent Reproof.

SOME years ago, I was going down the James River in a steamboat, in company with several clergymen, whose eyes may alight on these lines. There was also with us a judge of one of the Virginia courts, much celebrated for his eccentricity and his genius. In the course of conversation, mention was made of the Rev. Dr. JOHN H. RICE, then lately deceased. The attention of the judge was awakened, and he related the following anecdote:

“I was once crossing the James River at Osborn’s, in company with Dr. Rice. When we reached the further side, it became necessary for us to be carried ashore on the shoulders of the black ferrymen. One of these, not sufficiently careful, let my cloak drag in the water, upon which I visited him with a sudden oath. Dr. Rice, who was immediately before me, and had just landed on the bank, drew up his tall figure, and turned his large speaking eye upon me, with an expression of mingled surprise and sorrow. Perceiving that he was a cler-

gyman, I instantly begged his pardon, though he had not uttered a syllable. 'Your offence is not against me,' said he. The implication was obvious and affecting, and I shall never lose the remembrance of it as long as I live."—*American Messenger*.

The Power of Kindness.

MANY years since, there lived in one of the central counties of New Jersey a poor mechanic, eminent for his pious zeal and consistency. He was very much tried by the conduct of an ungodly neighbor, who was in the habit of cutting his wood for the week on the Lord's day, and the sound of whose axe continually disturbed the old Christian's meditations. Father H., as he was called, often remonstrated earnestly and kindly with his neighbor, but without any effect. At length he adopted a different course. One Saturday afternoon his neighbor found the old man very busy at his woodpile, and inquired in astonishment what he was doing. "Why," replied Father H., "you will persist in cutting your wood on God's holy day, and it grieves me so much that I mean to do it for you this afternoon, so that you will have no temptation to do it to-morrow." The man was at once overcome, and exclaimed, "No, you shall not, I will do it myself. Nor will you ever, after this, have reason to complain of me for chopping wood on the Sabbath." And he was as good as his word.

The old man has long since gone to his reward, but this incident lives after him to enforce the divine direction, "Be not overcome of evil, but overcome evil with good."—*American Messenger*.

SYRIAN REFORMER.—Letters from Tripoli state that a young Greek of learning and influence in Damascus, is engaged with the dignitaries of the Romish church in discussing its doctrines. The Bible is the test used on both sides.

Rev. DAVID B. COE, of the Presbyterian church in New York, has been appointed one of the Secretaries of the American Board, to reside in that city.

THE
Calvinistic Magazine.
[NEW SERIES.]

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

Vol. IV.

August, 1849.

No. 8.

Perseverance of the Saints.

—
BY REV. JAMES H. GASS.
—

Hebrews 6: 1—20.

THIS chapter of Sacred Writ is one about which there have been, and yet are, different opinions;—one about which there have been many warm and animated discussions. Many of these discussions have tended to mystify, rather than elucidate the text. Men of talents, piety, and learning, have written and spoken upon the subject, without fully settling, to the satisfaction of all inquiring minds, the design of the apostle in his argument. Hence it can scarcely be expected that my humble efforts will cast much additional light upon a subject so deep, grand, and glorious. But by noticing with care some of the opinions respecting the passage before us, together with the apostle's argument, we hope to be able to show what is the true doctrine on the subject discussed in this chapter.

1. The first of these opinions is, that the apostle here teaches the doctrines of christian perfection, and falling from grace.

2. That the apostle here speaks of nominal professors, not christians.

3. That the apostle here speaks of true believers in Christ, and their security. The latter is the opinion of the speaker.

Both reason and Scripture support this view, as will be seen by a careful examination of the apostle's argument, to which I now invite the attention of my hearers.

Verse 1—"Therefore leaving the principles of the doctrine of Christ, let us go on unto perfection; not laying again the

foundation of repentance from dead works, and of faith toward God.”

The correct understanding of this verse will cast much light upon the whole chapter, and enable us to see with the clearness of a sun beam the design of the apostle’s argument. By turning to the Greek Testament we will see the true meaning of this verse.

(*Greeks.*—“*Dio aphentes tes arches ton logon tou Christou pherometha epi ten teleioteta.*”)

The true meaning of which is, “Therefore leaving or dismissing the beginning, or first principles of the word of Christ, let us go on to the end, result, or completion. Not as some suppose, “Therefore, leaving the principles of the doctrine of Christ, let us go on to christian perfection.” This view of the subject condemns itself. For if christian perfection were attainable in this life, there is no possible way by which we could attain it, but by embracing and resting upon the principles of the doctrine of Christ. This however is not the design of the apostle’s argument. He designs to teach us, that having learned or discussed the beginning or first principles of the word of Christ, let us trace these principles to their end. Or in other words, let us go on and see what will be the end of the believer who embraces and rests upon these first principles. Just as we would say to the child, having learned the alphabet, hasten, go on, or follow out these principles to their end, which will be the end or completion of all the English science. In the alphabet he learns the beginning, or first principles, by which he can arrive at the highest eminence in literature. Thus having embraced the first principles of the word of Christ, we will arrive in heaven. For they as certainly lead the soul to heaven as the understanding of the alphabet will enable the scholar to go through, or to the end of all the sciences. The beginning of these first principles in the heart is eternal life, and this life is “Hid with Christ in God.”—Col. 33.

The apostle tells us some of the things we will leave, “Not laying again the foundation of repentance from dead works, and of faith toward God, &c., &c. These have been laid, let us not lay them again, but go on to see what will be the end of the believer.”—V. 3. “And this will we do if God permits.” Notice one thing in this place—that there were some

in the days of the apostles who believed and taught the doctrine of falling from grace. They seemed to teach it just as it is taught at this day. They taught that a man could fall from grace and then obtain it again. With this class the apostle had here to contend.

In the first place he took up their doctrine of falling, and ran it out, in order to show them their error. Thus he begins: V. 4—"For it is impossible for these who were once enlightened, and have tasted of the heavenly gift, and were made partakers of the Holy Ghost, V. 5—And have tasted of the good word of God, and the powers of the world to come, V. 6—If they shall fall away, to renew them again unto repentance, seeing they crucify to themselves the Son of God afresh, and put him to an open shame." Here he shows them that if the true believer were to fall from grace, it would be impossible to renew him again. They believed that he could fall and arise again. But Paul says, if your doctrine of falling be true, your doctrine of his rising again is false. For in that case he would "crucify to himself the Son of God afresh, and put him to an open shame." Hence there would be no possible chance for him to be renewed again. Thus he shows them conclusively that one portion of their doctrine was false. Now I ask the candid man, does the apostle by this language teach that the believer may, can, or will fall from grace, and be lost? I answer, he does not.

Let me illustrate the case. Were I to say, if the sun were blotted out of creation, perpetual darkness would be the result or consequence, would any man in his senses think that this language implied, or was a conclusive proof, that the sun might or would be blotted out? Surely not. No more does the apostle teach in verses 4, 5 and 6, that the believer may, can, or will fall from grace and be lost. This form of argument was common to Paul, as we will see by turning to other portions of Scripture.

See 1 Cor. 15: 12—20. The subject here is the resurrection of the dead. "Now if Christ be preached that he rose from the dead, how say some among you that there is no resurrection of the dead? But if there be no resurrection of the dead, then is Christ not risen: and if Christ be not risen, then is our preaching vain, and your faith is also vain. Yea, and we are

found false witnesses of God, because we have testified of God that he raised up Christ, whom he raised not up, if so be that the dead rise not. For if the dead rise not, then is not Christ raised. And if Christ be not raised, your faith is vain; ye are yet in your sins. Then they also which are fallen asleep in Christ are perished. If, in this life only, we have hope in Christ, we are of all men most miserable."

Does any one infer from this argument that Paul believed there was no resurrection of the dead? No one that can put two ideas together will believe it for a moment. He adopted this argument to show them what would be the result of their doctrine, if true. It would destroy the whole scheme of grace and leave man in his sins.

After thus showing to them the absurdity of their doctrine, he goes on to prove that the dead will rise. See v. 20—"But now is Christ risen from the dead, and become the first fruits of them that slept." This verse proves the resurrection of the dead as clearly as language can prove any thing.

We will now resume our subject. In v. 6, Paul says, "if they fall away," &c. Did he believe this ever was or would be the case with any true believer? That he did not, we will see by attending to his argument. V. 7—"For the earth which drinketh in the rain that cometh oft upon it, and bringeth forth herbs, meet for them by whom it is dressed, receiveth blessing from God. V. 8—But that which beareth thorns and briars is neglected, and is nigh unto cursing; whose end is to be burned." In these two verses we have the two grand classes of the human family brought to view.

(1.) Christians are represented by the first piece of ground. They receive the influences of the Spirit and grace of God in their hearts, by which the graces of the Spirit are cultivated in the soul; the result of which is, they bring forth herbs meet for him by whom it is dressed, and are blessed of God. See Is. 27: 3, where this piece of ground is spoken of under the similitude of a vineyard—"I the Lord do keep it; I will water it every moment: lest any hurt it, I will keep it night and day." Notice the language in both these passages. Paul says, "Drinketh in the rain that cometh oft upon it." "I will water it every moment." Both the prophet and apostle have reference to the influences of Divine grace bestowed upon the

church, and believers individually, by which the heart of the believer is dressed, and enabled to bring forth fruit unto God. Paul says, they do bring forth herbs, meet for them by whom it is dressed, and are blessed of God. It is the rain that cometh oft upon it that causes this ground to bring forth herbs. And it continueth to bring forth herbs, because it is still watered and dressed. It is a fact well known that a piece of ground well cultivated will never wear out, but get better, as long as it is properly managed. Thus it is with the child of God, whose heart is dressed by grace Divine; or in other words, "drinketh in the rain that cometh oft upon it, it bringeth forth herbs meet for them by whom it is dressed." Every watering and dressing increases the fruit. In this way it is that the believer has his "fruit unto holiness, and the end everlasting life."—Ro. 6: 22. Again. "Every branch that beareth fruit he purgeth it that it may bring forth more fruit."—John, 15: 2.

The second piece of ground represents the sinner who, notwithstanding the many favors he receives, bringeth forth nothing better than thorns and briars—whose end is to be burned. This is the end of the sinner, not of the believer.

V. 9—"But, beloved, we are persuaded better things of you, and things that accompany salvation, though we thus speak." The idea here is, he was persuaded better things of believers than cursing and burning, or falling from grace, though he had thus spoken. He was persuaded better things, and things that accompanied salvation; just as I would say to the believer, I am persuaded better things of you than falling from grace. In this verse he tells us plainly that he did not believe that the believer would ever fall and be lost, "for I am persuaded better things, and things that accompany salvation;" that is, the final salvation of the soul of the believer.

But, says one, why did he thus speak, if he did not believe that the believer would ever fall and be lost? He did it to show them their error; not that he believed such a case would ever occur. By what means was he persuaded better things? By the Spirit of God. In the next verse, he tells why he was thus persuaded. V. 10—"For God is not unrighteous to forget your work, and labor of love which you have showed toward his name, in that ye have ministered to the saints, and

do minister." Turn back to v. 7—"Bringeth forth herbs meet for them by whom it is dressed receiveth blessing from God." "For God is not unrighteous, &c., to forget your work, and labor of love, which you have showed toward his name, in that ye have ministered to the saints, and do minister." By comparing these two verses we see one way by which they bring forth herbs meet for him by whom they are dressed. God looks upon each act of ministering to the saints, as done unto himself. See Matt. 25: 40—"Verily I say unto you, in as much as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me."

V. 11—"And we desire that every one of you do show the same diligence to the full assurance of hope unto the end." From this, and verse 1, the advocates of apostacy would prove christian perfection. V. 1—"Let us go on unto perfection." Then to the "full assurance of hope." Of course they have arrived at perfection. Now, I ask the candid man, how he can reconcile doctrines so directly opposite, as christian perfection and final apostacy? As well try to mix oil and water, as to harmonize two points so opposed to each other.

Again, I ask, does the doctrine of falling from grace encourage full confidence or assurance of hope to the end? Surely not.

Hope is the expectation of some future good. Full assurance, is a full confidence or expectation of entering heaven at last. Paul says, we desire that every one of you have this confidence or expectation unto the end. If the doctrine of falling from grace be true, then it is true also that the man who believes it cannot have this full assurance unto the end. He may say he has grace now, but he knows not but he may lose it and be lost. His hope does not reach unto the end, but is confined to the present time. This would beget distrust in God, and encourage confidence or trust in man's own works. Follow out this principle and we will see that it ends in this—that, after we are made the children of God, it then depends upon our own works whether we get to heaven or not.

V. 12—"That ye be not slothful, but followers of them who through faith and patience inherit the promise."

From this verse we learn what effect full confidence or expectation of entering heaven had upon those who embraced it,

It led them actively to persevere unto the end, or until they possessed the promise, which was an admission to heaven.

V. 13—"For when God made promise to Abraham, because he could swear by no greater he swear by himself. V. 14—Saying surely blessing I will bless thee, and multiplying I will multiply thee. V. 25—And so, after he had patiently endured, he obtained the promise."

None will dare deny that Abraham entered heaven. God's faithfulness led him into the full possession of all the joys above. And as certainly as Abraham entered heaven, so will each one of the heirs of promise.

V. 16—"For men verily swear by the greater, and an oath for confirmation is to them an end of all strife."

This we know to be true among men, an oath ends the strife. It is the end of the law. Here it stops.

Now see the application of this in V. 17—"Wherein God, willing more abundantly to show unto the heirs of promise the immutability of his counsel, confirmed it by an oath." God had given Abraham full evidence of his faithfulness to his promise, in multiplying and blessing him, and receiving him into heaven. But willing more abundantly to show unto the heirs of promise the immutability of his counsels, he confirmed it by an oath. "That by two immutable things, in which it was impossible for God to lie, we might have a strong consolation who have fled for refuge to lay hold of the hope set before us."

Who are the heirs of promise? Believers, or Abraham's seed. All believers are Abraham's seed, as is evident from the following passage:—"And if ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise."—Gal. 3: 29. This proves clearly that believers are the heirs of promise. Now, God willing to give to them more abundant testimony of his faithfulness and immutability, confirmed it by an oath; and that by two immutable things—first, his eternal purpose or counsel; second, his oath or promise. Notice the purpose for which God thus bound himself to the heirs of promise—"That they might have a strong consolation." For he regards their consolation as well as their safety. God's immutability is pledged unto each of them; then if one fails, God has become mutable, which would destroy his Deity.

V. 19—Which hope we have as an anchor of the soul, both

sure and steadfast, and which entereth into that within the veil; whither the forerunner is for us entered, even Jesus, made a high priest forever after the order of Melchisedec."

From this we see that the christian's hope is given as an anchor to his soul. It is both sure and steadfast, and entereth into the veil. Let us go back to the 11th verse—"The full assurance of hope unto the end." Now mark, this full assurance is unto the end. Where is the end? See v. 19—"Which hope we have as an anchor of the soul, both sure and steadfast, and entereth into that within the veil." This hope to the end enters into the veil. Heaven is the veil, whither Christ the forerunner hath entered. I think I am warranted from these to say, that as certainly as Christ entered heaven, so certainly will all true believers; otherwise, their anchor is neither sure nor steadfast. To suppose that the anchor is uncertain, would be to charge God with falsehood.

I have now briefly gone through this chapter, and, as I think, given the true meaning of the doctrine therein contained. I will next proceed to answer some objections usually brought against the doctrine of final perseverance.

OBJECTIONS ANSWERED.

1. If apostacy be not true, why so many cautions in the Bible?

Ans.—For the best of reasons. But,

In the first place, I ask the advocate of apostacy to show me, in the Book of God, a caution against falling from grace. Do you say that there are many? If so, I ask you to show me one passage where God says to the believer, take heed lest you fall from grace. Perhaps you may say, there are many such as the following:

"Let him that thinketh he standeth take heed lest he fall."—1 Cor. 10: 12. Will any one say that this is a caution against falling from grace? If so, I ask that man to show me the word grace, or any thing like it, in this or other passages of like kind. The opinion of the speaker is, that there is not the first caution against falling from grace in the Book of God. Do you ask what the many cautions are, if they are not cautions against falling from grace? They are cautions against falling into sin, and the snares of the enemy. This is evidently the caution. Will any one say that it is falling from grace? If

this be true, then it is true that every side-step or backsliding is falling from grace. The question is not whether the believer does any wrong, but whether he can fall away and be lost.

Christians are the children of God, and as such, have need of caution as well as the children of the flesh. Here the question may be asked, why does the parent caution his child? Is it for his own sake, or for the benefit of the child? It is for the benefit or interest of the child. In a well regulated family there are established laws, the object of which is to guard the interest and regulate the conduct of its members. This law contains many cautions to the child against every violation of its precepts. This we know to be true. Now, the question is, do these cautions imply that if the child does violate the law he will thereby cease to be the child of that parent? Surely not. The question is not whether he will ever disobey the parent, for all do this more or less. But, whether he can or will cease to be his child? This is the point at issue. I say he cannot.

Perhaps one may say, that the child may act in such a manner that he may be banished, or become an exile. Suppose this to be true, would that destroy the relation he sustains to his parent? That of a child? No. He would still remain the child—the begotten of the father. No act of either the father or the child can destroy this relation. There is no law either of God or man by which this relation can be destroyed. Suppose the child to be engaged in doing that which he is forbidden to do. Does that destroy the relation of child? No. But, says one, suppose he were to die while doing wrong, how then? The relation of child would still exist. Were this the case it would only prove that the child in that case had for a time forgotten, or broken over his obligation to his father. Not that he had ceased to be his child. That cannot be. He cautions the child in order that he may escape the chastisement which he must necessarily receive in case of transgression.

The relation between God and his child is brought to our view by that of an earthly parent and his child, but in a much stronger degree, as will be seen by the following passage of Scripture:—Is. 49: 15, 16—“Can a woman forget her sucking

child, that she should not have compassion on the son of her womb? Yea, they may forget, yet will I not forget thee. Behold, I have graven thee upon the palms of my hands; thy walls are continually before me."

The question is here asked, "Can a woman forget her suckling child?" and is answered that she may, which according to nature is next to impossible. Still God says she may forget, yet he will not forget his children. They are graven upon his hands, where they are continually before him; ever in his sight.

Again, see his care of his church—"I the Lord do keep it; I will water it every moment: lest any hurt it, I will keep it night and day." This passage proves God's continual care of his church, and the influences he exerts upon her, by which she is enabled to persevere in the service of God unto the end. And what is true with regard to the church collectively, is true with regard to each individual member. See Ps. 121: 4-8:—"Behold, he that keepeth Israel shall neither slumber nor sleep. The Lord is thy keeper: the Lord is thy shade upon thy right hand. The sun shall not smite thee by day, nor the moon by night. The Lord shall preserve thee from all evil: he shall preserve thy soul. The Lord shall preserve thy going out and thy coming in from this time forth, and even forever more." This passage ought to stop the mouth of every objector. For if it be true that God preserves the soul forever, then the final perseverance of the saints is true absolutely. Otherwise God does not preserve the soul forever more. This would make God a liar.

But, says the objector, this is true if the believer will do his duty, God will do his. This objection would make the salvation of the soul depend upon man's own works. See Ps. 89: 30-37, speaking of David, or Christ—"If his children forsake my law, and walk not in my judgments, if they break my statutes and keep not my commandments; then will I visit their transgressions with the rod, and their iniquity with stripes: Nevertheless my loving-kindness will I not utterly take from him, nor suffer my faithfulness to fail, My covenant will I not break, nor alter the thing that is gone out of my lips. Once have I sworn by my holiness that I will not lie unto David. His seed shall endure for ever, and his throne as the

sun before me. It shall be established for ever as the moon, and as a faithful witness in heaven."

From this passage we see that the safety of the believer rests upon God's covenant with David, or Christ—for David here means Christ. "Once have I sworn by my holiness that I will not lie unto David." "My covenant will I not break, nor alter the thing that is gone out of my lips. Nor suffer my faithfulness to fail."

Now mark, 1. That God says he will not suffer his faithfulness to fail, nor alter the thing that is gone out of his lips. And 2. That he will not lie unto his Son. What has he said unto his Son? 1. He says, if his children transgress my law I will correct them. 2. That his seed shall endure forever.

No one will deny, that the kingdom of Christ is established forever, as the sun and moon. This is admitted by all. Then as his kingdom is established forever, so is the safety of God's child based upon the same inviolable oath and promise—"Once have I sworn by my holiness that I will not lie unto David." His seed shall endure for ever, "and his throne as the sun before me." Here the duration of Christ's throne, and the life and safety of the believer, are placed side by side. If one fails, or falls, the other will fall also. "My covenant will I not break," "Not suffer my faithfulness to fail." If the seed of David or Christ are unfaithful, I will not be—I'll bring them back. This is confirmed by an oath. The Psalmist says God has sworn by his holiness. Paul says he has sworn by two immutable things, "in which it was impossible for God to lie." These immutable things are, his eternal counsel, and promise. This being true, God's faithfulness, counsel, promise, holiness, and immutability, are pledged by solemn oath to keep his child forever. Then, if they fall from grace and are lost, His counsel, faithfulness, holiness, and promise, would fail.

OBJECTION 2.—"When a righteous man turneth away from his righteousness, and committeth iniquity, and dieth in them, for his iniquity that he hath done shall he die."—Ez. 18: 26.

In this chapter God was charged with injustice, because he would not punish the father for the sin or wickedness of the son, and the son for the wickedness of the father. But he teaches them that this would be unjust, to punish the innocent for the

guilty. "The soul that sinneth it shall die." That is, each soul shall bear its own sin. If one man has done wrong, and turns from the wrong he hath done, it would be right to forgive that wrong. And if a good man were to do wrong and die, it would be just in him to punish him for his wrong. Does this teach that the righteous man will turn from his righteousness and die? Surely it does not. Take another passage. "If the Lord be God follow him."—1 Kings, 18: 21. Who that is a believer in the Bible will say from this passage that the prophet here teaches that it is doubtful whether the Lord be God or not? No one in his senses. No more does God teach in the passage under consideration that true believers will fall away and be lost. I admit that he may and does fall into error many times. But, "Though he fall he shall not be utterly cast down; for the Lord upholdeth him with his hand."—Ps. 37: 24. Again, "Rejoice not against me, O mine enemy: when I fall I shall arise; when I sit in darkness the Lord shall be a light unto me."—Mich. 7: 8. "For a just man falleth seven times and riseth up again."—Pro. 24: 16. Here it is stated in plain terms that good men may do wrong, but God's faithfulness cannot fail. He will raise them up again.

We will adopt similar language with the text above. Were I to say, if my child violates my law I will disinherit him, does this imply that he may, can, or will cease to be my child? Surely not. Then in the text above, and kindred passages, "If the righteous fall he shall die," it is not implied that the righteous may, can, or will cease to be God's child, any more than when I say, if my child does wrong I will banish him, implies he may cease to be my child. If a parent were to banish his child into exile, he would still be his begotten child. So, were God to banish his child as an exile to hell, he would still be the begotten son of God his Father. In this case hell would be a strange place for him. In view of this, I would ask, for which of his sins he would be punished? Would it be for his sins prior to his conversion? No. For they are pardoned. See Heb. 10: 17—"And their sins and iniquities will I remember no more." If they are remembered no more, they will not be brought up against them. Then they cannot be punished for the sins done before conversion. What then would follow? They would go to hell half pardoned, as there

is no law, either civil or divine, to punish a man for his pardoned sins.

Again. When we are begotten by the Spirit of God, we are constituted heirs of God. See Ro. 8: 17—“And if children; then heirs; heirs of God and joint heirs with Christ.” By the begetting act of the Spirit we are constituted joint heirs with Christ: Then if we are joint heirs with Christ, our heirship will continue jointly with him. Dare any one say that Christ’s heirship may, will, or can cease? Then, as the believer is a joint heir with him, the question is settled beyond all controversy; for, just so long as it is a joint heirship, the case is as certain to the one as to the other.

3.—Another argument against perseverance is, that Adam fell from grace. I can but pity the divine who uses this as an argument to prove falling from grace. It shows, 1. That he does not know the difference between law and grace. Or, 2. A total misapprehension of the Word of God. Adam, in his state of innocence, was not under grace, but under law. The law under which he was placed required him to obey in every point. He ceased to obey and died. In this dead state grace found and restored him, or brought him back to God.

The christian is not under law, but under grace, as is evident from the Word of God. Ro. 6: 14—“For sin shall not have dominion over you: for ye are not under the law, but under grace.” The difference between law and grace is this—the law required us to do and live; grace, or the gospel plan of grace, requires us to believe in Christ and be saved. Thus we see, that the man who is condemned by law can be saved by grace. On the plan of the Gospel, grace saves the man who trusts in God. “For by grace are ye saved, through faith, and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God.”—Eph. 2: 8. Thus it is that our salvation is more secure than it was before we fell. In view of this, Paul says—“For 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 us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord.”—Ro. 8: 38, 39.

In relation to this passage the advocates of apostacy say, it is true that none of the above things can separate us from the

love of God, but man can do it himself. If this be true, then we know not how the above passage can be true, together with many other positive promises in the Book of God. That we may see that the argument is not true, we will suppose a case.

The President of these United States wishes me to visit the great house, and sends me word that if I will go he will raise me above want. I believe him, and set out; but I see by the way a number of bears, wolves, panthers, &c., and say unto him, President, I have started to you, but I see so many bears, wolves, panthers, &c., that I am afraid to go. O, says the President, do not be afraid of them, for I have the entire control of them; they shall not harm you. I proceed a little, and see a tremendous lion by the way. I ask the President, what about that big lion I see by the way? O, says the President, he is a savage beast, and I do not know how to manage him. You must manage him yourself.

Do you ask me what I intend by this? By the bears, wolves, panthers, &c., I mean all the temptations, snares, and trials, through which we have to pass on our way to heaven. God hath overcome all these—they cannot hurt us. But the big lion—by which I mean man's own will, or self—God cannot manage that without destroying free agency. Man must do it himself. This shows the gross absurdity of the argument. God cannot control or manage the will without destroying free agency. Hence man, poor feeble man, must do what God cannot, or be eaten by the big lion. If man could go to heaven, on this principle, he would go upon his own works, independent of God.

Again. I say that man cannot separate himself from the love of God. Proof.—Take the case of Jonah. See Jonah, 1 & 2 chapters. God told him to go and preach to the Ninevites. Jonah said he would not go. He went down to Joppa, there he found a ship going to Tarshish. He paid the fare, and went down into the ship to go to Tarshish from the presence of the Lord. But the Lord sent out a great wind into the sea, and there was a mighty tempest, so that the ship was like to be broken. The mariners were afraid, and cried unto their god. They cast out the wares that were in the ship. But all was vain while Jonah was there. The ship-master awoke him, and said, call upon thy God, if so be that God will think upon

us that we perish not. Then they cast lots to ascertain for whose cause this evil was upon them. The lot fell upon Jonah. Then they asked him for whose cause this evil was upon them. What is thine occupation? And whence comest thou? What is thy country? And of what people art thou? He said I am a Hebrew, and I fear the Lord, the God of heaven, which hath made the sea and the dry land. Then were the men afraid, for they knew that he fled from the presence of the Lord because he had told them. Then said they unto him, what shall we do unto thee, that the sea may be calm unto us? for the sea wrought and was tempestuous. He said unto them, take me up and cast me into the sea, so shall the sea be calm unto you, for I know that for my sake this great tempest is upon you. The men rowed hard to bring it to land, but they could not. Now see them take up Jonah, and cast him overboard into the sea.

What would the advocates of apostacy say to this? He is in direct rebellion against God, and is cast into the sea. The sea is raging and tempestuous. Surely they will say he is gone to hell now, for he dies in direct rebellion against God. But the Lord had prepared a great fish to swallow up Jonah, and Jonah was in the belly of the fish three days and three nights. Here he began to pray unto God out of the fish's belly. God heard his prayer and spake unto the fish, and it took Jonah back and laid him out on dry land. Then God said unto him go and do the preaching I bid thee.

From this we see that God wrought a noted miracle, in order to keep Jonah from death and from hell. The course of nature was changed, rather than suffer his faithfulness to fail, or his child to be lost. This is a standing and an eternal proof of the fact. Man cannot separate himself from God. Rather than break his covenant with his Son, or suffer his faithfulness to fail, God will change the laws of nature, and by miracle preserve and keep his child from ruin.

Again, the absurdity of the doctrine of apostacy may be seen from the following fact:

1st. When God created man he placed him in the garden of Eden, in which there were two trees—one the tree of life, the other the tree of knowledge of good and evil. Of the latter he was forbidden to eat, but of the tree of life he was at liber-

ty to eat. Now I ask, what would have been the consequence if Adam had eaten of the tree of life? He would have had eternal life,—that is, he would have lived forever. Even after he had sinned, had he eaten of that tree he would have lived forever. “And the Lord God said, behold, the man is become as one of us, to know good and evil: and now, lest he put forth his hand, and take also of the tree of life, and eat and live forever. Therefore the Lord God sent him forth from the garden of Eden.”—Gen. 3: 22, 23. This shows what would have been the result had Adam eaten of the tree of life, either before or after his fall, he would have lived forever.

Turn now to the New Testament. In the great gospel scheme, Christ is the tree of life.—Rev. 22: 2. On the gospel plan the man who embraces and receives Christ as his Saviour, eats of the tree of life, by which he has eternal life confirmed unto him. See John, 6: 47—“Verily, verily, I say unto you, he that believeth on me hath everlasting life.” That is, hath it now in possession. Again. “And I give unto them eternal life, and they shall never perish, neither shall any man pluck them out of my hand.”—John 10: 28. Notice the nature of this gift bestowed by Christ. “I give unto them eternal life.” The length of this life is as really a part of the gift as the life itself, and that is eternal. And any thing that is eternal has no end. As well talk of God’s eternity ceasing, as to talk of an eternal life ceasing. For if God’s existence is eternal and can never end, then an eternal life can never cease. If one be true, the other is true also; otherwise it is not eternal. When the heart is renewed, the soul is in possession of eternal life. Not that he may have it, but has it then. And this life is hid with Christ in God.—Col. 3: 3. If the believer may fall and be lost, then he has not eternal, but temporary life. Hence Christ has not told the truth.

Another argument against perseverance is, that it encourages sloth, or indolence. Hence many have been heard to say, if I believed that I was certain to go to heaven, I would take my fill of sin. To all such I say, you are full even now. The man who feels thus is yet in his sins, unrenewed in heart, and the only thing that checks, or causes him to pretend to religion, is the fear of hell. Remove this, and his pretended religion will go with it.

But let us test the argument, and see whether it is true that it makes the believer slothful or indolent.

1. Whether is the man more energetic in the pursuit of a certainty, or an uncertainty? Common sense answers, we do know that if an object is certain, or in other words, if it is certain that we can obtain it, we will seek it with more energy than if it is doubtful. Thus it is with the doctrine in question. Make the man believe that by perseverance he can and will be admitted to heaven, and you fill him with a double energy. On the other hand, make a man feel that though he is the child of God to-day, he may be the child of the devil, or in hell to-morrow, and you paralyze every nerve.

Let us suppose a case to illustrate. Suppose my child to be carried away by the Indians into a far country, over hills, mountains, rivers, lakes, &c. &c. Here he makes his escape from the savages. After his escape he sits down and thinks of his father's house, but he remembers the hills, mountains, rivers, lakes, &c., that lie between him and his father's house. Here he sits and asks, shall I ever, a helpless child, be able to reach my father's dwelling? Suppose in this situation, and at this moment, an angel from heaven was to approach him, and say to him, my boy, I know your situation, the distance you are from home, the difficulties that lie in your way; but be not afraid, I will guide you safely home, and place you again in your father's house. The little boy believes him. Will he not leap from his seat, and run with renewed energy and a glad heart after his guide? Surely he will. But while he is in this disconsolate condition, the angel says to him, my boy, I know your situation, the distance you are from home, and the difficulties that lie in your way, and it is doubtful whether you will ever reach your father's house; but go on and do the best you can. Would not this paralyze every nerve, and cause the child to despair?

Apply this to the child of God. He is in the enemy's land. The Son of God appears to him, and says—"Be of good cheer, I have overcome the world," (John, 16: 33,) and I will lead you safely to my Father's house. Surely this causes him to go on his way with renewed energy and a glad heart. On the other hand, were he to say, I know your condition, and it is possible you may miss heaven at last. Would not this de-

stroy his energy? This is precisely the import of the language of falling from grace. But God from heaven assures the believer that he will lead him safely home. He believes it, and runs with patience and delight.

Again. The doctrine of falling from grace is hurtful to sinners. They know not, if that doctrine be true, but they would miss heaven at last, even if they had religion, hence they are careless about it.

To illustrate this point we will suppose a case. Were I to assure the sinner that if he would walk out into the yard he would there find, and that certainly, a pearl of great price; one that he could retain forever. Would he not be more likely to go than if I were to say to him, you can find it, but it is doubtful whether you can retain it? I ask, which of these statements would be best calculated to stimulate the man and cause him to go? Surely that which makes a certainty, rather than an uncertainty.

Lastly, I ask, from whence come apostates? Not from those who believe in the perseverance of the saints, but from those who say they can fall. If this is true, does this doctrine make men more careful? No. For these are the men who are always preaching up the doctrine of falling from grace.

This doctrine encourages men to profess religion, and then it is very convenient for them to say they have lost it. They fall, not from grace, but for want of it. "They went out from us, but they were not of us; for if they had been of us they would no doubt have continued with us: but they went out that it might be made manifest that they were not all of us."—1 John, 2: 19. This is the true case with all apostates; they profess to be what they are not, then fall, not from, but for want of, grace.

I have now given what I think to be a fair statement of the different points in question. And I ask all who believe in falling from grace, to examine with care the arguments advanced. Compare them with the Word of God, and see if I have not fully proved every point. If so, I trust you will review your theory and abandon it, and receive the truth as it is in Jesus. May God bless the truth as far as spoken, and pardon every thing that is wrong. Amen.

[We publish the following to show how Presbyterians are assailed beyond the bounds of our own synod, and how they defend themselves.—EDS.]

From the Presbyterian Record.

REPLY.

To the Second, third, and fourth numbers of Rev. J. W. McFarland's attack through the Advocate,

In these numbers, as usual, Mr. McFarland boasts of what he is going to do, talks about what he calls the "snorting of Methodism" and says Methodists are "likely to set the world on fire" while I am only lighting my match. But we are apprehensive that these swellings will end in smoke; or if they succeed in filling the world with fanaticism, and setting the world on *wild fire*, they would do well to remember what God says by the prophet Isaiah, 50: 11. "Behold all ye that kindle a fire, that compass yourselves about with sparks; walk in the light of your fire, and in the sparks that ye have kindled. This shall ye have of my hand; ye shall lie down in sorrow." I shall not attempt to set the world on fire; but instead of offering strange fire, hope I shall be satisfied with the fire that God shall be pleased to kindle until the final conflagration at the last day, when the fire of God shall try every man's work.

But that the public may know how much importance to attach to Mr. McFarland's assertions, and pretended quotations, I will refer to a few statements in his pamphlets which will place his moral character in no enviable light. In his first pamphlet, in which he perverts the doctrines of the Presbyterian church, and then calls them "horrible beyond conception," he says on page 10, "If this system of decrees be true, no evil consequence can result from its rejection." Thus he puts truth on a par with error, making it a mere matter of expediency by taking it upon himself to decide whether truth may be rejected or not. Let us now see how the adoption of such a sentiment has operated on the practice of the man.—The following is the pretended quotation from our Catechism, with all the marks and points as it stands on the 7th page of the same pamphlet:

Mr. McFarland's quotation.

"God created them that they might fall into eternal destruction." "The elect, and they only, are effectually called; although others (the reprobate) may be, and often are, outwardly called by the ministry of the world, and have some common operations of the spirit, who for their wilful neglect (of what they could never embrace) and contempt of the grace (which was excluded them 'by the decree of God') offered to them, being justly left in their unbelief, do never truly come to Christ, (God decreed that they never should come.)—*Larger Catechism.*

Correct quotation.

"All the elect, and they only, are effectually called; though others may be, and often are outwardly called by the ministry of the word, and have some common operations of the spirit, who for their wilful neglect and contempt of the grace offered to them, being justly left in their unbelief, do never truly come to Jesus Christ."—*Larger Catechism.*

As Mr. McFarland has solemnly vowed "to put down Presbyterianism" he thinks no evil consequences can result from perverting the truth, and forging our catechism so as to make it teach blasphemy.

Again, on the 32d page of his second pamphlet he charges the officers of the Presbyterian church with assuming powers that do not belong to them. And to prove his charge he makes a pretended quotation from our Confession of Faith.

Mr. McFarland's quotation.

"To these officers the keys of the kingdom of heaven are committed, by virtue whereof they have power respectfully to retain and remit sins, to shut that kingdom against the impenitent, both by word and censures; and to open it unto penitent sinners, *reprobates excepted*, by the ministry of the gospel, and by absolution from censures as occasions shall require."—*Confes. Faith, chap. 22, sec. 2.*

Correct quotation.

"To these officers the keys of the kingdom of heaven are committed, by virtue whereof they have power respectively to retain and remit sins, to shut that kingdom against the impenitent, both by word and censures; and to open it unto penitent sinners by the ministry of the gospel, and by absolution from censures as occasion shall require."—*Con. Faith, chap. 22, sec. 2.*

Under his false quotation he remarks as follows: It would be difficult to see from the above quotations that his holiness

the Pope claims greater power in the forgiveness of sins than is here attributed to the officers of the Presbyterian church." But it will be seen that he has slipped in the phrase "*reprobates excepted*," and put it in italics as if it were the most important phrase in the sentence. And the word *respectively*, which according to Webster, means "*relatively—not absolutely*," he has changed into *respectfully*. The power of our officers is only declarative. Now if any man had changed an instrument of writing, for the purpose of obtaining money, only one fourth part as much as Mr. McFarland has changed our standards, it would be called forgery, and the perpetrator of so foul a crime would be sent to the penitentiary. But as it is done for the sake of traducing the character, and putting down Presbyterianism, we leave it for the public to name the crime and say what the penalty should be.

Again, Mr. McFarland, in endeavoring to prove that God does sometimes violate his solemn promises, quoted Num. 14: 34; "And ye shall know my breach of promise." In reply to this, I stated in my first pamphlet, page 45, that Clarke agrees with Scott in saying, our English translation does by no means convey the force of the original; and that it would be better rendered thus, "ye shall experience my vengeance." Mr. McFarland in reply to this says: "Neither does Drs. Clarke, or Scott say the things attributed to them by Mr. G., as the reader may see by referring to their commentaries." I say let us now refer to their commentaries, and see which of us speaks the truth. Clarke, in commenting on the passage alluded to, says: "This is certainly a most harsh expression; and most learned men agree that the words *et tenuati* should be rendered by *vengeance*, which is the rendering of the Septuagint, Vulgate, Coptic, and Anglo-Saxon, and which is followed by almost all our English translations." So much for Clarke. Scott remarks on this passage as follows: "Neither the text nor the marginal reading seems to convey the precise meaning of the word rendered *my breach of promise*. Some translate it, ye shall know the fury of my anger or my vengeance." Now is there any reason for even charity to hope that Mr. McFarland is not guilty of downright and wilful falsehood? He speaks as if these commentaries were before him—denies that

they say what I had attributed to them, and has the hardihood to refer the reader to them.

Again, on the 37th page of his second pamphlet, he accuses me of saying that God is the author of sin. To prove this charge he pretends to quote from the 53d page of my first pamphlet as follows: "God is the author of all things, and sin included." And now if the reader wishes still further to be convinced that Mr. McFarland resorts to the most barefaced falsehoods to sustain his cause, let him turn to page 53 of my first pamphlet and he will then find that I am repelling a false charge of his; that he, Mr. McFarland says we make God the author of sin. In quoting me he has left off the first part of the sentence so as to make it appear that the sentiment was my own, instead of a slander which I was refuting. He makes the same false quotation again on the 58th page, and brings it up again afterwards; thus in three different places he charges me with saying that "God is the author of all things, and sin included;" when I only say, "He says if God predestinates, man is not responsible; but God is the author of all things and sin included." What would be thought of the infidel who should attempt to prove from the Bible that there is no God, and should quote Ps. 14: 1—"The fool hath said in his heart, there is no God." And it surely would prove atheism, by leaving off the first part of the sentence. And yet this is only the beginning of the enormity of Mr. McFarland's offences. I can produce almost any amount of passages from his writings of the same character. Indeed he rarely quotes a single sentence correctly. I only ask the public to examine my pamphlet in connection with Mr. McFarland's, and in connection with all that these Methodist reviewers have said about it, and it will very clearly appear upon which side is justice, and who is on the defensive; and that they have not fairly met one single point that I have made. I have publicly exposed Mr. McFarland's falsehoods several times before; but he takes no notice of them, but still goes on with his slanders against Presbyterians. The Methodist reviewers, who have come up so promptly to Mr. McFarland's assistance, have not offered to help him in these points involving his moral character; where indeed he most needs help. Though bolstered up at both ends, by the editors of the Advocate and the presiding elders,

He is broken down in the loins; yet Mr. Harris says I will find Mr. McFarland more than a match for me. In such things I do; I cannot descend to falsehood and forging catechisms. Nor does the cause in which I am engaged require it.

Having proved that he is destitute of all regard to truth, every honorable man will say that it is time for me to drop him. But as he figures largely in the Advocate, says he is "a highly respectable minister in the Methodist church," and is endorsed by the presiding elders, we may venture to notice him occasionally still farther. But what are we to think of a cause that requires a "highly respectable minister" to resort to such practices, and what are we to think of a church, in which a person guilty of such practices continues to be highly respected?

Having shown that there is something the matter with this man, either in respect to his intellectual or moral faculties, that he cannot quote correctly, we are prepared briefly to examine his succeeding numbers, allowing his quotations to have their due weight.

He complains that I misrepresented him, in saying that the Presbyterians of this country are seeking secular aggrandizement—he meant the charge for the poor oppressed Presbyterians of Scotland; and yet he goes on immediately, and makes the charge against the Presbyterians of the United States.—Those acquainted with the struggles of the Scotch against the oppressive measures of the Episcopal church, in the days of Charles I., but more particularly for the last ten years, will smile at the charge of weakness and folly. But he did represent the Presbyterian church in this country as opposed to the sentiments of the declaration of independence. He pays no attention to the arguments by which I met his charge; but continues to repeat it; and quotes from the History of Mr. Bancroft, whose views he represents about as correctly as he represents our confession of faith when he says it teaches infant damnation. It is true that Mr. Bancroft says that most of the colonies were at times intolérant, and that there were certain individuals who instigated the government in their acts. But that these individuals in the acts quoted were Presbyterians, is a gratuitous assumption of Mr. McFarland, by no means authorized by Mr. Bancroft. That they were called Elders is

no evidence that they were Presbyterians. "Elders were a regular part of the organization of the churches of the Independents, even when totally disconnected with Presbyterians," says Dr. Hodge. But suppose that these individuals were members of the Presbyterian church, it only proves that they acted contrary to the teachings of Calvin, and in opposition to our confession and form of Government. Calvin says: "Though it may be wrong to form friendship or intimacy with those who hold pernicious opinions, yet must we contend against them only by exhortation, by kind instructions, by clemency, by mildness, by prayers to God that they may be so changed as to bear good fruits, and be restored to the unity of the church. And not only are erring christians to be so treated, but even Turks and Saracens. Our confession of faith says (chap. 20, sec. 2,) "God alone is Lord of the conscience." And chap. 23 sec. 3 says, magistrates may not in the least interfere in matters of faith. And the candid enquirer will find in many instances where Presbyterians have been accused of seeking secular aggrandizement, they have only been contending for the rights of conscience, and endeavoring to prevent the magistrate from interfering with the matters of their faith. Also chap. 8, sec 2 says, speaking of the different indications of our church, "These assemblies ought not to possess any civil jurisdiction, nor to inflict any civil penalties. Their power is wholly moral or spiritual, and that only ministerial and declarative." Can Mr. McFarland show any thing from Wesley's writings, or from the Methodist Discipline, as liberal as the above, even though they have had a Presbyterian example. But suppose it could be shown that Presbyterians in that age were intolerant, were they more so than others? Nay, have they not always taken the lead in civil and religious liberty? Was not the Methodist church an integral part of the Episcopal? And did not Virginia, in which the Episcopal church was established, banish the Puritans who came there from New England? Bancroft vol. 1, p. 207 says they did: "For to tolerate puritanism was to nurse a republican party." Then if, in an age in which all persecuted, Presbyterians were less intolerant than others, that man who would prefer the charge against them, is not very remarkable for love of truth or modesty. And the next time that Mr. McFarland lets go a heavy

stroke to decapitate Presbyterians, he should take care that his own head is not endangered by the blow. That the acts of Calvin, or of Presbyterians were never regarded as intolerant, when fairly judged by the age, and that Presbyterians have generally been ahead of the age in regard to civil and religious liberty, I clearly showed in my second defense, which Mr. McFarland has by no means met. And though I did not endorse all that Mr. Bancroft has written, as Mr. McFarland says, for I distinctly stated that he was no friend to Presbyterianism, (and I regard his testimony as more valuable on that account,) yet I am not afraid of the testimony of Mr. Bancroft when taken as a whole. For no man who has carefully read him, and has any regard for truth will deny, that he traces civil and religious liberty in this country and in England to Calvinism and Presbyterianism. One or two plain quotations from Bancroft will suffice; vol. 2 pp. 459, 460, "In Geneva, a republic on the confines of France, Italy, and Germany, Calvin, appealing to the people for support, continued the career of enfranchisement by planting the institutions which nursed the minds of Rosseau, Necker, and De Stael." "The political character of Calvinism, which, with one consent, and with instructive judgment, the monarchs of that day feared as republicanism, and which Charles I. declared a religion unfit for a gentleman, is expressed in a single word, *predestination*." And vol. 1, pp. 463, 464, "The effects of puritanism display its true character still more distinctly. Ecclesiastical tyranny is of all kinds the worst, its fruits are cowardice, idleness, ignorance and poverty. Puritanism was a life-giving spirit, activity, thrift, intelligence, followed in its train, and as for courage, a coward and a puritan never went together." "The fanatic for calvinism was a fanatic for liberty."

Bear in mind that Mr. McFarland puts down puritans as Presbyterians, and a majority of them no doubt were, and Bancroft here considers puritanism as the very soul of civil and religious liberty, for he contrasts it with ecclesiastical tyranny. Again in a public address Bancroft says, (see Smyth's life of Calvin, pp. 54, 57,) "Calvin infused enduring elements into the institutions of Geneva, and made it for the modern world the impregnable fortress for popular liberty." "He that will not honor the memory, and respect the influence of Calvin,

knows but little of the origin of American liberty." Let me now put a sentence from Mr. McFarland by the side of Bancroft, whom I did not endorse but whom he did. "What Calvinism has done to secure the liberties of mankind, is insignificant when compared with the fetters with which they have trammelled the world." I need not ask how insignificant Mr. McFarland looks when thus placed by the side of a man whom he pretends to quote. Is there no shame in man, that will forbid a "highly respectable ministry of the Methodist church" from distorting the views of an author so as to represent him as uttering sentiments the very opposite of what are true?—Listen to what Scott, a pious Episcopalian, says. "The tree of liberty, sober and legitimate liberty, *civil and religious*, under the shadow of which we in the establishment, as well as others, repose in peace, and the fruits which we gather, were planted by the *Puritans* and watered, if not by their blood, at least by their tears and sorrows. Yet it is the modern fashion to feed delightfully on the fruit, and then revile, if not curse, those who planted and watered it." So much for Bancroft and Dr. Scott. Mr. McFarland quotes them as he does the Bible when he attempts to prove that the saints will not persevere. He passes by all those passages that assert in unequivocal terms that "the righteous shall hold on his way," and lays great stress on those that have a bare squinting towards falling.

Trenton, Tenn., July, 1849.

A. T. GRAVES.

[To be concluded in our next.]

The Present Religious Condition of Great Britain.

BY REV. DR. CARRUTHERS.

GREAT BRITAIN comprises the two kingdoms of Scotland and England, long since united under one government, and having the same general system of civil law. In the northern, or Scottish part of the united kingdom, there are, indeed, certain ancient laws, customs, modes of judicial procedure, and social usages, to which the people cling with great tenacity, and by some of which they are advantageously distinguished from their southern neighbors. In this they are alike, that each has

its established church, that of Scotland being, as to its internal government, of the Presbyterian order, professedly discarding the authority of the civil government in ecclesiastical affairs, but practically gainsaying this profession, by annually holding its General Assembly of ministers and elders under the presidency of the Lord High Commissioner, who formally opens and closes their meeting in the name of the reigning sovereign—the Moderator of the Assembly afterwards, with strange and striking incongruity, doing the same thing in the name of Jesus. Since the memorable disruption of 1843, when nearly 400 ministers left the pale of the establishment, and were followed in this movement by a large proportion of its members, the state church of Scotland, though numbering still some excellent men among its staunch adherents, is, as a body, shorn of its moral strength and glory. Its sanctuaries are, to a great extent, forsaken, its jurisdiction strenuously, and sometimes indignantly discarded, and its very existence maintained, in opposition to the connections and wishes of the people, by the emoluments over which the people have no control, and the patronage of which is technically called a large landed aristocracy. The “Confession of Faith” is still the recognized standard of doctrine, and the ancient “directory of discipline” is still the avowed rule of action in matters ecclesiastical; but *practically* both are neglected and forgotten. Personal piety is not deemed essential to the occupancy of the Christian ministry. A dry and dusty morality, based on mere natural reason and social expediency, supplants extensively the truth as it is in Jesus—and the church of Scotland, established by law, is, as to all moral beauty and efficiency, the mere wreck of what it was. An intelligent and charitable observer may yet detect some lingering symptoms of vitality; but its energies are paralyzed, its strength is turned to weakness, the few things that remain in it are ready to die, putrefaction is begun, and its different parts are held together, not by any natural cohesion, but by the ligaments and cerecloths of state patronage and pay.

THE FREE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND—so called because its ministers and members have voluntarily relinquished the patronage, and escaped from the bondage of the State—comprises among its pastors none, it is believed, who is not evangelical in doctrine, and, in moral conduct, exemplary—and very ma-

ny who, in native talent, industry, devotedness and enlightened zeal, are at least equal to the Christian ministry of any age or country. They preach the gospel—many of them with the demonstration of the Spirit—and, if some of them cling with the characteristic adhesiveness of Scotchmen, to the *theory* of establishments, and hope, in some future millennial era, to get secular governments to support spiritual churches, without exacting any equivalent, the theory, as such, is perfectly harmless, and does not in the least obstruct or embarrass the moral movements of this great body. The erection, by voluntary subscription, throughout all Scotland, of commodious churches, comfortable parsonages, and capacious school houses; the respectable “sustentation” of the ministry, and the expenditure, for home and foreign objects of benevolence alone, during 6 years of freedom of £242,819—or \$1,214,095—attest, very strongly, its unrelaxing energy, and enlightened zeal and buoyant elasticity, and hold out a bright augury for the future moral destinies of the country. The Free Church, however, has yet to earn its appropriate title by a nobler claim. Its communion is confessedly and deplorably impure. The mixed multitudes that followed the dissidents of 1843 were, with scarce a show of discipline, admitted, as a body, within its pale. The certificate of a Free Church would not be held by the Congregationalists of Scotland or England as evidence of piety—and many good men in the Free Church, and the majority of those out of it, are deeply and painfully convinced that, though liberated from the ignominious shackles of the State, it has yet to achieve, and by a more arduous struggle, the separation of “the precious from the vile.”

THE UNITED SECESSION CHURCH, originating in the secession upwards of a century ago, of the Erskines and others from the then establishment, has now—and especially since the reunion of its two great branches, and still more recent accession of the “Relief” body—grown into a very large and efficient community. Its ministers all receive a thoroughly classical and theological education. The doctrines of the Assembly’s Catechism are steadfastly maintained and taught in all its pulpits. Its communion is considerably purer than that of the Free Church; and its home and foreign, and especially its *colonial* missions, are liberally and effectively sustained. This body

has recently assumed the name of "the United Presbyterian Church of Scotland." Congregationalism, or rather the gospel proclaimed and promulgated by christians of this order, has done very much for Scotland. Its ministers and evangelists—at a time when nearly the whole Scottish population were morally asleep and even dead—emulated the Whitefields and Wesleys of the South, in their earnest and self-denying efforts to save souls from death. And very much of the harvest, since reaped by other hands, has sprung from the precious seed which they sowed with unremitting diligence, on the mountains and in the glens of their native land. The names of a Cowie, an Ewing, a Gleghorn, an Aikman, and a Russell, are embalmed in the memories of thousands whom they instrumentally turned from darkness to light—and such men as Wardlaw, who still lingers on this side heaven, and Alexander, who is rising into extensive popularity, and distinguished not more by their native talent and acquired erudition, than by their elevated piety, and their enlightened philanthropy, adorn and illustrate the recent annals of Scottish independency, and of the common faith. To no men more than to these, and such as these, does Scotland owe a debt, unredeemable, of gratitude for their labors of love in all that relates to her true greatness and prosperity.

They have maintained, unflinching, the social rights of which tyranny has often sought to deprive them; they have thrown unsparingly the rectifying salt of heavenly truth into the poisoned fountains of social feeling and of public action; they have occupied the foreground in peaceful but firm resistance of every effort, by potentate or priest or parasite, to fetter the conscience, to invade the province and usurp the prerogative of the Head of the Church, to strengthen in order to perpetuate the bulwarks of a State establishment. To them, mainly, and to some leading men of the older secession, the Free Church owes whatever of freedom it has yet achieved—and by the comparative purity of their churches, they still hold up to that church and to others, a pattern of internal polity which, though it is not, nor claims to be exclusive, serves, by comparison and contrast, to remind their neighbors, that in their ecclesiastical order and discipline, they "have not yet attained, neither are already perfect."

With all, however, that in Scotland is cheering and encouraging, there is much, as to the state of religion there, which is painful, and that, but for the promises and provisions of divine truth and grace, would be exceedingly discouraging. The number of sound conversions bears, nowhere, any desirable proportion to the regular increase of population. Very vigorous attempts have recently been made, though unsuccessfully to legalize the desecration of the Sabbath, by enforcing the running of railroad trains on the Holy Day. The current literature of Scotland is becoming largely imbued with a disguised, but, on that account, the more dangerous infidelity. The temperance movement is still very sluggish and unsatisfactory. A spurious sentimentalism is submerging some of the divinely sanctioned principles of social morality. The daily and weekly press is there but partially sanctified by alliance with the teachings of divine wisdom and the requisitions of divine authority. In no place, New England excepted, is there a more general external observance of the Sabbath—nowhere is the sanctuary more frequented—the Sabbath school more intelligently and efficiently sustained; but Scotland's best and wisest men long for a larger infusion of vital godliness into the body of the nation—for an abatement of that "fierce sectarianism" which keeps even the mutually acknowledged friends of Jesus apart from each other in the field of active labor, and, in a word, the down pouring from on high, of that divine influence, which alone can realize the aspirations of christian charity.

THE RELIGIOUS CONDITION OF ENGLAND.—Here, we are at once confronted by the gigantic abomination of the Episcopal establishment, having nearly 16,000 clergy, of whom, by the largest estimate of the most liberal charity, *not one sixth part* either know or preach the gospel. High birth, extraordinary natural talent combined with political subserviency, the patronage of some distinguished nobleman, purchased of course, by some equivalent, or the payment of a sum of money, are the usual means of introduction to a Church-of-England 'benefice.' Once introduced, the clergyman regards his parish as his freehold, employs some needy curate to do the drudgery of preaching, pockets his large stipend, and rivals his neighboring gentry in the sports and pastimes of the field, rambles on the continent, or spends his days and nights amidst the gaieties

and luxuries of London. Such is the true character of a large proportion of the Anglican clergy. Another class (comprising, however, not a few of that now mentioned) consists of what are now called *Puseyites*, whose tenets are too well known to require specification here. Some of them claim *precedence* to Rome; with it they all own a close ecclesiastical *relationship*. They hold dissenters in abhorrence, refusing often to bury their dead in the parochial cemeteries, and incessantly endeavoring by all means, *fair or foul*, to control the secular as well as religious education of the people. The necessity of resisting such attempts imposes on evangelical dissenters of all classes, the task of unwearied vigilance, incessant activity, and a vast expenditure of money, time and toil. They have to bear, besides, much cold disdain, and not unfrequently, direct, unrighteous and unchristian opposition from many of the evangelical clergy, who hold to the divine right of Episcopacy, and denounce dissenting ministers as "unauthorized," "irregular," "intruders," and "usurpers." The almost entire absence, in this class, of sympathy with Mr. Shore, Baptist Noel, and others who have recently seceded from the State Church, proves that, as a class, they are far as yet from being prepared to recognize as their equals and co-workers, the ministers of other denominations. Can it be surprizing that, under these circumstances, the people of England should now be extensively agitating the question of the continuance or overthrow of this exclusive and tyrannical establishment? The almost insane conduct of the Bishop of Exeter towards Mr. Shore and others—the publication of Mr. Noel's masterly work on the "Union of the Church and State"—the distraint of property for the payment of Church rates—the constant augmentation of the number of Bishops, and huge salaries and baronial equipages—and most of all the visible indifference of the clergy as a body, to the spiritual and social interests of the community—all have come in aid of the resolute efforts of dissenters, and especially of Congregationalists, to raze this anti-christian and iniquitous fabric to the ground.

The number of *Methodist* Churches in England and Wales is upwards of 4000. This, of course, includes Methodists of all classes, Calvinistic and Wesleyan, "old connexion" and "new connexion." They are active, industrious, energetic,

and successful workers in God's vineyard—less intelligent as a body, than other classes of dissenters, but second to none and superior to most in the tact of enlisting all sorts of intellectual, moral and circumstantial power in the service of religion. Their labors have been greatly blessed, and the reaction of their zeal on other denominations has been eminently beneficial.

There are in England—and especially in the large towns—offshoots from the great parties in Scotland—all of course dissenters *South of the Tweed*, and all, with very rare exceptions, strictly evangelical. The Socinian body is, in England, almost defunct—and other denominations seem willing to die in peace. Its very aliment is agitation; and for want of this, it is now worn into a thin and shadowy phantom, soon to lie unmourned in the grave dug for it by the daring and unholy speculations of a Lindsey and a Belsham. If a single tear be dropt upon its tomb, that tear will fall from the bereaved and sightless eye of infidelity.

Romanism in India.

I should be false to my trust if I did not say that in British India, one of the worst enemies the missionaries had to contend with was the Church of Rome. I say it soberly and solemnly, Rome is making immense efforts to take possession of the land; where we number our three bishops, Rome numbers her twenty; where we number our three hundred priests and deacons, Rome numbers her three thousand; where we number our thousands of teachers and followers, Rome numbers her hundreds of thousands. Rome must be grappled with, or she will overrun the whole land. It is not that our missionaries are not devoted to the cause intrusted to them; but what can they do amongst one hundred and thirty millions of natives, and such an army of Romish emissaries?—*Bishop of Madras.*

No ministry will be really effective, whatever may be its intelligence, which is not a ministry of strong faith, true spirituality and deep earnestness.

THE Calvinistic Magazine.

[NEW SERIES.]

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

Vol. IV.

September, 1849.

No. 9.

Profession of Religion.

THOUGHTS UPON THE LORD'S SUPPER, &c.

One design of Baptism and the Lord's Supper is, “solemnly to engage” the subjects of them “to the service of God in Christ according to his word.” While they answer other ends, they are a token or pledge of an engagement or covenant. That the real force of this covenant is overlooked by most professors of religion cannot have escaped the observation of any.

In the first place, there seems to be little effort made to come up to its real meaning. In making a profession of religion every thing is given up to Christ. The body, the soul, the property, the friends, the reputation—everything is laid upon the altar. This is done in taking the vows of God upon one at first, and it is done anew every time one takes a seat at the Lord's table. How can the disciple of Christ then turn away with an air of indifference, when he has said there by a deliberate act, that he and his are the Lord's. Can it be that he really intends to be less worldly, to love the cause of Christ more, and do more for the souls of men, when the Monday morning after the sacrament finds his grasp as strong upon the world as ever? Does he really regard his property as belonging to the Lord, when, if a claim of benevolence endorsed by Christ is presented, or the failure of a debtor takes place, or some providential event brings a heavy loss, he becomes dejected, and wears a sad face for it? Does he look upon his friends as being the Lord's, when, if disease attacks one of them, or death takes one away, he gives it up with a struggle? Does he really mean that his time and his talents belong to the Lord, when he will not spare an hour of that time during the

week for social prayer, and all his talents are spent upon his worldly schemes?

But more than this, the engagement made by a professor of religion is one that lasts forever. There is no release from it. It is a step that cannot be retraced. And why? Because the obligation binding one to do it will never cease. Rather that obligation will become much stronger. But some one, almost tired of the strict life of a christian, may wish that he had never taken upon him the obligations of a follower of Christ; if there is no release from that obligation. Taken upon you that obligation, my dear friend? That obligation always was upon you. Whether you were willing to acknowledge it or not, that obligation has rested upon you, since you have been capable of moral action. The unbeliever is not free to serve God or to serve him not, just as he chooses; but he is under precisely the same obligation that the christian is. The only difference between him and the christian is, that the christian acknowledges the claim of God upon his services, but he is unwilling to admit that claim.

If now God's claims upon the christian will never cease, but become much stronger every day of his life, certainly his engagements to serve God must be perpetual. How is it, then, that a profession of religion comes to be regarded by many as something like a garment, that may be taken and laid aside at pleasure. How is it that a member of the church can stand aside from the table of the Lord, and neglect to fulfill and renew his covenant vows, if he does not chance to feel like it? Are his feelings to be the rule of his duty, and not his sacred obligations to Christ? This course is taken frequently, with the impression, that it is less sinful than to eat and drink unworthily. To eat and drink unworthily is a great sin, greater a thousand fold, no doubt, than any one thinks it is; but is it greater than to break the most solemn promise ever made? than to spurn the highest obligation that ever rested upon man?

Besides, it is an attempt to heal one wrong by another, much greater one. It is an attempt to get into the path of duty by going farther from it. In the sin that keeps one away from the Lord's supper, there is fearful guilt; but why should it be made more fearful still, by the accumulation of that which is yet more awful? The way is plain for an erring disciple feel-

ing unfit to commemorate the love of Christ. You have but to repent, just as you did when you first came to Christ. You have only to fall at the foot of the cross, and to beg for mercy. Do not, then, flee away and get clear out of sight of that cross.

If a true view has been taken of the perpetuity of a christian's engagement to serve God, how is it that a professor of religion can change his place of residence, and leave his church membership behind? Does not the same God uphold, protect, and bless him in the forests of Texas, or on the river bottoms of Missouri, that did on the banks of the Holston? Has not the Lord the same claim upon him, whether he tills the soil of the wide prairie, or works a farm in East Tennessee? Can a member of the church of Christ here move out of the jurisdiction of his Lord and Master, by plunging into the wilds of the West, by straying far away to the South, or by seeking a home in the gold region of California? No. He will find that the claims of God cannot be set aside, and he will be chastized till he is willing to meet those claims, or their violation will be avenged by the hand of Infinite Justice. The curse of God will fall upon such an one sooner or later, in this world or in the world to come. When his fields shall be blighted under Jehovah's curse, or his house be darkened by affliction, or the icy hand of Death be upon him, the solemn memory of his covenant engagements will steal over him, and his past unfaithfulness will shroud his soul in the gloom of despair.

If the claims of God are thus lasting, what becomes of the practice of dismissing members of the church to the world? It matters not now whether that dismissal be written out formally, or it consists in dropping the name, or scratching it off from the church book, it is virtually a dismissal to the world. *The church gives her consent to, and approves of, a man's going back to the world.* Now where is there any warrant for such a procedure. Does God ever say to a christian—you need not serve me? Has he said—you need not love me with all the heart, and with all the soul, and with all the mind, and with all the strength?¹ And if he has not said it, how can a church dare to say it? How can they think to set aside a claim which God enforces to the last? How can they release from an obligation that will last as long as the very being of God? How can they

¹ Mark, 12: 30.

set aside or repeal the command of Christ, to remember his death and sufferings, when this command will be forever binding upon every member of the human family? Surely such doings appear bad enough among those believing that one can be a saint to-day and a sinner to-morrow; but how inconsistent they are with the belief of the doctrine of the perseverance of the saints? Though they may have the sanction of a small part of the Presbyterian church, they are wholly at variance with her constitution and principles.

The door is not open then from the church of Christ to the world;—indeed Christ never designed that there should be a door there at all. But there is one from one church to another, and it is the will of Christ that it should be always open, for he said—all ye are brethren.¹ Now if one branch of the church of Christ chooses to shut and bar their door, and will not open it save to those who will go under the water; and if another branch refuses admittance but to those who will kneel at the sacrament and endorse the doctrine of the apostolic succession, why, it is for them to answer to their Lord and Master. Sufficient for us it is, that from the beginning it was not so.

This being the case, how inexcusable it is for a church member to leave one church and join another in an irregular manner. Nay more, such a course is a violation of a most solemn engagement. In making a profession of religion there are three parties in the engagement—the individual, the church, and God. If these parties make the engagement, it cannot be annulled but with their consent. If you ask a church to receive you under her care, and into her fellowship, and engage to make a return for it, you cannot tear yourself away from that church without asking her consent. Of course you can do it dishonorably, just as you can do any other mean act.

Let us see how such conduct as members of the church are often guilty of, would look in political life. Texas is now a State of this Union. How did she become a State? Why, briefly, a contract was made by her on the one part, and by the United States on the other part. Suppose now there were a great change in the affairs of Mexico, so that it would be greatly for her interest to become a part of that nation again.

¹ Matt. 23: 8.

Could she, without getting a release from her contract with us, join the Mexican republic, and swear to uphold her constitution? And suppose she were to do it when we were ready to release her from her engagement with us, who would be found to uphold her in such a violation of her plighted faith? Would not the voice of the civilized world condemn her, and her name become a by-word among the nations?

How does the supposed conduct of Texas differ from the course of those church members who tear themselves away from a church without even asking the consent of the parties with which they have most solemnly covenanted, especially when they know that those parties stand ready to give their consent? Has not South Carolina stood forth too long bearing the stigma of nullification, and have not nullifiers in the church of Christ gained that pre-eminence of which the Palmetto State cannot boast?

I can conceive of a case, and such cases occur often, when one finds insuperable difficulties in getting a dismissal from a church, and a recommendation to another church. Of course this would be an exception to the rule. But in an ordinary case for a church member to violate his engagements with his church by joining another one, when he can be released from his first engagement by only applying for it, is to do that which is dishonorable, and to be guilty of the sin of covenant breaking. And entertain whatever views we may of the purity of the Methodist church, if it is a church of Christ; [an admission which I suppose no one will hesitate to make for a moment,] does not the session receiving from that church a member into the Presbyterian church, without requiring that the consent of the authorities of that church should be had, wink at a dishonorable procedure? Is it not attempting to rear Christ's spiritual temple from wood, hay, and stubble, instead of lively stones? Moreover, will a man who will violate an engagement with his Methodist brethren make a noble-minded Presbyterian? Will he not be likely to play the same game upon Presbyterians in turn?

We are here met with the charge of illiberality, and men are cautioned not to join the Presbyterian church, because they can never leave it. If this charge is made because we will not dismiss our members to the world, we are willing to bear that

stigma, for we had rather the whole world would reproach us than to be required to meet the frown of God for attempting to annul his requirements, and to excuse men from complying with them. And if it is made because we require our members to leave the church in the same way they come into it, we are willing to meet the charge before an impartial community. We can show that a man is just as free to go out of our church as he is to come into it. He comes into it with the consent and approbation of the church, represented by its session. If he is in good standing, he can have that consent and approbation to leave it any day. And if he is unwilling to ask for that consent and approbation, he wishes to act in a manner beneath the dignity of a christian and a man of honor. And neither the Presbyterian church nor her officers have any right to sanction such conduct.

Two suggestions will close this article.

1.—Would it not be well to have a regular formula, to be used in the admission of members to the Presbyterian church? This was recommended by the Moderator of the last General Assembly, in his discourse at the opening of the Assembly this year. Our constitution contains a form for licensing probationers to preach the Gospel, for ordaining deacons, elders, and ministers, and for solemaizing marriages, but none for the admission of members to the church. Hence, in some churches members are received by the vote of the session alone, and they are not required to present themselves in the congregation, and in a public and solemn manner take the vows of God upon them. The result is, a profession of religion is regarded as an affair of not much importance, and some members of the Presbyterian church think they can change their church relation, or lay aside their profession, without any ceremony. This is the fruit of making a profession of religion a light thing—of having the admission of members made no more solemn and impressive. If marriage were attended to with as little ceremony and appropriate form as the joining of members to the church, our courts would be annoyed with more frequent applications for divorce, and our churches would be oftener called upon to exercise discipline for lightly esteeming the divine institution of marriage. But if the matter of joining the church were treated as a most solemn thing—if it were felt that God,

angels and men were witnesses of it, and that the consequences of it would run parallel with the unending ages of eternity—if it were sought to impress these things upon the mind most deeply, no man could regard his obligation as small, nor could he hasten away and join some other church in a disorderly manner. I hope, therefore, that ere long a form for the admission of members to the church will be incorporated into our constitution, and be invariably used in the reception of members.

2.—Would it not be well for those who are guides to the people, to speak oftener and more earnestly of the obligations involved in a profession of religion? We all need line upon line, and precept upon precept. Let the member of the church of Christ be often told, that his covenant vows extend to every thing that he has, and he will be more likely to use this world as though it were the property of Jesus Christ. Let him be often reminded that his obligation to Christ is perpetual, and not for a brief period, and he will be less likely to stand aside from the table of the Lord, and excuse himself from doing a duty which Christ requires him to do. He will be more apt to remember he cannot flee away from his duty by removing to some remote part of the country, but he will take his church membership wherever he goes. Let this matter be fully understood, and be reflected upon as it should, and our sessions and ministers will not be annoyed by members of the church asking to be released from the claims which God has upon all. They will not be asked to dismiss professors of religion to the world, and thereby to annul the requirements of the Most High. Let it ever be borne in mind, that a profession of religion is of the nature of an *agreement between different parties*, and that as the assent of these is necessary before it can be valid, so their assent alone can release from this agreement, and the members of our churches will change their church relations in an orderly way, whenever they wish to do so. They will not steal out of the church through some back door and blind path to a church of another name, but they will go in the broad daylight, manfully and honorably, and with testimonials they well deserve, laden with the prayers and good wishes of those left behind, they will knock at the door of a sister church and be received cordially, and many thanks

will go back to the donors for their gift. In a word, let professors of religion in our churches be properly trained as to their duties and covenant obligations, and I am certain that the result of that training would be seen in their orderly walk and godly conversation. Great peace and harmony would abound, and then there would be great power in the efforts of the church of Christ.

R. P. W.

The Episcopalian—The Witness of the Spirit.

BY THE REV. WM. MINNIS.

THE editor of the "Methodist Episcopalian" is out, in his paper of June 5th and 12th, in great wrath against the Synod of Tennessee, and the writer of a sermon under the above caption, published in the May No. of the Calvinistic Magazine.

His first objection is to the following proposition—that if we know that we are in the faith, it would be useless to examine whether we be in the faith. He denies the truth of this proposition, but does not tell us of what use examination could be in such a case.

He also objects to the position, that if we will pursue the proper course in self-examination, we may have satisfactory evidence whether we be in the faith or not. He pretends to see some great absurdity or contradiction in these two propositions. After using many words without any distinct ideas on the subject, he says—"Now look on *this*, and then on *that*. If you know yourselves to be in the faith, self-examination is unnecessary—useless. But if you do not know it, you must examine yourselves till you find the evidence on which you can rely, for if we be in the faith we may have satisfactory evidence of the fact." He does not show wherein the absurdity or contradiction lies, he just leaves it so. Now, a denial of the truth of the above proposition is the legitimate result of the doctrine of the direct witness of the Spirit. For, according to that doctrine, the knowledge of the fact that we are in the faith is not obtained by examining ourselves, and comparing the feelings and exercises of our hearts with the declarations of the Word of God, but by an immediate, direct disclosure or

revelation of the fact by the Spirit of God; and of course this new revelation cannot be obtained by self-examination. Hence, according to that doctrine, if self-examination be necessary at all, it must be necessary while I know with absolute certainty that I am a child of God. But that self-examination in this case would be useless, is a self-evident proposition. Hence, as we proved in the sermon, the doctrine of the direct witness of the Spirit renders totally useless, and lays aside altogether, the important duty of self-examination.

The editor's next objections are to the word *hope*, as used in the sermon. We explained explicitly in the sermon that when we say we hope we are the children of God, we mean by the word hope, in this connection, a belief founded upon substantial evidence; and we referred to Webster's dictionary to prove that this is a correct meaning of the word. But the editor is careful, in all his remarks, to keep this meaning of the word entirely out of view, and notwithstanding he pretends to give the different meanings of the word, he never once notices the sense in which we explicitly stated in the sermon we used it. He quotes different passages of Scripture in which the word hope is found, and proceeds to prove, what no one denies, that the word in these passages means the expectation of future good. Hence his remarks have no bearing whatever on the question in dispute, but are evidently designed to misrepresent our views on the subject.

The editor takes up the subject of self-examination again. He remarks—"Paul says, 'Now we have received not the spirit of the world, but the Spirit which is of God, that we might know the things that are given to us of God.'—1 Cor. 2: 12. John says, 'We know that we are passed from death unto life because we love the brethren.'—1 John, 3: 14. Here are two witnesses to one fact, of which fact Mr. Minnis admits that we may have satisfactory evidence; and yet his argument is, that if we know certainly that we are in the faith, we might as well examine ourselves whether we be in existence, because such examination would be unnecessary, useless—senseless." Here the editor resorts to the most pitiful sophistry, in order to make it appear that there is some absurdity, or something wrong, (but for the soul of him he cannot make out what it is,) in the assertion, that if we know *certainly* that we are in the faith, it

would be useless to examine ourselves whether or not we be in the faith. His sophistry consists in making the phrase, satisfactory evidence that I am in the faith, synonymous with, knowing *certainly* that I am in the faith. Is the editor of a religious newspaper so stupid as not to know that these phrases are not synonymous? I have satisfactory evidence that the planets are inhabited, but I do not know *certainly* that they are; hence it would not be useless to examine, were it in our power, whether they be inhabited. But I know *certainly* that the earth is inhabited; here it would be unnecessary, useless, senseless, to examine whether or not the earth is inhabited. I have satisfactory Bible evidence that I am a child of God, but I do not *know certainly* that I am; hence, in my case, self-examination is both necessary and useful. But the Spirit of God, by an immediate and direct testimony, caused the editor to know with absolute certainty that he was a child of God, before he had any love to God or any holiness of heart, and he has known *certainly* ever since that he is a child of God; hence, for him to examine whether or not he is a child of God, is, and always has been, unnecessary, useless, senseless.

Nothing is more clear than the fact, that the doctrine of the direct witness and self-examination cannot belong to the same system of theology.

The editor, in the following strange remarks, pretends to point out some end, or use, in self-examination. He says, "Our Lord said to his disciples, 'Do ye now believe?' 'Continue ye in my love.' The exhortations, threatenings and promises of the Gospel, all bear directly on this point." We ask, on what point? On the question, "Do you believe?" Or on the exhortation, "Continue ye in my love?" for here are two distinct points; and it is not true that all the exhortations, threatenings and promises of the Gospel bear distinctly on either or both of these points. But he continues, "'Exhort one another daily—lest any of you be hardened through the deceitfulness of sin. For we are made partakers of Christ if we hold fast the beginning of our confidence steadfast unto the end.'—Heb. 3: 13, 14. To this end the examination enjoined in the text, on which Mr. Minnis discourses, is required."

What end does the editor mean? for there are divers ends brought to view in the texts quoted above. Is it that we may

thereby ascertain whether we do now believe, or are in the faith? We suppose not, for the Methodist doctrine is, that no one can be in the faith without knowing certainly the fact, and he maintains that the examination takes place when we know certainly that we do *now* believe—when we know certainly that we are *now* in the faith. Hence, the end of the examination cannot possibly be to ascertain a fact already known.—Does he mean that the end of self-examination is to ascertain whether we will continue in Christ's love? Or whether we will exhort one another daily? Or whether we will hold fast the beginning of our confidence steadfast unto the end? It would be passing strange for any one to suppose that any of these is the end of the examination enjoined in the exhortation, "Examine yourselves whether ye be in the faith."

The editor evidently did not intend to specify any end or use in the duty of self-examination, for if he had intended to do so, he could have stated it in less space than is occupied by his Scripture quotations, neither of which has the most remote allusion either to the duty or the end of self-examination. But what can he do with this duty? His creed renders it totally unnecessary and useless;—but it is a duty enjoined in the Bible. What then is to be done with it? Why throw mist around it. Shroud it in darkness—admit that there is some use in it, but be careful not to state what that use is. This is what the editor has done with it!

In his closing remarks in his paper of June 5th, the editor says, "But one main object of this review is to correct the caricatures of Methodism, and the misrepresentations of her theology, which we find in the sermon." This we are to look for next week. In his paper of June 12th, after a lengthy quotation from the sermon, he says, "The design of the sermon is to make the impression, 1st, that the direct witness implies a '*new revelation*,' not contemplated in the Word of God, but over, above, and beyond it." This we understand to be one of the misrepresentations of Mr. Wesley's doctrine which the editor pretends to find in the sermon. The question then is, does the doctrine of the direct witness of the Spirit, as taught by Mr. Wesley, imply a new revelation? If it does not, we are guilty of misrepresentation. And if it does, the editor is guilty of falsehood and slander in the charge

which he has published against us. Revelation, says Webster, is "the disclosure or communication of truth to men by God himself, or by his authorized agents, the prophets and apostles." A new revelation is the disclosure or communication of truth to men by God himself, since the close of the Inspired Volume, and which truth they did not learn from the Bible. Mr. Wesley says, "By the testimony of the Spirit I mean, an inward impression on the soul, whereby the Spirit of God *immediately* and *directly* witnesses to my spirit, that I am a child of God—that all my sins are blotted out, and I, even I, am reconciled to God." How did he come to the knowledge of these important facts? 1. Did he learn them from a consciousness of, and by reflecting on, the fruit of the Spirit in his heart? Mr. Wesley positively denies that he did. He says, "The Spirit itself bore witness to my spirit that I was a child of God, gave me an evidence hereof, and I immediately cried, Abba, Father! And this I did, (and so did you,) *before I reflected on,* or was conscious of, any fruit of the Spirit. It was from this testimony received, that love, joy, peace, and the whole fruit of the Spirit flowed."—Page 368.

2. Did he learn these facts from the Bible? Did he learn from the Bible that every one who has the fruit of the Spirit in his heart is a child of God, &c., and did he feel conscious that he had the fruit of the Spirit in his heart, and thereby come to the knowledge of the important facts? Mr. Wesley positively denies that he did. For in the quotation given above he asserts that he was put in possession of these facts before he reflected on, or was conscious of, any fruit of the Spirit. He also asserts in the same quotation, that "it was from this testimony received, that love, joy, peace, and the whole fruit of the Spirit flowed." Hence, until after he was put in possession of these facts by the Spirit, he had none of the fruits of the Spirit to be conscious of; therefore he did not, and according to his theory, absolutely could not, learn the important facts in question from the Bible. How then were these facts disclosed or communicated to him? He answers this question explicitly, for he says, "The Spirit of God *immediately* and *directly* witnessed to my spirit, that I am a child of God,—that all my sins are blotted out, and I, even I, am reconciled to God." Here he asserts that the disclosure of these facts was

made to him *immediate* and *directly*, (that is, without the intervention of any other cause or event,) by the Spirit of God himself. Is not this a “*new revelation?*” If not, what would be a new revelation?

We have now proved to a positive demonstration, that the witness of the Spirit, as taught by Mr. Wesley, is a positive, *immediate*, direct, new revelation from God himself. Hence, we have not misrepresented Mr. Wesley’s doctrine in this particular. Therefore the editor is guilty of falsehood and slander in the charge which he has published against us.

Again, the editor says, “But 2d, the sermon is designed to make the impression that Mr. Wesley holds that a man may have the direct witness at the same time that ‘he is a sinner all over—a sinner both in heart and life.’ See the quotation already given. In reply to this, we will just appeal to the writings of Mr. Wesley, which are before the public. There is not a page, nor a paragraph, in the writings of that author, on this subject; which does not contradict the assertion, and cast off the imputation. How a Presbyterian minister can make so false and so injurious an imputation, and how a Presbyterian Synod, in this day of light and investigation, can sanction, and send forth a declaration so injuriously destitute of one particle of truth, is a mystery which we must leave to the revelations of the future. And we hold the ‘Synod of Tennessee’ to a strict accountability for one of the gravest and most injurious falsehoods which could be penned, both against the dead and the living. An imputation sufficient to blast the reputation of an apostle, if it could be made out against him. What do these modern reformers mean? Have they determined to wage *eternal war* upon the Methodists, and carry it on by a violation of the sacred obligations of Christianity? The ‘Synod’ may *twitch* and *quirk* and *twinge*, but they are gravely committed to a declaration for which enlightened public sentiment will hold them answerable.”

Now from the wrath and ranting of the editor here, the reader might suppose that he did really think that the doctrine of Mr. Wesley was misrepresented in the sermon, but this is not the fact. He knew when he penned the above, that the statement in the sermon, the truth of which he so positively denies, is strictly and literally true. The words which the editor marks

as a quotation from the sermon, are Mr. Wesley's own words on the subject. And the editor quotes the passage from Mr. Wesley, in which these words are found, and in which he teaches, in the most plain and positive manner, the very thing which we stated in the sermon, he does teach.

Now let us have the quotation from Mr. Wesley as given by the editor himself. He says, "Mr. Wesley, in answering an objection to the doctrine in question, when speaking of the direct witness, says—'It' (the direct witness) 'is antecedent to our making any profession at all, but that of being lost, undone, guilty, helpless sinners. It' (the direct witness) 'is designed to assure those to whom it is given, that they are the children of God; that they are justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Jesus Christ. And it' (the direct witness) 'does not suppose that their preceding thoughts, words and actions, are conformable to the rule of Scripture; it' (the direct witness) 'supposes quite the reverse, namely, that they are sinners all over, sinners both in heart and life.'" The objection which Mr. Wesley is here answering, is as follows. He says—"It is objected, secondly, 'the design of the witness contended for is to prove that the profession we make is genuine.' But it does not prove this." There is the objection. Mr. Wesley says, "I answer, the proving of this is not the design of it." Then follows the part of the answer given by the editor, in which Mr. Wesley asserts that we receive the witness of the Spirit while we profess to be nothing but sinners, before we make any profession of love to God or holiness at all. He denies that it is designed to prove that the profession we make is genuine. He then states what the design of the witness of the Spirit is. He then asserts that the reception of the witness of the Spirit does not suppose that our thoughts, words and actions, before receiving the witness, are conformable to the rule of Scripture. He then asserts that the reception of the witness supposes quite the reverse, namely, that we are, at the time we receive the witness of the Spirit, sinners all over, sinners both in heart and life. Here is the identical thing which we stated in the sermon. It may be asked, does not the editor, after quoting the above passage, attempt to prove that Mr. Wesley does not here teach that we receive the direct witness "at the same time that we

are sinners all over, sinners both in heart and life?" We answer, no, he attempts no such thing!! He gives no explanation of the passage whatever!!

After quoting the passage, he says, "Mr. Wesley then proceeds to show, that although their preceding thoughts, words and actions, are not conformable to Scripture, yet, that from the moment of their adoption, they bring forth the fruits of the Spirit, love, joy, peace, long suffering, &c. The one, he contends, is *direct*, while the other, the fruit, is *indirect*, yet concurrent." In place of attempting to prove that Mr. Wesley does not teach, in the passage quoted, what we stated in the sermon he does teach, the editor tells us that Mr. Wesley *then* proceeds to show certain things!! What difference does it make what he *then* proceeds to show? If he proceeds to show any thing contrary to what is in the quotation, it only proves that he contradicts himself, not that we have misrepresented him. But it is not true that Mr. Wesley proceeds to show what the editor here asserts. He represents Mr. W. as proceeding to show, that the fruit of the Spirit, love, joy, peace, long-suffering, &c., is the immediate result of adoption, whereas Mr. Wesley says not one word about adoption in his whole sermon on the witness of the Spirit. But throughout the sermon he asserts that the fruit of the Spirit *immediately* results, springs, or flows from the direct witness of the Spirit.

On the first page of the sermon he says, "The immediate result of this testimony is the fruit of the Spirit; namely, love, joy, peace, long-suffering, gentleness, goodness." And he asserts the same thing on every page throughout the sermon. The editor basely puts adoption, in place of the witness of the Spirit, and thereby makes Mr. Wesley assert that adoption is direct. He says, "Mr. Wesley then proceeds to show, that from the moment of their adoption, they bring forth the fruits of the Spirit, love, joy, &c. The one, he contends, is direct, while the other, the fruit, is indirect, yet concurrent." The one, here, must mean adoption, for the editor does not mention the witness of the Spirit at all. Who ever before heard of *direct* adoption?

But the passage which we have had under consideration, is not the only one in which Mr. Wesley teaches that the man, at the time when he receives the witness of the Spirit, is a sin-

ner both in heart and life. On page 367 he says—“That the testimony of the Spirit of God, must in the very nature of things be antecedent to the testimony of our own spirit, may appear from this single consideration. We must be holy in heart and life before we can be conscious that we are so. But we must love God before we can be holy at all: this being the root of all holiness. Now we cannot love God till we know he loves us. And we cannot know his love to us, till his Spirit witness it to our spirit. Since therefore the testimony of his Spirit must precede the love of God and all holiness, of consequence it must precede our consciousness thereof.” Here he not only teaches that the man receives the witness of the Spirit *before he has any love to God, or any holiness of heart*, but he argues that it is impossible, in the very nature of things, for us to love God, or have any holiness, until after we receive the witness of the Spirit! And is not the man, while totally destitute of love to God and all holiness, a sinner both in heart and life?

Again, he says—“The Spirit itself bore witness to my spirit that I was a child of God, gave me an evidence hereof, and I immediately cried, Abba, Father! And this I did, (and so did you,) before I reflected on, or was conscious of, any fruit of the Spirit. It was from this testimony received, that love, joy, peace, and the whole fruit of the Spirit flowed.”—Page 368. Here he asserts, that the whole fruit of the Spirit flowed, not from adoption, as the editor falsely asserts, but from the witness or testimony of the Spirit received, so that at the time when he received the witness of the Spirit, he was totally destitute of the whole fruit of the Spirit. And is not the man, while totally destitute of love, joy, peace, and the whole fruit of the Spirit, a sinner both in heart and life? Indeed, Mr. Wesley was so enamored with this strange doctrine, which the editor says “is sufficient to blast the reputation of an apostle, if it could be made out against him,” that he became poetic on the subject. At the close of the above quotation, he says, “First I heard, thy sins are forgiven! Accepted thou art! I listened, and heaven sprung up in my heart.” No love to God—no holiness of heart—none of the fruits of the Spirit—no heaven in his heart, until after he received the direct witness of the Spirit!!! This surely would be a strange hearing to a man, at the time when he was a sinner all over, a sinner

both in heart and life. We will give yet another quotation from Mr. Wesley, in which the state and character of the man, at the time when he receives the witness of the Spirit, is set forth more fully and in stronger terms than in any passage yet quoted. After the above poetry, he continues:—"But this is confirmed, not only by the experience of the children of God, thousands of whom can declare, that they never did know themselves to be in the favor of God, till it was directly witnessed to them by his Spirit; but by all those who are convinced of sin, who feel the wrath of God abiding on them. These cannot be satisfied with any thing less than a direct testimony from his Spirit, that he is merciful to their unrighteousness, and remembers their sins and iniquities no more. Tell any of these, 'you are to know you are a child by reflecting on what he has wrought in you, on your love, joy and peace;' and will he not immediately reply—by all this I know I am a child of the devil. I have no more love to God than the devil has: my carnal mind is enmity against God. I have no joy in the Holy Ghost; my soul is sorrowful even unto death. I have no peace: my heart is a troubled sea: I am all storm and tempest. And which way can these souls possibly be comforted, but by a divine testimony, (not that they are good, or sincere, or conformable to the Scripture in heart and life, but) that God justifieth the ungodly."—Page 368.

Is not the man "a sinner all over, a sinner both in heart and life," who is neither good, nor even sincere; who is not conformable to Scripture, neither in heart nor life; the man who is all storm and tempest; whose heart is a troubled sea; who has neither joy nor peace; whose carnal mind is enmity against God; the man who knows from the examination of his own heart that he is a child of the devil; that he has no more love to God than the devil has? No wonder that such souls as this cannot "possibly be comforted, but by a divine testimony." No wonder that they cannot, while in this state, learn from the Bible that they are the children of God.

Now are we guilty of falsehood and misrepresentation, for stating in the sermon that Mr. Wesley teaches that a man may have the witness of the Spirit at the same time that he is "a sinner all over, a sinner both in heart and life?" Has not the editor attained to a boldness in falsehood, when, in

the face of the above quotations, he can publish to the world that the statement in the sermon which we have had under consideration, "is destitute of one particle of truth"—that "there is not a page nor a paragraph in the writings of Mr. Wesley, on this subject, which does not contradict the assertion and cast off the imputation?" Can he persuade himself that such a course as this will meet the approbation of the Great Head of the church, or even aid the cause which he labors to sustain?

Again, the editor says—"Another impression, which we shall number the 3d, is intended by the sermon; to wit, that the doctrine of the direct witness abandons the Scriptures as the only rule of faith and obedience, and relies in religious experience, on supernatural voices, dreams, visions, fancied revelations, &c." We answer, this is strictly true. And this is the main point of controversy on the subject. We maintain that we learn that we are the children of God from the testimony of the Spirit in the Written Word, while the advocates of the direct witness maintain that we learn that we are the children of God *immediately* and *directly* from the Spirit in some supernatural way. Hence they do, on this subject, abandon the Scriptures as the only rule of faith and obedience. But the editor says—"The doctrine" (of the direct witness) "claims to be founded upon numerous texts of Scripture, which clearly, plainly and unequivocally teach it. We quote two or three as examples. 'We are his witnesses of these things, and so is also the Holy Ghost whom God hath given to them that obey him.'—Acts, 5: 32. Will they tell us that the Bible is that gift of which the apostle speaks here as bestowed on 'them that obey?'" We answer, no, for we have never heard of any one who supposed that the Bible and the Holy Ghost are one and the same thing, nor is there any thing in the sermon from which such an inference could possibly be drawn. "'And they chose Stephen, a man full of faith and of the Holy Ghost.'—Acts, 6: 5. Will they tell us this simply means that Stephen was full of faith and the Scriptures?" We answer, no, we have never heard of any one who thought the Holy Ghost and the Scriptures to be the same thing. "'But if the Spirit that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, he that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken your

mortal bodies, by his Spirit that dwelleth in you.—Rom. 8. 2. Will they tell us that the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead, was simply the Written Word? Or will they tell us that these, and all similar passages, mean nothing more by ‘the Holy Ghost,’ and ‘the Spirit,’ than the fruits of the christian life? Or will they tell us that all such passages are confined in their application to apostolic times?” We answer, no, we never have heard of any one who supposed that the Holy Spirit and the fruit of the Holy Spirit are the same thing. Nor do we know of any who believe that the influences of the Spirit were confined to apostolic times.

Why does the editor ask these questions respecting the Holy Ghost? Does he think that we deny either the existence of the Holy Spirit, or his influence upon the heart? Certainly he is not so ignorant as to believe any such things. He knows perfectly well that neither of these facts is involved in this controversy respecting the witness of the Spirit. Why then did he ask these questions? Evidently his design was to make the impression on the minds of his readers that we believe the Holy Ghost and the Scriptures to be one and the same thing!! And that we confine the influences of the Spirit upon the heart to apostolic times!! Hence, his object must have been to deceive.

The editor asserts that the above quoted texts of Scripture *clearly, plainly, and unequivocally* prove that “the Spirit of God *immediately and directly* witnesses to my spirit that I am a child of God—that all my sins are blotted out, and that I, even I, am reconciled to God,” for this is the direct witness, as taught by Mr. Wesley. Now does he really believe that these texts prove this doctrine, or that they have the most remote allusion to it? If so, he may be expected soon to go to eating grass with Nebuchadnezzar.

Again, he says—“Another impression which is intended by the sermon, is, that all the different Calvinistic denominations have totally rejected the doctrine of the direct witness of the Spirit. We reply to this by simply presenting to the reader a few of the very many testimonies, both of the Presbyterian Confession, and of distinguished Calvinistic writers.” He then quotes from the Confession of Faith, and from the writings of John Flavel, Rev. Matthew Poole, and Dr. John Owen,

in order to prove that the doctrine in question is, and always has been, a Calvinistic doctrine. Now, the Confession of Faith of our church is near three hundred years old; Flavel was born in 1627, Poole in 1624, and Dr. Owen in 1616. Hence, if the editor be correct, the doctrine in question was a standing article in the Calvinistic Confession of Faith, and was maintained by the most eminent Calvinistic writers long before Mr. Wesley was born. But let us hear what Mr. Wesley says about the origin of this doctrine. He says, "It more nearly concerns Methodists, so called, clearly to understand, explain and defend this doctrine, because it is one grand part of the testimony which God has given them to bear to all mankind. It is by his peculiar blessing upon them in searching the Scriptures, confirmed by the experience of his children, that this great evangelical truth has been recovered, which had been for many ages well nigh lost and forgotten."—Introduct. to sermon 101, later edition, ser. 11. Was this doctrine well nigh lost and forgotten, at the same time that it was set forth in the Calvinistic Confessions of Faith, and published to the world by the most distinguished Calvinistic writers? Did "the Methodists, so called," learn the doctrine from their own experience, and by the peculiar blessing of God upon them in searching the Scriptures, if it was understood and taught to the world by the Calvinistic churches and divines long before, and at the time when Methodism was born? Was the doctrine a peculiar gift of God to the Methodists, when the Calvinistic churches were in possession of it before, and at the time when Methodism came into being? Therefore, if the assertions of the editor be true, Mr. Wesley is guilty of several most outrageous falsehoods in the quotation above. Since, then, the editor's assertion, that the doctrine in question is a Calvinistic doctrine, is proved to be false by both branches of the Presbyterian church (for they have publicly denied it) and by Mr. Wesley himself, we think in all good conscience he ought to abandon this false position, and in place of laboring to prove that some other churches are implicated with the Methodists in this gross error, he had better abandon a doctrine which he evidently is ashamed to own, and unable and afraid to defend. The editor requests an explanation of the following passage in the Confession of Faith;—"This certainty is not a bare con-

jectural and probable persuasion, grounded upon a fallible hope; but on infallible assurance of faith, founded upon the divine truth of the promises of salvation, the inward evidence of those graces unto which these promises are made, the testimony of the Spirit of adoption witnessing with our spirits that we are the children of God.”

In this passage the framers of the Confession say, that this certainty (that we are in a state of grace) is not a bare probable persuasion, grounded upon a fallible hope. A fallible hope, is a hope founded upon fallible evidence; that is, evidence that may deceive us, such as supernatural lights, visions, voices, dreams, &c., or animal excitement, fancied revelations, &c. They then say that it is an infallible assurance of faith, founded first, upon the divine truth of the promises of salvation. The man who has not unshaken confidence, or faith, in the divine truth of the promises of salvation, cannot be certainly assured that he is in a state of grace. They say it is founded, secondly, upon the inward evidence of those graces, unto which these promises are made. Inward evidence, is consciousness. When I am conscious that I have these graces in my heart, I have inward evidence of the fact. In the answer to the 80th question, Larger Catechism, in place of “inward evidence of those graces,” they say, “discovering in themselves those graces.” The man who is not conscious of, or cannot discern those graces in his heart, cannot be certainly assured that he is in a state of grace.

They say it is founded, third, upon the testimony of the Spirit of adoption witnessing with our spirits that we are the children of God. The testimony of the Spirit is in *the Written Word*. In the first place, there is nothing in the passage from which we could infer that they did not intend so to be understood. 2d. The Scripture references, at the bottom of the page, prove beyond controversy that they did understand the testimony of the Spirit to be in the Written Word. Amongst other Scriptures referred to, we find the following:—“We know that we have passed from death unto life, because we love the brethren.”—1 John, 3: 14. “And hereby we know that we know him, if we keep his commandments.”—1 John, 2: 3. “These things have I written unto you that believe on the name of the Son of God, that ye may know that ye have eter-

nal life.”—1 John, 5: 13. If they had understood the testimony of the Spirit to be an “*immediate, direct*” revelation from the Spirit of God, as Mr. Wesley understood it, these texts would not only have been inappropriate, but they would have directly contradicted the doctrine which they were intended to prove. If additional proof were needed, we have it from the fact that they proceed to say, that we may attain to this infallible assurance “*without extraordinary revelation, in the right us of ordinary means.*” If the testimony of the Spirit be not in the Written Word, it must unavoidably be extraordinary revelation, and is not attainable in the use of *ordinary* means.

Now does the editor believe that Mr. Wesley’s doctrine of the direct witness of the Spirit is taught in the above passage from the Confession of Faith? We are confident that he believes no such thing. The two doctrines differ as widely as the poles.

Again, the editor quotes from the sermon a supposed case, designed to illustrate the fact, that if the Spirit of God directly witnesses to me that I am a child of God, I cannot look after additional evidence to prove that I am a child of God, without mistrusting or discrediting the testimony of the Holy Ghost. But he does not state what the point designed to be illustrated was!! He then makes some very silly and irrelevant remarks with regard to more than one witness being required in a court of justice, or before a church judicature, to establish a fact. His meaning evidently is, that the direct testimony of the Spirit is not to be credited without additional proof!!! Is not this shocking blasphemy? But this shows to what extent men will go in their attempts to bolster up gross error.

Finally, the editor says,—“But we must close our remarks. We have merely touched the proof that the Synod of Tennessee has proved recreant to a sacred trust. Its members have denied the faith of their own church on an important subject.” These remarks are quite too contemptible to merit any reply.

The doctrine of the direct witness of the Spirit, as taught by Mr. Wesley, is too grossly absurd and unscriptural to bear the light of the present age. We do not believe that one in a hundred of the more intelligent members of the Methodist church now believe it. This may account for the strange fact, that

the editor, in all that he has written on the subject, has never once attempted, so far as we have seen, to explain and defend it. But his jesuitical course will only tend to the more speedy and complete overthrow of the doctrine.

[We have been much interested in the following letter, which lately appeared in the Christian Observatory, an invaluable monthly magazine published in Boston, and edited by several Congregationalist ministers. We know the letter will be read by our readers with pleasure, coming as it does from one whose name is well known to them all, and under whose voice many of them have often sat with profit and delight, and speaking as it does of scenes with which they are familiar. As this letter speaks in high terms of two of our editors, we deem it proper to state that it is published without the knowledge of any but the junior editor.]

Western Reminiscences.

BOSTON, JULY 23, 1849.

BROTHER STEARNS:—Since my visit to New England, I have been led to review pages in the precious book of providence, recording facts which have deeply impressed my own mind; and, peradventure, the communication of them to the public may favorably affect the minds of others.

It is now more than thirty years, since Dr. Anderson of Maryville, Tennessee, put into my hands a volume containing the Sermon of Nathaniel Emmons, D.D., of Franklin, Mass. The book was open as he gave it to me, and his finger pointed to the sermon on the language of Joseph to his brethren:—"Now therefore be not grieved, nor angry with yourselves, that ye sold me hither; for God did send me before you to preserve life." I had never before heard the author's name, and knew nothing of his character or history. But I commenced reading, and at once was charmed with the clearness, accuracy, and precision of his style; and delighted with his full, rich, transparent tide of thought. I soon made arrangements to procure for myself, and to circulate among my people, the works of this able and instructive theologian. I sent to W. W. Woodward of Philadelphia, and obtained through him the volumes containing the sermons of Emmons, some of which, I remember, had been published by Samuel T. Armstrong of Boston. Other minis-

ters in East Tennessee did in like manner. Thus the writings of Dr. Emmons were extensively circulated, and attentively read by ministers and church members through a large district of country. Very many of the *early* settlers in the West were religious men. I allude to those who settled in Tennessee and Kentucky sixty and seventy years ago. They had the Holy Scriptures among them, also the Larger and Shorter Catechisms of the Westminster Assembly, and the Sermons of Davies, Doddridge, Whitfield, Bellamy, Edwards, and others. Yet both ministers and people united in esteeming the sermons of Emmons as a most valuable addition to their theological literature.

Lest I should be misapprehended, however, allow me to remark, that neither our ministers nor our people thought of ascribing to Dr. Emmons the accuracy of inspiration. They well knew that absolute perfection is the attribute of but one book—the Book of God. Nor did they at all sympathize with those who shut their eyes against the lovely light of day, because they suspect, forsooth, that there may be here and there a dim or a dark spot on the surface of the sun. Many of these precious people, and many of these precious ministers, are now gone “to the city of the living God.” And I but “speak what I know, and testify what I have seen,” when bearing witness that the divine truth embodied in the sermons of Dr. Emmons cheered and strengthened many of their hearts while they were journeying through this dark world. I wish here to give, more particularly, one specification.

The doctrine of the certain and final perseverance of the saints, was esteemed among this people, a very delightful Bible doctrine. They thought it was clearly taught in the Word of God. And they wished to derive from it that encouragement, and that consolation which it is calculated to impart. But this doctrine was violently assailed by persons who denounced it as both false and dangerous. And the great argument on which its opponents relied, was this: The certain perseverance of the saints in holiness, unto eternal life, is inconsistent with the exhortations, warnings, and cautions addressed to Christians in the Scriptures. Said the objector: “If there is a *certainly* that the saint will persevere in holiness, then such warnings and exhortations are idle and useless.” Now it was at a period when there was much discussion and much feeling on this sub-

ject, that the sermon of Emmons came to hand, on the text,—“Paul said to the centurion, and to the soldiers, except these abide in the ship, ye cannot be saved.” He shewed with the conclusiveness of demonstration, that in this case, there was a *previous certainty* that Paul and his shipmates would come safe to land. For when their prospect was darkest, Paul stood forth in the midst of them, and said: “Now I exhort you to be of good cheer; for there shall be no loss of any man’s life among you, but of the ship; for there stood by me this night, the angel of God, whose I am, and whom I serve, saying, Fear not, Paul; thou must be brought before Cæsar; and lo, God hath given thee all them that sail with thee. Wherefore, sirs, be of good cheer, for I believe God, that it shall be even as it was told me.” But, soon afterwards, when the sailors were about to flee out of the ship, “Paul said to the centurion, and to the soldiers, Except these abide in the ship, ye cannot be saved.” Then the soldiers cut off the ropes of the boat, in which the sailors designed to escape, and let her fall; the sailors, remaining in the ship, employed their skill in managing the vessel, “And so it came to pass, that they escaped all safe to land.” The warning of Paul was necessary and important, the exertion of the sailors was essential to their safety, and yet all this was in perfect agreement with “the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God,” that there should be “no loss of any man’s life.” The exhortation of Paul answered a most valuable purpose, and was a necessary link in the great plan of God. So in the delightful Scripture doctrine of the perseverance of the saints. The word of God is: “I give unto them eternal life, and they shall never perish, neither shall any pluck them out of my hand.” And O how firm is the word of God! “The grass withereth, the flower fadeth; but the word of our God shall stand forever.” Now the warnings given to Christians, are just as consistent with the certainty of *their* salvation, and just as important and necessary links in the great chain of God’s counsels, as was the warning of Paul to the centurion and the soldiers. Or, to take another illustration; the warnings given to Christians, are just as important as the warning given to Joseph by the angel of God: “Arise, and take the young child and his mother, and flee into Egypt; for Herod will seek the young child to destroy him;” while it was *certain*

that the time of Messiah's death was more than thirty years distant, and that "all things must be fulfilled which were written in the law of Moses, and in the prophets, and in the psalms, concerning him." Who will say that this warning of the angel was *useless?* or *unimportant?* or *inconsistent* with the other declarations of God?

To those who delight to "dig deep" into the great doctrines of revelation, and lay the foundation of their hope "on a rock," a clear, satisfactory view of the connection and consistency of high momentous truths in the scheme of redemption is like "rivers of water in a dry place, and as the shadow of a great rock in a weary land." Now, in imparting aid to Christians in this respect, no sermons written since the days of inspiration, have been so extensively useful, for the last thirty years, in the wide region of which I have spoken, as the sermons of Dr. Emmons. On reaching Boston two months ago; I was informed that the widow of Dr. Emmons was yet living in the country, some ten miles distant from the city. I soon had an opportunity, through the polite attentions of her son, of making her a visit. Though at the advanced age of eighty-six, she was cheerful, communicative, and seemed to be in the full enjoyment of her mental faculties. She spoke with much interest of her departed husband, and said that she was happy to see any one who had a regard for his memory. I told her that I had long cherished an exalted esteem for the great and good man who was once her husband, and asked her if Dr. Emmons ever knew, during his life, that his sermons were widely circulated in the State of Tennessee? And that they were considered as the instruments of very great blessings to the church of God in that country? She replied that she was quite confident that he never knew it. On hearing this statement from that venerable woman, I was deeply affected in view of the mysterious and wonderful ways of God. Ah, we but "know in part," in the present life. What rich and rapturous disclosures await the faithful servant of God when he enters eternity!

These sermons helped to quicken the Christian mind of East Tennessee, and prepare the good people of that region for the great mercies the Lord had in store for them. These will appear in connection with another train of facts, which I have been led to review, since my visit to the East.

There existed some twenty-five years ago, in the State of Connecticut, an association of pious females, called, "The Tolland County Revival Society." That society, about the year 1825, sent an excellent man, who was also a worthy minister, to labor among the churches in East Tennessee. This minister was Nicholas Patterson. He had been, I think, for a considerable time associated with Rev. Asahel Nettleton. Why those pious sisters sent this brother to Tennessee, rather than to another field, I never knew. But he was an able minister of the New Testament, and he was most cordially received by the churches in that part of our Lord's vineyard. About nine years before his arrival, I had commenced preaching at Rogersville, Tennessee, where in a village numbering a population of four hundred, there was not one professor of religion,*—not a Baptist, not a Methodist, not a Presbyterian; for this county had been much neglected, and was a wild waste, while other counties contained churches of thirty years standing. But at the time of Mr. Patterson's arrival, two churches had been formed in that county. One at the village, or county seat, the other thirteen miles distant; and the two churches embraced above three hundred members. This may be taken as a tolerably fair specimen of the state of the church, in that section of our country. In some counties the number of church members was greater, in some, not so great; but perhaps the above is near the average. Many of our preachers had the charge of two churches, some of three, and some even of four. Among these ministers were many strong men; men who were "mighty in the Scriptures;" men, the joy and rejoicing of whose heart it was, to unfold to listening multitudes the sublime truths of "the everlasting gospel." Often, while listening to the rich discourses which they gave, concerning Christ and the great salvation, have I found myself instructed, encouraged, and my heart "lifted up in the ways of the Lord;" often have I felt the obligation to praise God for the institution of a standing ministry, and the divine ordinance, that the gospel shall be *preached* to all nations, and preached to the end of the world. When the English bishop asked the Welch minister "What kind of preaching do you have in Wales?" "We have very good preaching," was the modest reply. "What!" said the bishop, "I know you are famous for jumping in Wales, but I did not

know that it was owing to the kind of preaching you have." "Ah, you would jump too," said the Welchman, "if you could only hear such preaching."

Repeatedly has this anecdote occurred to my mind, when I have listened to the preaching of such pulpit orators, as Isaac Anderson, John McCampbell, Frederic A. Ross, David Nelson, author of the "Cause and Cure of Infidelity," and other men of the same class. Now, such was the description of preachers among whom this brother Patterson found himself, when he arrived in Tennessee. And though they were "workmen that needed not to be ashamed," yet, Mr. Patterson, having labored with Nettleton, and other successful ministers at the East, had much knowledge and experience, that was of great value to the ministers in Tennessee. "Give instruction to a wise man, and he will be yet wiser." It is a proof of true wisdom to be willing to learn.

Mr. Patterson proposed what was called the "twilight concert of prayer for the revival of religion." Most of the churches throughout all that country, entered into an agreement to observe this twilight concert of prayer. Where the family could come together at that hour, they would then have their evening worship, and in that exercise, pray particularly for the revival to the cause of God, and the conversion of sinners. When it was not convenient to call the family together, each one, in his closet, or on his journey, or wherever he might be, alone would lift up his earnest prayers to God, for the salvation of souls. Thus, over a wide land, from evening to evening, a vast volume of prayer for showers of divine mercy, went up to the throne of God.

The preaching of Mr. Patterson was plain, solemn; powerful, and aimed to convert men to God. He preached with *expectation*,—as one who expected that God would hear prayer, expected that God would accompany his preaching with the energies of the divine Spirit, expected that sinners would take the warning, and flee from the wrath to come. And this holy, heaven-born expectation, which so remarkably characterized the labors of that beloved brother, was diffused abroad. Other ministers now preached with expectation, leaning on the covenant promises of God. The church also, in the name of her great Redeemer, drew near, and took hold of the promise and

the oath of God, "that by two immutable things in which it is impossible for God to lie, she might have strong consolation." The consequence was, that the windows of heaven were opened, showers of salvation came down, and the wilderness and the solitary place were made to bloom and rejoice, as the garden of the Lord. Every church that entered into this concert of prayer shared in the divine blessing; and every church visited by Mr. Patterson was greatly strengthened by the encouragement of its minister, and the increase of its members. The two churches of which I was then the pastor, were nearly doubled in their numbers, and altogether doubled in their strength, during the two years that he remained among us. But the entire result can never be known, until "the Lord himself shall count, when he writeth up the people, that this and that man was born there."†

This revival continued for a long season with power and great glory, in the State of Tennessee, and some of the results, after a lapse of more than twenty years, we are now able to specify.

Very many souls were savingly converted to God. Among these, quite a large number were middle-aged men, business men, professional men, and men whose weight in society was great, and whose lives ever afterwards were to the praise of the glory of God's grace. Many infidels were brought to renounce their infidelity, and turn to the Lord. Dr. Nelson, in his work on Infidelity, has given the public an account of the kind of skepticism which had polluted portions of the West at an early day. Many of these victims were rescued from the destroyer. Dr. Nelson himself was converted before the revival that accompanied and followed the labors of Mr. Patterson; but many of his former associates were now brought to the Redeemer's feet, and he was made to realize that it was now his duty to "preach that Gospel which once he destroyed." Without the influence that was brought to bear on him during this revival, it is more than doubtful whether Dr. Nelson would ever have been a preacher; and whether his admirable work on infidelity would ever have blessed the world.

Near the close of the year 1827, Dr. Nelson was called to take the pastoral care of the church at Danville, Kentucky. One of our young ministers from East Tennessee, accompanied, or soon followed him. This was William G. Gallaher, now

pastor of a church near Jacksonville, Illinois. This young man, then in feeble health, travelled over a considerable portion of the State of Kentucky, preached as he was able, and made known to the churches there, how the Lord had heard prayer, and blessed the labors of his servants in Tennessee. "Then were the disciples glad." Many of the churches in Kentucky united in the twilight concert; they also wrote letters to Tennessee, desiring Rev. Frederic A. Ross, and another brother to visit them early the next Spring, and assist them in the cause of God. On Friday before the first Sabbath in May, 1828, Mr. Ross and his friend met some of those Kentucky brethren at Richmond, in Madison county. It was a precious season—a day of the right hand of the Most High. "And the lofty looks of men were humbled, and the haughtiness of men was bowed down, and the Lord alone was exalted in that day." Their meeting continued four days. Then, accompanied by a number of the brethren, they proceeded to Lancaster, and preached there. Then to Danville, to Nicolasville, Lexington, Paris, Cynthiana, Mt. Pleasant, Springfield, Flemingsburg, Maysville, Louisville, Frankfort, and other important points. They preached from four to six days, at each of these places. Many persons came from a distance to attend the meetings, and many were turned to the Lord. It is now twenty-one years since that series of efforts, and I have, during this long period, while travelling up and down in the great West, had reason to rejoice at the frequency with which I have met with those who were then born of God. Scarcely have I visited a town, or an extensive neighborhood in any of the Western States, within the last twenty years, but I have found "burning and shining lights" in the Christian church, who dated their conversion, from that blessed outpouring of the Spirit of God, in 1828. Let me give one example out of many.

A few years ago, I had been to visit my aged parents in Illinois. It was during the severity of winter. The Mississippi was frozen over. I had crossed it on the ice, and when about 15 miles from the river, night was approaching, and I stopped near a house which I had never seen before. While I was fastening my horse the landlord came out, and exclaimed:—"Ah! I know you! come in, come in." I could not identify him as an acquaintance, but he inquired: "Do not you remember the meeting at Mt. Pleasant, in Kentucky, in the year 1828?" "Yes, I remember it well." "Well, sir, I was ploughing in

a field at a distance from the church. I had no thought of going to the meeting; but while I was ploughing, I heard the congregation at the church-singing these lines:

"In all my Lord's appointed ways,
My journey I'll pursue;
Hinder me not, ye much-loved saints,
For I must go with you."

I immediately took my horse from the plough, went to the house, changed my clothes, and came right to the church; and at that time gave my heart to God. My aged father also joined with me on that occasion, in a public profession of Christ as our Saviour; and we are now both hoping for eternal life." Such was the statement of this plain, pious man, and such is a sample of the fruits of the revival of 1828, with which I have been meeting for the last twenty years.

While Mr. Ross and his friend were laboring in Kentucky, Dr. Joshua L. Wilson wrote a letter inviting and urging them to come to Cincinnati. They accepted his urgent invitation. At Cincinnati, the work of God's Spirit was marvellously extensive and glorious. In the space of six weeks, about six hundred persons professed conversion to God, in the congregations connected with the Presbyterian church; and other denominations also were greatly blessed. It was, perhaps, the most powerful revival that I have ever witnessed. Soon after this, that beautiful building occupied by the second Presbyterian Church was erected, the third Presbyterian Church was formed, and then the fourth, the fifth, and the sixth. One of these brethren from Tennessee, became pastor of the third church, and soon after he became a trustee of the Lane Seminary. He introduced in the Board of trustees, the resolution, to call Dr. Beecher to the presidency of the Lane Seminary; and he, as the officiating member of that Board, inducted Dr. Beecher into the office which he now holds in that institution. A tide of holy influence has gone forth from that seminary, and already extended afar. A tide also of good, from the lives of those who were converted in those mighty revivals, has already blessed the souls of many. How wide those streams may spread, how far their waves may roll, before the trump of God shall stop the march of time, neither man nor angel can tell. But, already, we can see enough to awake the exclamation, "Blessed are they who are permitted to be workers together with God! Truly our fellowship is with the Father and with his Son, Jesus Christ."

Now observe, all these immense results can be traced to the mission of Nicholas Patterson from Connecticut to Tennessee, as unquestionably as you can trace the channel of the Ohio river from Pittsburg to Cincinnati. Had not those pious sisters sent that man of God to the West, that concert of prayer would not have been entered into by the churches. Without prayer,

that revival would not have come; without that revival, Dr. Nelson would not have been *constrained* (for it was a tremendous struggle,) to abandon the profitable practice of medicine, and enter the ministry, in a country where privation and penury stared him in the face. Had he not entered the ministry, it is next to certain his book on infidelity would never have been written. Had he not entered the ministry, he would not have been called to Kentucky, to the Danville church. Then, there is no likelihood that the young brother would have gone and travelled through that State, introducing the concert of prayer, and making known the wonders of God's grace in the neighboring State. In that event, Mr. Ross and his friend would not have been invited to visit the churches in Kentucky. Had they not gone to Kentucky, they would not have been invited to Cincinnati. The great revival in Cincinnati, so far as their agency was the instrument, would not have taken place. The beautiful building for the second Presbyterian Church would not have been erected at the time it was. Dr. Beecher would not have been called to that church, in connection with the Lane Seminary, nor would the Lane Seminary have been established, certainly at that time. A host of young ministers now in the field, and that multitude of converted souls, "that long cloud of witnesses" would not have been raised up to bless the church of God, in those wide-spread regions of the West.

How little did these sisters know what they were doing, when they sent their missionary to the West. Rev. Mr. Calhoun, of Coventry, in a letter to a clergyman in Boston, speaking of the Tolland County Revival Society, says:—"The society embraced many of the most intelligent and devoted females in the county; and the annual meetings of that society were of peculiar interest. It is affecting to me to call them to remembrance. Should any of them be yet living, and should their eyes light on these pages, I will say to such, in the language of the queen of Sheba, "Behold the half has not been told you." Wait for the clearer light, and the more perfect disclosures of eternity, and in the meantime, "Be ye steadfast, unmovable, always abounding in the work of the Lord, forasmuch as ye know that your labor is not in vain in the Lord."

I am, dear brother, yours affectionately,

JAMES GALLAHER.

NOTES BY THE JUNIOR EDITOR.

* We are informed on the best authority that Br. Gallaher has here fallen into a slight error of fact, as he is speaking of a state of things which existed more than thirty years since. There were some professors of religion at Rogersville, and some in Hawkins county, when Br. G. came to labor there, and our venerable father Dr. Coffin had preached for years in that field.

† We know it is the opinion of some, well qualified to judge in the matter, that Br. Gallaher overrates the good which resulted from Mr. Patterson's preaching in this region of country.

THE
Calvinistic Magazine.

[NEW SERIES.]

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

Vol. IV.

October, 1849.

No. 10.

A Sermon,

*Delivered at the Installation of the late Rev. John B. Meek,
Pastor of Mars' Hill Church, Athens, Tenn., June 18, 1848.*

BY REV. GIDEON S. WHITE.

"So they read in the book in the law of God distinctly, and gave the sense, and caused them to understand the reading."—NEHE, 8: 8.

THE text is, in part, a record of the qualifications and official acts of the teachers in Israel, in the days of Ezra. They read the law of God. They understood what they read, otherwise they could not have given the sense. They caused the people to understand the reading. The great object they seemed to have had in view, in reading and explaining the law of God, was to *understand*, and cause others to *understand and embrace the doctrines of the kingdom of grace*. The types, shadows and ceremonies of the dispensation, under which they ministered at the altar, were without value or efficacy, only as they were viewed in connection with the principles, doctrines and duties connected with the expression, "Christ, and him crucified."

Taking this view of the subject, we remark, that much depended upon a correct understanding of the law of God, on the part of the teachers; upon giving the true interpretation when they taught; and upon their enforcing the truth, by such arguments and illustrations as were adapted to their age and circumstances, so that their hearers might *understand, embrace, and obey the truth*.

At the present time we shall consider the text as inculcating the minister's duty to *understand, explain, illustrate, and cause*

the people to understand, the doctrines, duties and privileges, connected with the kingdom of grace.

This subject ought to be understood, both by the minister and the people of his charge. Let the church and congregation cherish erroneous opinions, in relation to ministerial qualifications, responsibilities and duties, and it will *disqualify* them for the discharge of their duty to him, who stands upon the walls of Zion. Let them be fully impressed with the belief, that the man of God does not need much time for study, for thought, and reflection, and they will not appreciate his labors, nor give him the support to which he is entitled by the decree of heaven. Let the belief pervade the old and the young, that he, who ministers at the altar, is not bound by the statute books of heaven, but is to preach and pray for the pleasure of his people, keeping in view their prejudices and wishes, and no minister could be, for a great length of time, faithful to God and acceptable to his people, even if in him were blended the argumentative talents of Paul, the eloquence of Apollos, the zeal of Peter and the lovely spirit of John.

We invite your attention to the following points :

- I. The minister's qualifications.
- II. What he is to preach and teach.
- III. Adaptation of his style and manner of preaching, to the great object he has in view.

I. The minister's qualifications.

A person may possess qualifications suitable for one station in life, and not for another. Qualifications appropriate to the farmer, might not be available to the mechanic. The course of study, of thought, investigation and experience, indispensable to a successful medical practitioner, would not be of equal value, nor as appropriate in the practice of law. The qualifications for any station, must correspond with the design, responsibilities, duties, difficulties and consequences, connected with the station or office.

The minister of Jesus Christ holds an office, which is inseparably connected with responsibilities, duties and difficulties, far surpassing those connected with any other office ever entrusted to man. Other stations are connected with duties and responsibilities interesting and important. In sickness, all our hopes for returning health, and the continuance of life depend,

with God's blessing, upon the skill, the judgment and fidelity of him to whom we have entrusted our all. The want of qualifications or the neglect of his duties, may close the scenes of life, and deprive us of the imperfect pleasures, connected with a few short years of our earthly pilgrimage.

Much depends upon the skill and fidelity of the lawyer. To him we commit the maintenance of our rights, the protection of our property, our character and our lives. Should he prove treacherous or unfaithful, our injury might be serious and our loss involve all that is dear in character and life. But to those who thus suffer, there is a higher court of appeal, where truth will appear in its convincing light, and where justice will be awarded. But what language can describe the loss sustained to souls, to the universe and the glory of God, by the unfaithfulness or incompetency of him, who speaks for God? Connected with his official acts, are scenes as bright, cheering and durable as heaven; or as dark and cheerless as the wailing of the damned.

The consequences connected with his official acts, are as vast as eternity. To those who believe, he is the savor of life unto life; and to those who believe not, the savor of death unto death. In view of the responsibilities, difficulties and consequences of his station, well may the minister exclaim, in the language of the Apostle, "Who is sufficient for these things?" The ministry of reconciliation was not entrusted to angels, "But we have this treasure in earthen vessels, that the excellency of the power may be of God, and not of us." "That your faith should not stand in the wisdom of men, but in the power of God."

During life, the minister's duties and responsibilities never cease. Not so with other stations. The lawyer, the physician, the merchant, mechanic or farmer, may pursue their respective professions, until they secure competency or a fortune; and then, at pleasure, retire from business, consulting only their individual ease, pleasure and happiness. Their professions are designed to secure personal interests. This consideration guides and controls all their plans and acts. But the ministerial office was not designed to secure individual interests, personal pleasure or ease; but the glory of God in the salvation of souls. The minister's time, talents, acquirements,

all the energies of his soul and body should be consecrated to the object of his mission. He is an ambassador for Christ. "Necessity is laid upon" him, "yea, wo is unto" him if he "preach not the gospel." From these duties and responsibilities, there is no release, until called to give an account of his stewardship. The design of the gospel ministry may be learned from the fact, that the minister is an ambassador for God. Standing between the living and the dead, he is to preach, teach, admonish, warn and entreat, saying to the high and to the low, the learned and the unlearned, to the moral and the profligate, to the rich and the poor, the bond and the free, to one and to all, "be ye reconciled to God." What, then, should be regarded as appropriate qualifications for a minister of Jesus Christ?

1. He should possess warm, ardent, enlightened personal piety. Without this, his qualifications are essentially defective. We wish to be explicit upon this. Our branch of the church has often been misrepresented, in relation to this point. By some, it has been said, that the Presbyterian church does not require personal piety, as a prerequisite for the gospel ministry—that we correct the head, but not the heart; that we cultivate, discipline and improve the intellectual powers, without insisting upon deadness to the world, and an entire consecration of soul and body to the service of God. These and similar statements, so far as they imply that we overlook, set aside or undervalue, personal, ardent and enlightened piety, as an indispensable prerequisite to the gospel ministry, are as wide from the truth, as light from darkness. There is no branch of the church in this land, that invariably pursues a course so cautious, so prudent and so strict, in the examination of candidates, in relation to personal piety and their motives for seeking the gospel ministry, as that adopted and practised without deviation by the Presbyterian church. In some other churches, persons not only may, but do enter the ministry soon after they make a public profession of their faith, even while babes in Christ, if in Christ at all, even without any special literary and theological qualifications, without experience and proof of character. Such instances would seem to say, that ignorance and inexperience were regarded by some as congenial to personal piety, and favorable to usefulness in an office

in the church ; *an office* that would reflect *honor upon an angel* from the *kingdom of glory*. Committing the gospel of reconciliation, to persons possessing only common literary and theological attainments, with but little proof of christian character, *we regard as improper, alike injurious to the world, to the ministry, and to the peace, purity and prosperity of the church*. The precautionary rules and regulations prescribed by our constitution, in relation to inducting candidates into the sacred office, show that we regard warm, ardent and enlightened personal piety, as an indispensable prerequisite in the qualifications for a gospel minister.

2. It is also necessary that a minister should be, by nature, endowed with capacity and talents for usefulness.

Nature's gifts are variously dispensed. The talents of some are adapted to one profession, and of some to another. A minister should possess capacity for acquiring knowledge. His mind should be clear, strong, critical, communicative and instructive—always improving, even so viewing the works of nature, as to elevate the thoughts and affections to nature's God. His love of improvement, of science, of influence and of popularity, should all be made subservient to the great interests of his Master's cause. By nature, he should be warm-hearted, ardent, energetic, persevering, yet prudent, judicious, mild, affectionate and persuasive. He who possesses these traits, being created anew by the Holy Spirit, and called of God to take part in the ministry, will be useful, willing to spend and be spent for the glory of God and the salvation of souls.

3. His intellectual powers should be cultivated, improved and disciplined by science. Natural qualifications cannot be made available, without improvement. The object of an education is to improve, expand, polish, strengthen and discipline the mind—to prepare and enable it to exercise its originating powers, rendering its perception more acute and discriminating ; its judgment more mature, discreet and sound ; its descriptive powers more chaste, brilliant and captivating ; and its argumentative talents clearer, or more convincing and irresistible. Many speak of finishing their education. We should be deeply impressed with the fact, that there is no completion of a minister's education during life. What is generally regarded

as a liberal or collegiate education, should be considered by him, who ministers at the altar, only as the beginning or foundation for intellectual improvement.

The oracles of God, history, the arts and sciences, the works of creation and providence, all furnish lessons, useful and interesting, tending to make a minister "a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth." One great defect, in the education of too many who enter the gospel ministry, is, they never learn to think and investigate. Hence arises the lack of discrimination, precision and perspicuity, in their arrangement and exhibition of truth. But the minister's time and attention must not be exclusively devoted to his studies. Such is the nature of the organization and union of our physical and intellectual powers; that we must have the refreshing and invigorating influence of quietude and rest, or sink under the pressure of the cares and duties of life. There is a peculiarity in the kind and degree of rest and quietude, necessary to invigorate and sustain a minister in the discharge of his official duties. In every prescription, there should be an adaptation to the accomplishment of the result desired. The duties and labors of the farmer and mechanic impose a tax upon the physical powers and energies, but leave their intellectual powers comparatively free and buoyant. Hence, rest to them is found in cessation of physical labor, even while their intellectual powers may be actively employed. The duties and labors of professional men, and especially of the ministry, may be regarded almost as a constant drain upon their intellectual powers. The rest they need, is intellectual quietude, free from study, from investigating thoughts and reflections. This rest may be enjoyed, all its refreshing and invigorating influences secured, while the physical powers are actively employed. Thus the judicious employment of our physical and intellectual powers, tends to sustain, invigorate and improve each other. Health is thus secured, and life perpetuated. Expansion, elasticity and durability are given to all our capacities for enjoyment and usefulness to the church and to the world. Inattention to the practical influences of this subject, has laid many a talented, lovely and useful minister in an untimely grave. It has doomed others to drag out an existence, miserable to themselves and almost useless to the church.

Indolent habits, incompatible with the design of the ministry, have slain more than have ever fallen victims to studious habits. A minister's life should be one of action, energy, thought and love of doing good.

4. We have no right to commit the duties and responsibilities of the gospel ministry, to the weak-minded, the ignorant and unlearned. Upon this point, the Bible is explicit and conclusive. "The bishop then must be blameless, the husband of one wife, vigilant, sober, of good behaviour, given to hospitality, *apt to teach.*" "Not a novice" (one lately converted to the christian faith, and newly planted in the church) "lest being lifted up with pride, he fall into the condemnation of the devil." "And the things that thou hast heard of me among many witnesses, the same commit thou to *faithful men, who shall be able to teach others also.*"

5. Appropriate qualifications for the gospel ministry, imply a correct scriptural understanding of the doctrines of the kingdom of grace.

It is scarcely necessary to remark, that to understand correctly these doctrines, their connection and harmony, we must understand the languages in which they were first revealed—we must acquaint ourselves with the usages, customs, habits and events, to which the inspired writers so often allude. The minister should have clear, correct and distinct views of the principles of law and of grace—of the nature and design of God's moral government—of the conditions of salvation, and of the provisions for sustaining and perfecting the work of grace in the hearts of all, who are created anew in Christ Jesus—of the necessity, nature, design and extent of the atonement. It is also very important that his views, in relation to the nature, extent and influence of the total depravity of the human heart, should be clear, definite and scriptural. "All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works." These doctrines, the minister must study and investigate. "Meditate upon these things; give thyself wholly to them; that thy profiting may appear to all." "Study to show thyself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of

truth," looking to God in the spirit of prayer, for counsel and direction.

6. A minister should be well acquainted with human nature.

This will give him many advantages for doing good. His messages and official duties will bring him into contact with persons possessing the various peculiarities which distinguish one from another in society. That which will be pleasing to one, will be uninteresting to another. The motives and arguments which will command the respect and attention of many, will fall powerless upon the minds of others. How is he, then, to succeed in the arduous undertaking of instructing, enlightening and benefitting all? An acquaintance with human nature will suggest to the mind that knows the opposing peculiarities to be overcome, the mode; the most appropriate and successful, in winning souls to Jesus Christ.

7. A minister of the gospel should possess a good share of common sense.

To no profession is this more important, than to the ambassador who wishes to present to his people "Christ and him crucified," in all the winning forms of love and truth, that he may effect a reconciliation between them and their offended God. A minister may be eminent in piety, intelligent, moving and convincing in his descriptive and argumentative talents; yet if he be deficient in good common sense, in many circumstances surrounded by complicated difficulties, when he should evince the strength, judgment and prudence of a man, he will exhibit the weakness and folly of a child. This has seriously embarrassed the influence and usefulness of many an under-shepherd, who otherwise might have been eminently successful in building up the waste places of our beloved Zion. In family visitation, alike in the parlor and the cottage, strengthening the weak, confirming the feeble, encouraging the timid, curbing the rash and wayward, administering the consolations, the reproofs, admonitions and the discipline of the gospel, good common sense is an essential qualification for a minister.

8. He should possess moral courage to preach the plain truth, the whole truth, as recorded in the Bible.

To do this in the right spirit, requires moral courage, integrity and decision. There is a wide difference between moral

courage and a rash, reckless spirit. The former is consistent with that prudence which will lead its possessor to such a presentation of the truth, as to enlighten the mind, correct and convince the judgment, endeavoring in the spirit of affection and kindness, to bring all to understand, love and obey the *truth, the whole truth.*

On the other hand, a rash and reckless spirit overlooks all the preliminary and precautionary steps, necessarily connected with sure and speedy success.

Perhaps the minister has spent days or weeks in collecting, arranging and examining the evidence and facts in relation to some doctrine. At length he sees the truth in a light, clear and convincing. Can he reasonably expect his people on the first hearing, to comprehend and understand the points in all their bearings? The minister must "be apt to teach, *patient*—in *meekness* instructing those that oppose themselves."

9. Another ministerial qualification important to success and usefulness, is, a willingness to spend and be spent for the glory of God and the interest of the church.

Sustained and freed from worldly care, by a support given according to the law of Christ's kingdom, the minister has many important and interesting duties to discharge, in visiting the families of his church and congregation. In his visits, he should not be too formal, going only when and where specially invited. So far as other duties will admit, he should visit all; entering the palaces of the rich and the cottages of the poor. Passing from house to house, manifesting the spirit of his Master, the people will be glad to see him. They will meet him as a friend, as one who feels a deep interest in their welfare. By these acts of kindness and attention, many may be brought under the influence of the truth, and be saved by grace.

The minister should pay special attention to the children—speak to them kindly—draw them into familiar conversation—make it pleasing and instructive to them. It will beget in them feelings, kind, ennobling and affectionate; thoughts and reflections which may lead to plans and purposes, at first, perhaps, childish and visionary, but which will prove to be the commencement of a series of events, upon which are suspended the interest of the church and the salvation of many souls. That little boy now shy and retiring, may at a future day,

prove to be another Jonathan Edwards. That little girl, modest and unassuming, may become another Harriet Newell, or a Mrs. Judson. His intercourse with the youth, should be pleasant, cheerful and impressive, always endeavoring by precept and example, to prepare them for more extensive usefulness on earth and for an inheritance, pure, peaceful and heavenly. The minister should take a deep and lively interest in all that pertains to the health, interest, prosperity and welfare of his people. His whole deportment should be such as to inspire confidence, respect and affection—and make the old and the young—the rich and the poor of his flock, perfectly easy in seeking his counsel or advice, in relation to worldly interests, family connections, their spiritual state and future prospects. We do not wish to be understood as inculcating that the pastor should be meddling, a busy body; but that he should be accessible and useful to his people—a minister, a pastor, sound in judgment, wise and discreet in counsel, active, energetic and successful in building up Zion and saving souls.

II. What he is to preach and teach.

It is not left discretionary with the minister, what he shall preach and teach. As an ambassador, to him is committed the gospel of reconciliation. This, he is to preach in its purity, its simplicity, with fidelity, with perseverance, in love to God and good will to man. It is not sufficient that what the minister preaches is true, but it should be the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. He has no more right to withhold a portion of his message, than he has to alter or add to it.

In the investigation and illustration of the doctrines of grace, it is well to consult the opinions of others; but not to regard them any farther than they harmonize with the Bible, the statute book of the kingdom of God. In relation to every subject connected with his message, the *inquiry should not be, what did the fathers believe, or what has been the general prevailing opinion of commentators?*—but what does the Bible teach? Upon many points, apparently obscure and conflicting, commentators and the fathers do not agree among themselves. But if they did, their opinions would be of no value, unless they harmonized with the Bible. The views and opinions of great and good men, are valuable and important, but not to be regarded as perfect and infallible. In conflicting opinions

in relation to the doctrines, ordinances and duties of the christian religion, the word of God is the infallible arbiter, showing what is truth and what is error. And from its decision there is no appeal. Neither the church nor the ministry have a right to add to, diminish, or change any of the doctrines or ordinances belonging to the kingdom of grace. Admit that they have, and you open wide the flood-gate of error, delusion and fanaticism, and bring upon the vitals of the church, an influence, corroding, blighting and damning in its effects. *Error can never be legalized by usage or age.* However long regarded as the truth, still *error is error.* *Concealing the truth, or adhering to error, upon what is falsely called the principles of expediency, is according to the logic and philosophy of hell,* and not according to the wisdom which is both peaceable and pure. The policy of carnal prudence and worldly expediency, when they have been permitted to control and regulate the discharge of ministerial duties in the church, have often led to a regular system of lying. The history of the church of Rome is a living comment, establishing this point. The history of the Presbyterian church of Scotland, shows how one branch of the church suffered and bled under the persecuting influence of nominal christianity, in the imposing garb of Episcopal and prelatical influence combined; endeavoring to unite in one, the service of Christ and Anti-Christ, regarding the plan wise, and the measure expedient. Adherence to the truth, with a firm, unflinching constancy, is the only course safe to the ministry and the church. Ministers of the gospel are set for the defence of the truth. But how can they defend the truth unless they understand it, or if at liberty to conceal it, explain it away, or misrepresent it?

His representations of church government should be scriptural, consistent with our rights and privileges, as citizens of the commonwealth, and as members of the household of faith.

III. Adaptation of the ministers style and manner of preaching, to the great object he has in view.

What object has the gospel minister in view? His own individual interest, popularity, or aggrandizement? "Seekest thou great things for thyself? Seek them not." His main object should be, to promote the glory of God and secure the salvation of souls.

The kingdom of Christ is not of this world. It is a kingdom of holiness. Among the means designed to give to this kingdom stability, enlargement, beauty and perpetuity, the gospel ministry holds the most prominent place. The bible and tract societies, sabbath school instruction, in connection with all the other benevolent institutions of the age, should be subordinate to, and co-operate with, the living ministry, in spreading the knowledge of "Christ and him crucified." "The kingdom of God is within you." Grace renews the heart, controls its passions, brings its thoughts in subjection to the law of love. Hence it is true, the work of grace in the heart, is begun, sustained and perfected by the Holy Spirit, through the instrumentality of the truth. The ambassador of Christ, in his studies, his learning, his talents, his zeal, his eloquence, in his appeals to the judgment, the hopes, the fears and the solicitude of his hearers, is to have in view no other object, but the presentation of the truth, in its primitive purity and harmony. In this way he will promote the glory of God, in the salvation of souls.

In order to subserve the great and important object he has in view, the minister's style and mode of presenting truth and enforcing duty, should be argumentative, clear, dignified, interesting and persuasive. He has no right to depend upon the excitement of the occasion to arouse his energies and to excite his feelings, depending upon circumstances to call forth thoughts and reflections for his public addresses. This procedure persisted in for a length of time, will spread over and cast around the soul of the under-shepherd, all the blighting and benumbing influences of a spiritual drought. It is spiritual indolence and apathy, not congenial to the growth of personal piety, and wholly incompatible with fidelity in the discharge of ministerial duties. If necessary, let him trim the midnight lamp, tax his physical and intellectual energies, that his thoughts and reflections may show that he feels the responsibility of his station, and appreciates the glory of God, the honor of Christ, the peace and purity of the church, and the welfare of souls.

In conclusion, we remark, many things have necessarily been omitted, connected with ministerial qualifications, responsibilities and duties.

My brother in Christ and in the ministry, the station you are

about to take, as the servant of God, to cultivate this portion of his spiritual heritage, is connected with *responsibilities vast and eternal*. Notwithstanding you may surpass all your brethren in *zeal*, in *talents*, in *devotedness*, and *success*, in *winning souls*, the strong probability is, that some to whom you minister, will fail of the grace of God, and from under your ministry they will sink to hell. If it shall be thus with any, may the *number be few*, very *few*, and their blood not be found upon your garment. When the redeemed family all meet in glory, may the stars in your crown be numerous and bright, and you be enabled to say, "here am I, and the souls thou hast given me." Amen!

From the Christian Observer.

Calvin as a Reformer.

In every stage of the Reformation, men were raised up eminently fitted for the work they were to accomplish, and it is interesting to notice, how divine providence wisely arranged every part of that wondrous event, and qualified its agents for the accomplishment of its great purposes. Wicklif arose, the morning star, and sent forth his calm, clear light upon the moral world, and while his exhumed ashes were scattered upon the Rhine as the last act of Papal tyranny, his doctrines were silently but powerfully moving upon the minds of thinking men.

Jerome and Huss imparted new motion to the stagnant mass of mind, and Luther gave the final impetus to the great moral revolution. From the recesses of his cloister he brought forth the almost forgotten pages of Revelation, and gave utterance to those thunders that fully awakened the world. It only remained to give a proper direction to the minds and thoughts already awakened and active. Old and long established systems had been exploded—it was essential that the truths of the gospel should be presented in their proper connections and proportions. For this work one was raised up of whom Scalliger has said—"That he was the most exalted character that hath appeared since the days of the apostles, and that at the age of 22, he was the most learned man in Europe." This

man was JOHN CALVIN, to whose genius and piety even his enemies bear testimony, and to whose intellectual exertions the world is indebted for the systematic arrangement and illustration of all the cardinal doctrines of the gospel.

To the great work of the Reformation, he brought perhaps a larger amount of intellectual strength and furniture than any of his illustrious coadjutors. Unwearied in his search for truth, he stopped at no labors however great—he never fainted though the way was toilsome, and rugged the ascent. He brought into exercise the full strength of his well disciplined mind, while relying on divine grace for ability to perceive and understand the mysteries of Redemption. He possessed a mind of perfect proportions, and a genius that none surpassed and few equalled. And yet was all controlled and tempered by a heart that with the simplicity and meekness of a child, had been taught in the school of Christ.

Of him the judicious Hooker, one of the brightest lights of the English church, has left this testimony—“Whom for my own part, I think incomparably the wisest man that the French church ever did enjoy—since the hour that it first enjoyed him. His bringing up was in the study of the law—divine knowledge he gathered not so much by hearing or reading, as by teaching others. For though thousands were debtors to him as touching knowledge of that kind, yet he to none but to God the author of the most blessed fountain, the word of life; and to the admirable dexterity of wit, together with the other helps of learning which were his guides.”

With a mind thus furnished, a piety ever glowing, Calvin entered upon the work of the Reformation, not for the sake of contention, but from a sincere love of truth. He engaged in theological discussion, not as an angry disputant, but with the burning zeal of a christian. He opposed the existing dogmas of the church, because he knew them to be destructive to its vital interests, and to the welfare of the soul.

It would seem that into a position so hazardous, and on a work so great as that which he assumed, none would enter but men of courage and boldness. But timidity was Calvin's peculiar characteristic, and yet when he commenced his efforts in the cause of evangelical truth, he seemed to be endowed with a superhuman courage,—and he made his attacks upon

prevailing errors with a boldness unsurpassed, even by Luther himself. He stood between two of the most powerful kingdoms of Europe, and against them as the strongholds of error, fearlessly launched the shafts of truth. On the one hand he met by mighty invincible arguments the attacks of the bigoted king of France, and on the other he dragged forth from his concealment the intriguing Charles of Germany, demolished all his artfully designed sophisms and showed by incontestible proofs, the corruptness of the cause he had espoused. Thus by his well directed blows, the church of Rome already trembling under the giant attacks of Luther; quivered as in the throes of its last convulsion. And still more when under the fearful power of that storm which eventually purified the moral atmosphere, the earth rocked and its foundations were shaken, Calvin stood erect a pillar of the truth. Combining and arranging the cardinal doctrines of our holy religion, he formed those lasting memorials of his intellectual strength, the immediate effects of which were to distinguish the Reformers from the fanatics that were already appearing, and to unite in a closer communion the true Christians of that day.

Whatever may now be asserted to the contrary, *history* proves beyond a doubt, that in all the great essentials of Calvin's theological system, the Reformers were agreed. Until the time of Laud his institutes were publicly studied, both at Cambridge and Oxford, and when the Pope uttered his bull of excommunication against the English church, (thus cutting off the apostolical vines from that church,) he brought against the Queen this offensive charge, "*that she received herself and enjoined upon her subjects the impious sacraments, the institutes of John Calvin.*"

When the first Protestant Archdeacon of Winchester, in the reign of Edward VI., was in the time of Mary, brought before his popish judges, previous to his martyrdom, he said, "Which of you is able to answer Calvin's Institutions, who is minister at Geneva? *I allow the church of Geneva and the doctrines of the same, for it is one, Catholic and Apostolic, and doth follow the doctrines which the apostles did preach, and the doctrine taught and preached in King Edward's days, was also the same.*"

It was thus that Calvin's system was regarded by the Reformers, both of England and the Continent. They appeared

in a solid phalanx, moving forward in defence of the same great and glorious truths. And yet in a later age, when those doctrines are questioned and their truth denied, Calvin has been singled out as the victim against whom all the shafts of malice are to be hurled. He is alone hated, because holding doctrine's discordant with man's limited views of truth, and unpalatable to a corrupt heart.

The world has heaped upon him its bitterest curses. And when the efforts to assail successfully the system held by him and his coadjutors, and taught ages before by Augustine, have signally failed, he has been attacked in another quarter, and denounced as a bigot, and an enemy to civil liberty. One act imputed wholly to him, has been the standing argument of those who have been incompetent to overthrow his system. Prove to them that Calvin's views of Divine sovereignty are those taught in the Holy Scriptures—their reply is, "Calvin burnt Servetus!" Compel them to confess that Calvin only re-affirmed the instructions of Paul, and the ready answer is, "Calvin burnt Servetus!" Prove that his system of Church Government is like the model of the Apostolic Church, and the unvarying argument in reply is, "Calvin burnt Servetus."

It is true that actuated, (not by malice, as has been falsely asserted, as is evident from the history of that transaction,) from a desire to prevent evil by an appeal to law, Calvin did cause to be brought against Servetus true charges of heresy and blasphemy. But the councils of his country, in which he took no part, tried and condemned the unhappy man, and executed him, though Calvin in the spirit of a Christian, sought in vain for a commutation of his punishment; and afterward strove long and earnestly to save him, by inducing him to retract his errors and blasphemies. For more than 50 years after his death, not one of his bitterest enemies censured him for the part he took in that transaction. The act was the result of the darkness which had not wholly passed from the most enlightened minds.

Even Cranmer, one of the noble ornaments of the English Church, before his own martyrdom, obtained the reluctant consent of his king, to burn four unhappy victims of superstition and error. Yet this and similar facts are forgotten, and every sound and scriptural argument in support of the distinctive

features of Calvinism, is considered as abundantly answered by the unvarying reply, "Calvin burnt Servetus!"

Thus has one of the freest friends of liberty, and one of the noblest supporters of truth been denounced; and one of the gentlest and purest spirits of the Reformation, has been refused his proper place in that glorious work.

But doubtless when those who defame him shall have passed away to be forgotten, the noble structure which that great mind erected, will stand unimpaired and unshaken by the surges that have beaten against it.

Those who have become most intimate with his life and writings, love him the most. Purified by the influence of the gospel—elevated by its ennobling principles—animated by its inspiring hopes the highest efforts of his intellectual powers, and encouraged by its promises to look for his reward beyond the present life, he went forward in the accomplishment of the great work to which Providence had assigned him, restoring to the church the doctrines taught by the Apostles and the early Fathers, and perfecting the revival of that *system of government* which, in the *early ages* of the Christian Church was the bond of union among the disciples of Christ.

As a man he was kind and gentle, faithful in his attachments, and lovely in his character. As a Reformer, he was severe and unbending in his opposition to error and mighty in attacks upon its stronghold.

In his death, as in his life, he illustrated the hallowed influence of the doctrines he preferred. That gospel which had been his study in life, was his comfort in sickness and his support in the hour of dissolution. Upheld by its blessed promises, he was enabled to meet tranquilly in triumph, the approach of the last enemy, and to see ere life had departed, the opening glories of heaven. The sight sustained his wasted energies, and filled his soul with rapture. Faith and Hope stood by him, and opened to his eyes the ineffable brightness of the City that hath foundations. So sweetly were life and death blended, that none could tell the moment of the spirit's departure. It was a union of Time and Eternity, of Earth and Heaven, as the twilight slowly steals upon the darkness, and the noonday brightly, yet unobserved, succeeds the morning. So died one of the noblest supporters of the Reformation, and

the light which faded gently from the earth, now shines as a star for ever and ever.

J. E. R.

[We publish the following letter from the Central Watchman, of Cincinnati, omitting some parts on slavery. —Eds.]

Meeting of the A. B. C. F. M. at Pittsfield.

ROCKAWAY, NEW JERSEY,
September, 17, 1849.

Without pretending to give you a minute account of the late meeting of the A. B. C. F. M., at Pittsfield, a letter of items and impressions, may not be unacceptable. The place of meeting was in perfect harmony with the occasion. It was fit and proper that once, at least, this great missionary society should hold its anniversary in the most beautiful town in "Old Berkshire," the very country in which *Samuel J. Mills* prayed American missions into existence. The country surrounding Pittsfield is beautiful, as that between Cincinnati and Dayton, and then it has grand mountains, listing themselves among these scenes to make them vastly more splendid. The eye, which has once thoroughly scanned that glorious country, will not soon forget it, but its natural scenery, its high mountains, its green hills, and fertile valleys, are not to be compared with its spiritual advantages. Old Berkshire is glorious for its Churches, and its schools, and for its many sons sent to all parts of the earth to grace every walk in life.

Such was the place of meeting, but the meeting itself, that was the most imposing I have ever witnessed. Just think of New England and the Middle States sending the very flower of her clergy and laity, while the West and South were not destitute of many distinguished representatives. The Church was literally packed with the best men and women, and the august body presided over by our own *Frelinghysen*, whilst the Secretaries sitting at his right would have done honor to the highest stations. You will infer the character of this meeting when I say that on Thursday afternoon, the communion was administered in two large rooms, to not less than fifteen hundred communicants, of whom the great mass was from abroad. Nor was it only a great meeting as regards its num-

bers; but also its spirit and its privileges. It was one of the heavenly places in Christ Jesus. I could not but remark this one fact, making a lasting impression on my mind. Every mind and heart seemed so imbued with the love of Christ and his cause, that the usual accompaniments of large gatherings, viz: dogmatism, contradictions, opposition, and such like, were thrown aside. All seemed to act as if the business of the occasion was not to make brilliant attacks on some antagonist or system, but rather to feel deeply the missionary spirit. Accordingly, the emotional has supplanted the legislative, and the contracted spirit of party gave way to the large and generous spirit of Christianity. I have never seen as many tears shed on any occasion in my life, as were shed whilst the missionaries were speaking, so simply, yet truthfully, concerning the wants of the world, and the progress made in satisfying those wants, and whilst the great congregation remembered Christ in the ordinance of his own appointment. Feeling seemed to be the genius of the occasion, and to preside over all the proceedings. All loved to feel rather than merely legislate on missions. There are special seasons, when the heart yields readily to every motive presented, and I cannot but regard this as one of them.

My task, Mr. Editor, is not to give a meagre skeleton of proceedings, but rather to give you some of my impressions concerning that meeting. You will wish, perhaps, to know about the slavery question, so much debated of late years. All felt deep anxiety, lest some root of bitterness should spring up. Accordingly, I noticed that in the great morning prayer meeting, a thousand persons probably present, it seemed the burden of petition at the mercy seat, that Christ's spirit might be imparted abundantly to all who should participate in any vexed question. The reading of the special report of the Prudential Committee was anxiously looked for, and that anxiety was not abated, when the Secretary announced that a letter had been received from the Choctaw Mission, which would be laid before the Board immediately. That letter, which was quite long, was read by Dr. Worcester of Salem, and lost nothing by his admirable reading. * * * * *

Here then was the great fact set forth in this letter, that the mission was, against their will, compelled by circumstances;

to hire slave labor to some extent, and so plainly did this appear, that I very much doubt whether there was any one in that vast audience who did not reason some how thus, "Certainly, these men do not sin much more highly in having pious and trusty slaves in these peculiar circumstances, than I do now in having a cotton shirt on my back, or in having used sugar in my coffee this morning!" In fact, the reading of that letter seemed to disarm the spirit of criticism, and to arrest the desire to inflict any further pain on the feelings of these devoted men, whose labors have been greatly blessed by the Head of the Church. Now, concerning this interesting topic, Mr. Editor, I may have received a wrong impression, and if so, it is at least an honest one.

Another topic of interest is one associated with the paper read by Dr. Pomeroy, the new Secretary, on the want of men to send out as missionaries. There has been a time when men were presenting themselves in such numbers as to excite the fear that money could not be obtained to send them out and sustain them in the field. The fear is now reversed. The Church was never better able to furnish money than now, but when we look for men, not only to occupy new fields but to fill the places of those who have fallen or have been compelled to withdraw, they are not to be found. Bangor, Andover, New Haven, East Windsor, Union, Western Reserve, and Lane, are the sources whence we look for the principal part of our supply. Among these seminaries only five young men can be relied on for this work, although not less than forty are needed to keep pace with Providence. The succeeding classes, so far as can be divined at present, give as yet no better prospect. Death and disease are making havoc among those now in the field, how shall we replenish their thinning ranks, and also send men to new and important posts? The question is one of searching power, and should lead the Church to pray the Lord of the harvest to send forth more laborers.

This paper produced a deep sensation in the Board, and called forth much remark, and what is better, much prayer. One thought the great difficulty was the debt of the Board. Another, that education of ministers in such numbers at the East, did not furnish motive enough to strengthen faith, and send the overplus of ministers among the destitute. Another

thought the remedy lay in the family circle. The venerable Dr. Cooley of Granville, Mass., urged this point, and illustrated it with facts. Another still thought the whole difficulty lay in the declension of true piety. Said Thomson of Syria—a dear brother he is too—send all your young clergy to the heathen, and in their places will soon spring up other preachers, who will preach better than those you now have. There is a giving that increaseth! The same idea was urged in felicitous and characteristic style by Dr. Beecher of Lane. The frightful picture presented by that paper rekindled the ardor of the veteran, and once more he sounded a note of warning to the Church, clear and loud enough for the palmiest days of his mature manhood. The same was true of Dr. Hawes of Hartford, and of Secretaries Anderson and Pomeroy. They labored under the one heavy burden that American missions must die in due course, unless God interpose and raise up men.

Here again, if I mistake not, Mr. Editor, is one of the great ideas of this meeting. The men drafting and reading of reports approving the conduct of the Prudential Committee, are well enough, and they are necessary, but this paper on the lack of missionaries, contained a momentous fact, which caused every reflective mind to pause and take a survey of the prospect. It is a fact which should be repeated in every closet of prayer, at every family altar, in every Sabbath-School, and from every pulpit, that the cause of missions is now threatened with serious disaster for want of well qualified and pious men to send to the heathen.

I must not omit to state another impression, or rather another source of interest in this meeting. It was the character and standing of our missionaries from abroad. Perhaps the Board has never had a delegation of its own missionaries which surpassed the one present at Pittsfield. Evidently, they are men calculated to shine in any country, and at the same time, to a man, they are devoted to the work. Father Poor from Ceylon, has been on the field more than thirty-five years, and yet, Dr. Anderson stated that the Prudential Committee were obliged to write to him repeatedly, urging him to take a vacation in order to visit his native land. And all were surprised to witness a man of his age, and so long shut out from the privileges of our land, yet remarkable for his intellectual sprightliness, and

his peculiar power to move audiences by real eloquence. Mr. Stoddard from Persia is a mere boy in appearance, yet on Thursday evening he delivered one of the most beautiful and affecting addresses I have ever heard. All listened in admiration, and paid to his pious eloquence the tribute of tears. He has almost died from exhaustion, and still looks like death and yet he longs to be again engaged in his chosen work. Mr. Thomson is no puny stripling physically, intellectually, or spiritually. His manly and simple appeals touched every heart, and he will never be forgotten. We shall always associate his words as we hope to see them hereafter with the man himself, who so affected our hearts at Pittsfield. Mr. Dwight is home for ill health, and yet the sobriety and clearness, and power of all his statements told with great effect, and he too will carry back with him many prayers for his welfare and success. My space forbids any thing more than a mere allusion to Messrs. Van Lennep, Bliss, and Talmadge. Suffice it to say, that the universal impression was, that men of such talents and piety, must exert a great influence in the work given them to do.

But I am trespassing, and will conclude, with saying, my impression is, that the Board has never enjoyed an anniversary of more unqualified and uninterrupted enjoyment, nor one where the Holy Spirit seemed more visibly manifest.

Truly yours.

The Want of Missionaries.

We copy from the New York Presbyterian the following report of the discussions of the American Board on the above subject.—*Central Watchman*.

Dr. Pomeroy read a document on the *Want of Missionaries*,—only five of whom out of thirty-eight now imperiously needed, are to be found. The Theological Seminaries, to which the Board look, have this year furnished only the following number, viz.: Union Theological Seminary, two; New Brunswick, one; Bangor, one; Auburn, one; and one has applied from New Haven; while Lane Seminary, Western Reserve, East Windsor and Andover furnish *not one missionary* from the graduating classes. The appeal here is made to the ministry and

to the Church, and they inquire, where are the men? They lay the facts before the Board. They would spread the facts before the members of Theological Seminaries, young members of the Churches, parents and Sunday School teachers. And, finally, all are desired to pray the Lord of the harvest to the end of the supply of this lack.

Dr. Pomroy added especial reasons for this demand of ripe missionaries for fields now open, not new but old localities, especially among the Armenians and Nestorians.

Dr. Cooley was invited to give some facts on raising up missionaries. He gave a sketch of a youth expelled from Yale College, sent to Rutgers College, and thence dismissed also, but afterwards restored, and who became hopefully converted, and is now a missionary of the Board. And this happy result was ascribed to a *mother's prayers*. He stated another instance also, and appealed to mothers present.

Dr. Lyman Beecher took the platform, on this subject, feeling, as he said, as if he could "pour off a stream of fire." He spoke as to two points:—First, The causes. Second, The remedy.

There is no adequate provision on this subject; and the remedy must be such as to go to the Churches, the colleges and to all classes. If the chariot is stopped for want of propelling power, we must find out the obstacle, and remove it. There is a way to make the wheels turn, and burn with motion.

As to the causes: there has been an apparent diminution of interest,—not by fault at the East, but owing to an overplus educated there, and a want of enterprise to go over the Alleghanies. This superfluous educated class must be removed, before this cause will cease; that is, "those who are waiting for dead men's shoes"—doing nothing. We want more than thirty-eight over the mountains: one thousand could find places. We educate ministers there, as you do here: but not enough; and when placed, they won't stay there.

All the ties of family, and the fever and ague, keep young men in the Eastern Schools and Churches. And, as every body, in his own estimation, lives in the middle of the world, if supplied at home, he thinks the rest of the world supplied. And the forty candidates at every vacancy at the East, the sudden growing old of the ministers, and the edging-off of the

old ones, to make room for young ones, keep the lack abroad out of sight. He would not blame the ministry here, but a superfluous amount every year being educated at the East, you will not get them away from home. The same causes operate on young men, not the dearth of revivals alone, to prevent not only going to college but going into the ministry. And this cause is going on all the time.

2. The remedy. Patronize Western Colleges and Seminaries. Let us who have so much need of men, educate the men, and let Eastern friends of education ease off their urgent feeling to multiply numbers. If we had one hundred in each class there, we would guaranty that they will stay at the West. He suggested a committee to take up the subject in due form, and it was so ordered.

Rev. Mr. Thompson, from Mt. Lebanon mission, was invited to speak on this point, as to the want of missionaries. He has been seventeen years in that mission, and confessed his ill acquaintance with the state of the Churches, and the necessities of the case here. But he would speak of the last sermon which he preached at Joppa, and there the call was for the gospel from America through the Board. And so of other places, on his way,—the people flung their arms around him, and took him by the hand, and bedewed it with tears, begging for some of the sons and daughters of America, to come and break to them the bread of life, and to teach them the way to heaven. Nor is that station the most needy, for they have had a reinforcement. But others still raise their earnest cry, and I hope there will be many who will go.

Dr. Wisner resumed the topic respecting the want of missionaries, ascribing it to the deficiency of funds, and illustrated the idea at length as a hindrance in many minds against enlisting as such.

Dr. Anderson rejoined also, that no proper person need be deterred from personal engagement, who is truly desirous to enter upon the work, and this policy of sending all who are qualified and who apply is to be pursued, till the question of too great a supply shall call for a change. Nor is it supposed that the Churches will fail to sustain such as are sent out. Never has but one person been detained, since Dr. Anderson's connection with the Board, by a lack of funds.

Rev. Mr. Van Lennep, missionary from Constantinople, spoke also of the call for missionaries at Tokat, at Aintab and at Antioch, near which place he had an affecting conversation with an ignorant native, and taught him to pray, who was ready to follow him whithersoever he went.

Rev. Mr. Talmage, from Amoy, China, also spoke of the need of men, and the willingness to hear, wherever the missionaries go. The people admire our morals and our doctrines. Here is a field for young men, who are examining the question of duty. There are matters of self-denial, to be sure,—such as the lack of Christian society, and absence and distance from home and friends. All that is necessary is there enjoyed. The natives say, “The harvest is wounded in vain.” They are unable adequately to instruct their relatives. There is one million accessible, according to the treaty, within the limits of twenty miles. The whole province contains 15,000,000, or nearly the population of the United States. The supply of preachers there is like six or eight ministers for this whole country.

Dr. Ferris expressed joy that Mr. Talmage, who expects this autumn to return, is one only of a circle of young men from New Brunswick, who will probably enter on the missionary work.

Rev. Mr. Stoddard, from the Nestorian mission, spoke also of the want of men there to preach the Word, as the number of preachers has been diminished by sickness and other causes. Men too are wanted to superintend the male and female schools. Mr. Stoddard himself is an example of the exhausting nature of that labor, so eager and active are the pupils to learn, and so piously inclined are they. Thus much for the plain of Ooroomiah.

So on the mountains of Koordistan. Now travelling there is safe, through the interposition of the Turkish power. The Patriarch also is humbled by his reverses, and is no longer an obstacle to the gospel; the very Koords, through hostility to him, beginning to favor the native helpers. Dr. Perkins writes, send us help, or we shall all break down,—he preaching one hundred times in sixty days.

Rev. Mr. Cope, from Ceylon. The Portuguese first took possession of the Island. Then the Dutch held it. Then the

English succeeded. In 1816, the first American missionaries landed; and from them the people at first were ready to flee—four boys at length coming forward for instruction. Mr. Oope has been stoned himself, and so it has been formerly, though these hindrances are subsiding. He described the dancing girls in great numbers, while it was necessary to offer a necklace as a present to get a class of girls. Now there are more than one thousand in the village schools. One missionary has had to attend four recitations a day, beside all the cares of preaching, and other duties pressing upon him. And hence the need of help. The acting Principal of Batticotta Seminary is likely to break down, like the Principal before him.

Rev. W. M. Rodgers, of Boston, here offered some remarks. If there are none to respond at Andover and other Seminaries to this call for missionaries, we may thank God that the stones are left, and that He can raise up missionaries even from them.

Besides, it is the law of all professions, that at least ten per cent. will be found to be unfitted for their calling. And hence the apparent supply is greater than the real amount of laborers. And so it will be till an impression is made at the fireside, in the circle of the family, with the father and the mother, and not simply in the colleges and seminaries. Hence ministers must carry it to each family. And all must adopt the maxim that the spirit of missions is in prayer. "Ask God for the means, ask God for the men," is the method of supply.

Abroad the demand increases, at home it decreases. God has used English bayonets to open doors abroad. Men have entered and returned again with their report. God, then, is in earnest in the missionary work, in China, in Koordistan, in Ceylon—everywhere God is in earnest,—even in Joppa, where the brother (Mr. Van Lennep) never expected to preach the Gospel: but he did. And remember the lesson of Peter given there, and of a certain great prophet, Jonah. When God tells us he is in earnest, and sends us his message even from Jonah's voice, if we do not obey, great monsters of the deep will swallow us. Then he sketched the crusade, and the cry, "God wills it." At the lips of these superstitious missionaries, it seems that we hear a lesson: "God wills it,"—the conversion of this world.

SIGMA.

Civilization and Missions.

It may be of advantage to take a bird's eye glance at facts, showing what has been done and is now doing for their improvement, and to consider what remains to be done in order to complete the work of christianizing and civilizing the Hawaiian race. We have spent some time at all of the nineteen missionary stations but one, where there are resident missionaries, except on the island of Kauai. We have surveyed missionary life under various aspects, and have become somewhat acquainted with the modes and means of operation upon the native mind, and their results, and with the trials and difficulties the missionary has to contend with. We have mingled with the people in the house and by the way, in the field and the school, at their work and their play, in the meeting for religious inquiry and at the public sanctuary; and we have seen by observation what they now are, and have heard from others what they once were. And in instituting the comparison between them now and times that were when the first missionaries landed at Kailua, we will take the state of progress found at the lapse of just one quarter of a century, as indicated by a careful survey and comparison of statistics never before made public in this country.

In the first place, there labored at the Sandwich Islands from 1820 to 1844, at different times, sixty-one male and sixty-seven female missionaries, who performed in all 1088 years of missionary service. By these were expended \$608,865 in their outfit, support, and missionary work. There were seen erected forty permanent dwelling houses, two printing offices and binderies, with which are connected four printing presses; four commodious seminary and school buildings, all which, together with large and valuable lands attached to them, are the property of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions. Beside these results of christian industry and perseverance, permanent stone meeting houses were found erected at almost every station, by the united skill and resources of missionary and people, giving and laboring voluntarily; and about three hundred and seventy-five school houses. The Hawaiian tongue had been mastered, we might almost say created, and reduced to writing, and one-half the adult population

taught to read. There had been established 403 public schools, in which 17,440 children and youth were being instructed. The entire Bible has been translated from the original tongues, and there had been printed 52,000 copies of the New Testament, and 20,000 of the Old, besides several editions of one to ten thousand copies of fragmentary portions of the Scriptures, before the entire translation was completed; upwards of seventy other different works, large and small, had been completed and issued from the press, and the total number of pages printed at the missionary presses, up to 1844, were 22,061,750.

There had been organized twenty-five independent native Churches, and there had been received to them on examination 31,409 persons, of whom there were then living in regular standing 22,652, being more than one-fifth of the entire population of the Islands. Besides these results that can be condensed into statistics, the institution of the Sabbath and of christian marriage has been firmly established; government had been rendered comparatively just and stable; a good written constitution and laws have been enacted; life and property were rendered secure; the country's industry and resources were beginning to be developed. The Hawaiian nation's independence had been acknowledged by other nations, and it was admitted into the fraternity of Christian States. The commerce of the Islands, that is, the value of its commercial exchanges, or bills negotiated there for the supply of ships, had grown from little or nothing to \$200,000, while the yearly net revenue of the kingdom had reached to \$70,000, and the annual consumption of foreign goods was \$175,000.

Not to repeat here various valuable statistics and facts that have been given elsewhere, there were found employed at the lapse of the first quarter of a century, as religious teachers of the Hawaiian nation, or in other missionary service among them, six unmarried and forty married missionaries having families to the number of 120 children. There were 548 native school teachers, themselves first taught by missionaries. There were four boarding schools or seminaries, having 276 pupils. There were two families formerly in the service of the mission changed to that of the government, but devoted to the improvement of the Hawaiian race. What then remained to be done before the Sandwich Islands could cease to be missionary

ground, and what still remains is, more thoroughly to instruct and christianize the common people; to train up an educated native ministry which the people shall support; to reform the national habits of living; to inculcate upon the sexes modesty and chastity; to efface the dreadful characters of pollution and death which heathenism has been burning in for ages upon the Hawaiian constitution; to introduce more extensively the improvements and arts of civilization; to develop the country's agricultural resources, and to foster habits and institute new ways of industry.—*Biblical Repository.*

Presbyterianism and the Revolution.

Mr. Reed, of Philadelphia, himself an Episcopalian, in a published address, remarks—"The part taken by the Presbyterians in the contest with the mother country, was indeed at the time often made a ground of reproach; and the connection between their efforts for the security of their religious liberty, and opposition to the oppressive measure of Parliament was then distinctly seen. *Mr. Galloway, a prominent advocate of the government, ascribed, in 1774, the revolt and revolution, mainly to the action of the Presbyterian clergy and laity as early as 1764, when the proposition for a General Synod emanated from a committee appointed for that purpose, in Philadelphia." Another writer of the same period says—"You will have discovered that I am not a friend to the Presbyterians, and that I fix all the blame of these extraordinary proceedings upon them."

"A Presbyterian loyalist," adds Mr. Reed, "was a thing unheard of. Patriotic clergymen of the established Church were exceptions to general conduct, for while they were patriots at a sacrifice, and in spite of restraint and imaginary obligations, which many found it impossible to disregard, it was natural sympathy and voluntary action that placed the dissenters under the banner of the revolutionary redress. It is a sober judgment which cannot be questioned, that had independence and its maintenance depended on the approval and ready sanction of the Colonial Episcopal clergy, misrule and oppression must have become far more intense before they would

have seen a case of justifiable revolution. The debt of gratitude which independent America owes to the dissenting clergy and laity never can be paid."

"This testimony of an Episcopalian is corroborated by Dr. Elliot, the able editor of the *Western Christian Advocate*, the organ of the Methodist Church in the West, in noticing an attack made on the Presbyterians by Bishop Percell:—"The Presbyterians," says he, 'of every class, were prominent, and even foremost, in achieving the liberties of the U. States; and they have been all along the leading supporters of the constitution, and law, and good order. They have been the pioneers of learning and sound knowledge from its highest to its lowest grade, and are now its principal supporters.'"

Statistics of Religion in France.

The archbishops and bishops of the Romish Church are named by the President of France, and confirmed by the Pope; they take the oath of allegiance to the republic before taking possession of their sees. Each bishop nominates his vicar-general, but the appointments are made by the Minister of Public Instruction and Worship. The right of removal is not claimed to its full extent by the State.

The salaries vary. The Archbishop of Paris has \$8,000, or nearly that sum, a year, the other archbishops \$3,000, and bishops \$2,000. If one of them happens to be a cardinal, he receives \$2,000 in addition. The salaries of the vicars-general and canons vary from \$400 to \$800, those of curates from \$240 to \$300. A retired curate is allowed a small pension. The total cost of the Roman Catholic clergy in France was estimated at 36,318,900 francs for the year 1846.

The salaries of Protestant ministers vary from \$240 to \$400, according to the number of parishioners. The whole expense of the Protestant worship for 1846, amounted to 1,255,050 francs.

The Jewish creed counts eight great Rabbins—the expenses amount to about 110,000 francs.

The total number of [Roman] Catholic clergy in France is about 42,000, comprising 15 archbishops, 65 bishops, 176

vicars-generals, 661 canons, 3,301 curates, and 28,501 priests, of what are called *succursal* Churches. To these add 8,500 theological students, 24,000 nuns, and hosts of monks belonging to the different orders of Trappists, Carthusians, Capuchins, Benedictines, and St. Sulpice.

Of the ministers of other persuasions, there are 411 Calvinists, and some 250 Lutherans.

In order to conduct the affairs of the Church in France, there is a bureau, comprising a director and 56 subordinates, acting under the supervision of the Minister. These 57 persons, who are not, for the most part, suspected of being religiously inclined, are charged by the State with the care of religion in France. Although the numerical force and the wealth of the [Roman] Catholic Church are very great, yet they have much decreased since the first revolution. Before 1793, the total number of ecclesiastical personages was 114,000, including 19,000 regular clergy; and their annual revenues, from actual property, amounted to 72,000,000 francs, and the tithe to 70,000,000 francs, giving a total of 142,000,000 francs. While the number of regular priests has increased, the number of monks and nuns has diminished. But it must be remembered that at present, the receipts from the State do not constitute more than about one half the income of the [Roman] Catholic clergy, as they receive an immense sum for marriages, burials, masses for the dead, and various other matters.

OBITUARY.

LOUISA M. MORISON, consort of John W. S. Morison, of Jonesville, Lee county, Va., fell asleep in Jesus, at about sunset, on Sabbath, July 22d, 1849. She was born June 25th, 1812. The deceased was a daughter of Thos. & Nancy Smith, of Scott county, Va., and was married to John W. S. Morison, July 26th, 1829. They had ten children, seven sons and three daughters, of whom six sons are living. The other four children were in infancy gathered into the granary of God above.

The disease which terminated the earthly existence of Mrs. Morison, was tuberculous consumption. She had been threatened with this fatal disease for many years, but was not taken down with it until June 15th, 1849. From that time until her death, she suffered as others do who die with this terrific disease: but she bore her suffering till the last with great christian patience and fortitude.

She had been a consistent professor of religion, and member of the Presbyterian Church, for a number of years. During her illness she gave entire satisfaction to all who visited her that she was a child of God; and often did she exhort, in impassioned strains, professor and non-professor, friend and rela-

tive, to prepare to meet her in heaven. She strove to make peace between all whom she knew to be at enmity, expressing, at all times, the most entire confidence in her own gracious state. To the very frequent inquiry, "Is all well?" she invariably answered, "Yes, yes." "Is the Saviour still precious to you?" "O yes. I see a greater beauty in his character now than I ever did before." "Read the Bible to me often," said she to her minister, "and sing and pray with me every time you come to see me, and come often." This we did as often as circumstances would permit. Her joy upon such occasions was truly ecstatic. But her conflict is over. She has gone to the spirit-land. Her record is on high.

In her death her father and mother have lost an amiable and dutiful daughter; her brother and sister, more than an affectionate sister; her husband, the wife of his youth and the mother of his children; her children, the best friend they ever had or can have upon earth; the church of which she was a member, one of its most zealous and ardent supporters, and the rich and the poor of the community where she resided, a friend whose generosity and kindness will long be held in grateful remembrance. Her gain is the end of sorrow and suffering, and a peaceful entrance into the enjoyments and employments of the upper sanctuary.

"Weep not for the soul that ascends,
To partake of the joys of the sky,
Weep not for the seraph that bends,
With the worshipping chorus on high:
Weep not for the spirit now crown'd,
With the garland of martyrdom giv'n,
O, weep not for her, she has found
Her reward and her refuge in heav'n."

HER PASTOR.

Died, on Sabbath morning, Sept. 23, Miss AGNES M. CLAPP, in her 18th year.

Miss Clapp was a child of the covenant, given to God in baptism by her parents in early infancy. She was carefully trained by them in the nurture of the Lord, according to the principles of the Presbyterian church. She showed this training in no small degree. For several months before her last sickness, she had manifested much anxiety about the salvation of her soul. During a sacramental meeting, before she was taken sick, in Greeneville, Tenn., where she was attending school, her impressions were deepened, and, in the opinion of the ministers who conversed with her, she gave evidence of a change of heart, though her own mind was not so clear. In her last illness she expressed such views in regard to her sins, the exercises of her heart, her trust in Christ, and his preciousness to her soul, as, with her exercises and conduct previous to her sickness, give a comfortable hope that death was to her infinite gain.

J. McC.

THE
Calvinistic Magazine.

[NEW SERIES.]

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

Vol. IV.

November, 1849.

No. 11.

Emendation of the Bible.

A few evenings since, while seated in my study meditating on the disputes which unhappily divide the christian world, I fell asleep and had the following singular dream:

I thought I saw an angel come down from heaven arrayed in glorious robes, and combining in his looks indescribable sweetness and majesty. He announced with a great sound of a trumpet that he had come down to mortals to receive such suggestions as they were inclined to offer, with a view to a new and improved Bible, to be issued in case the existing Scriptures could be shown to be in any wise defective. Each denomination of christians was directed to hold separate consultations, and to appoint delegates to represent their views and wishes.

After the first emotions of surprise and terror had subsided, all proceeded with alacrity to obey the summons. At the appointed time and place deputies appeared from each of the principal denominations, duly authorized to declare their different sentiments. The angel took his seat on a magnificent throne, and casting a look of ineffable benignity on the assembled delegates, invited them to express their wishes.

After a short pause a person stood forth, clad in gorgeous robes, holding a crucifix in one hand and an image of the Virgin in the other. He was attended by a numerous retinue of priests and monks, dressed in various uniforms—one of them bearing aloft a banner, on which was a faded picture of St. Peter holding three keys, and underneath it the words, “*Super hanc petram œdificabo ecclesiam meam.*”^{*} After many cross-

^{*}On this rock will I build my church.

ings and genuflexions, he began:—"Exalted saint of God! the church I represent would not deem any alterations in the Sacred Volume necessary, provided it could be kept from the eyes of the people. But unhappily, our wishes in this respect have been grievously thwarted. Certain pestiferous heretics, styling themselves Protestants, have already translated the holy book into more than a hundred different languages, and given it so wide a circulation that there is scarce a country on earth where it is not read in the vulgar tongue. Even the members of our own church, the only true church on earth, will sometimes steal a glance into the sacred volume, in spite of all our threats, and to the imminent peril of their souls. Since, therefore, we can no longer hinder the perusal of the Scriptures, our earnest request is, that a single clause or two be inserted therein, setting forth the absolute infallibility of the Pope in all matters of faith and practice, and prohibiting the perusal of the Sacred Volume, by laymen, under pain of eternal damnation. If this be done it will be of little consequence to us what it contains besides; although, as there is now much contention about the Pope's temporal kingdom, we should be glad if the passage, John 18: 36, were erased, and the reverse inculcated, viz: that Christ's kingdom, of which the Pope is the head, is of this world; therefore will his servants fight, &c."

The second who came forward was clothed in soft raiment, much resembling that of the first, and was attended by a retinue of clergy in black gowns and holding prayer books in their hands. On his banner was painted in large letters, the words **APOSTOLIC SUCCESSION**. Assuming a dignified air, he spoke as follows:—"The church I have the honor to represent, illustrious saint, cannot acquiesce in the request just presented: for though we admit that the church of Rome is a true church of Christ, and though we even boast of our relation to her as her eldest daughter, we are not willing to regard her as exclusively infallible. Nor do we regard it as necessary or expedient to prohibit the reading of the Holy Scriptures by the people. On the contrary their general circulation, if always accompanied with our prayer book, might do unspeakable good. Very different from these are the amendments we venture to propose; the desirableness and necessity of which I will now

briefly explain. Be it known to you, then, that we hold as a prime dogma of our faith, that the government of the church has by her Head been committed to a superior order of the priesthood, called bishops, or prelates, who trace back their ecclesiastical pedigree in an unbroken line from the apostles; and we affirm that all those religious bodies which are not governed by such bishops, are aliens from the fold of God, their ministers no better than imposters, their ordinances a nullity, and their sacraments blasphemy. In support of these not inconsiderable pretensions, we appeal to the bishops mentioned in Scripture, as the proto-types of our modern prelates. Dissenters, however, and they are not a few, argue with great appearance of plausibility, that the bishops mentioned in the New Testament were no more than pastors of congregations; and to our great grief and sorrow many of our own learned prelates have admitted the fact—a clear proof that the Scripture is not sufficiently explicit on the subject. To add to our mortification, our adversaries challenge us to prove our succession from the apostles, requiring us to establish each separate link in the descending chain—a work we have no desire to undertake. We humbly pray, therefore, that a new chapter be inserted in the Sacred Records, in which bishops shall be described as a superior order of the ministry—invested with all the prerogatives assigned to them in our prayer book. Let the said chapter also contain a geneological table, so constructed that our bishops may easily prove their ecclesiastical descent from the apostles. Then let a damnatory clause be inserted, declaring that if any man, however eminent in faith and holiness, be not in the communion of such bishops, let him be *anathema, maranatha*. Moreover, let men be forbidden to pray except in the words of ‘our excellent liturgy.’ Let the doctrine of baptismal regeneration be strongly stated, and the rite of episcopal confirmation established. Let a few verses be added enjoining the observance of saints’ days, together with Lent and Easter; and then let all expressions conflicting with these amendments be modified or erased. Thus we shall be placed under everlasting obligations of gratitude.”

When he had ceased, a third speaker arose, attended by but few followers, one of whom carried a banner on which was emblazoned in golden letters, SUPREMACY OF REASON.

Stepping boldly forward he began:—"The changes in the Sacred Volume I am authorized to propose, celestial stranger, are neither few nor unimportant. We hold that it is the province of reason to bring every doctrine of revelation to its bar, and decide upon its credibility independent of any external evidence by which it is supported. Proceeding in accordance with this principle, we have decided that the following doctrines, alleged to be taught in the Scriptures, are absurd, false and unworthy of God; viz: the doctrine of the Trinity, the deity of Christ, the divinity and personality of the Holy Ghost, the fall and ruin of mankind, original sin, a vicarious law satisfying atonement, justification by the righteousness of Christ, regeneration by the Holy Spirit. These, and their kindred doctrines, or rather all those passages which appear to teach them, we desire should be erased from the Sacred Volume, which will then commend itself to the reason of mankind. Infidels, Jews and Mohammedans will instantly withdraw their objections to the Christian faith, which will thus be rendered worthy of all acceptation. Some of us, indeed, are in favor of striking out of the book all miracles and prophecies, and of retaining nothing peculiar to the Gospel except 'the morals of Jesus.' The majority of us are not, however, prepared for so thorough an emendation."

He had scarcely time to retire when another rushed forward, bearing on his banner the motto, "YE SHALL NOT SURELY DIE," and spoke as follows:—"Celestial visitor, the denomination I represent will most cordially acquiesce in the amendments proposed by the last speaker, though we must proceed a step further. We read that 'God is love,' and from this fundamental principle we infer that there can be no suffering in a future world; for that God will put no difference between the righteous and the wicked. Still there are innumerable passages in the Scriptures which seem at the first view to teach the very reverse. These passages we can explain away to the satisfaction of our own partizans; but as the great body of the people still regard the Bible with much veneration, as an inspired book, we cannot convince them that such texts are not to be taken in their obvious meaning. The consequence is that our system is embraced by few except concealed infidels, and persons of grossly immoral character. We ask, therefore, that all

such texts be expunged, and that the doctrine of universal salvation be expressed in the most unmistakable language. Moreover, as the wicked, equally with the righteous, ascend to heaven at death, it is evident that to take the life of a murderer is to reward him for his crime, by sending him out of this miserable world into a world of unspeakable and never-ending happiness. We request, therefore, that the passage, 'Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed,' be erased, and capital punishment forever forbidder. In like manner, as it would seem as though the inhabitants of the old world, those of Sodom and Gomorrah, Korah and his company, Ananias and Saphira, and others, were rewarded for their wickedness by a speedy introduction to the realms of glory, while good men were left long to pine in this world of sorrow, we propose that these and similar narratives be omitted. Finally, as it is alleged that according to our scheme it is difficult to tell what salvation is, there being, apparently, nothing to be saved from, we hope the new Bible will state distinctly that salvation consists in being delivered from the *fear* of hell-torments."

After a brief silence, a person of a grave and venerable aspect, dressed in sober drab, and wearing a large low-crowned hat, moved deliberately forward and said:—"It cannot be supposed, respected stranger, that we should feel any great interest in thy proposed emendation of the Scriptures, since we hold that the INWARD LIGHT which is in all men, is of equal authority with the Written Word. And if men would follow that light, with or without the external Word, it would conduct them safely to eternal happiness. But since the Written Word has its use, and since many follow no other guide, we deem it proper to suggest a few slight amendments thereto. And first, let the doctrine of the inward light existing in every man as an infallible guide, be clearly and strongly stated. Next, let outward forms in religious worship be forbidden; particularly, let those passages which seem to teach that the apostles used water in the administration of baptism, and bread and wine in the Lord's Supper, and that they sung or recommended vocal singing in divine worship, be modified or erased. In addition, let so much of the 14th chapter of the first epistle to the Corinthians as for-

bids women to speak in public, together with so much of the 15th chapter as teaches the resurrection of the body from the grave, be omitted. I will only add that, for the comfort and benefit of some Christian sects, it might be well to insert a clause forbidding men to speak in public unless they have something to say."

The next who came forward was a respectable looking personage, plainly but decently clad, and attended by a large company of his brethren. On his banner was a representation of John the Baptist immersing the Saviour in Jordan, with the words, "BURIED WITH HIM IN BAPTISM," written underneath. Respectfully bowing, he began:—"I am, most exalted messenger, the representative of a numerous body of Christians, who will yield to none in their profound veneration for the New Testament Scriptures. For those of the Old Testament we confess we do not entertain the same regard, nor are we willing to appeal to them in controversies respecting doctrine or duty. And allow me here to state, that from our origin our most earnest efforts have been directed to maintain the purity of the ordinance of baptism. As a consequence, we have been the strenuous opponents of *infant sprinkling*, which we have ever ranked amongst the worst errors of popery. Our opponents, however, among whom are found nine-tenths of the Protestant world, attempt to justify this practice by an argument drawn from the Old Testament, by which we have been grievously annoyed. They allege that God had a true church under the old dispensation, to which infants were admitted by his authority; and that as there is no evidence that the law of membership has ever been changed, infants must still have the right of admission. They add, that as baptism is now the initiatory ordinance in the church, infants must have a right to baptism. In confirmation of this argument they further allege, that it is apparent that the apostles, when they baptized the head of a family, always baptized the whole household. Although we are satisfied that these arguments are fallacious, yet for the sake of our numerous Pedobaptist friends, we humbly propose that the famous passage, 2 Tim. 3: 16, which asserts that "ALL Scripture . . . is profitable for doctrine," &c., be so modified as to limit that assertion to the Scriptures of the New Testament; and also that in Acts, 7: 38, where we read of "the

church [among the Israelites] in the wilderness," the word *assembly* be substituted for *church*. We further suggest, that a part of the 11th chapter to the Romans, in which the apostle under the figure of an olive-tree appears to assert the identity of the Jewish and Christian churches; as also that mysterious passage, "Else were your children unclean now they are holy," 1 Cor. 7: 14, be entirely expunged. Let also a couple of verses be added, one denying the existence of a true church on earth till the days of John the Baptist, and the other declaring explicitly that neither Cornelius, nor the Jailor, nor Lydia, nor Stephanus had any children. It might not be amiss also to insert an "explicit warrant" for the admission of females to the Lord's table, which, quite unaccountably to us, has been omitted by the sacred writers.

"A few more suggestions, and I have done. It is known to all that we are strenuous advocates of immersion, believing firmly that it is the only baptism. This is indeed a prime article in our creed, for which we have contended more earnestly than for any other whatever. To such a length have we often been carried by our zeal for that way, that we have been reproached as glorying more in immersion than in the cross of Christ. Still we have held on our way, cheered by the delightful hope, that through our labors all Christians will in time submit to be immersed. At present as that glorious day appears rather distant, with a view to hasten it on we propose that the word *dip* or *immerse* be substituted for *baptize*, wherever the latter occurs in the New Testament. This will settle the question forever. We are aware that it might sound harsh to the ears of some, to say that the Israelites "were *immersed* by Moses in the cloud and in the sea," 1 Cor. 10: 2; or that the disciples, on the day of Pentecost were "*immersed* in the Holy Ghost and in the fire," or that "by one Spirit we are all *dipped* into one body," 1 Cor. 12: 13. But we have no objection to these and similar passages being altogether omitted. We are also willing to dispense with the passage, Acts, 19: 5, which appears to assert the re-baptism at Ephesus of certain disciples of John. We suggest, moreover, that it would have thrown much light on the subject, if the sacred writer in his account of the baptisms of Cornelius, of the Jailor, of the three thousand at Jerusalem, of Saul and others, had only stated that

these converts went out to a pond or river for baptism. In conclusion: allow me to say that we practise *close communion*; that is, we think it right to exclude from the Lord's Supper Christians of the most eminent and acknowledged piety, if they follow not us in our views of baptism. We should be pleased if a verse or two were inserted in the Scriptures clearly justifying a practice which we have ever found it hard to defend."

The speaker had no sooner retired than a bold, shrewd looking person pressed forward, accompanied by his disciples, and holding in one hand a banner inscribed with the word REFORM, and in the other a book which I was told was a translation of the New Testament, executed by himself. He addressed the angel as follows:—"Most heartily do I concur, celestial visitor, in all the emendations proposed by the last speaker. He has gone far indeed, but we think not quite far enough. Long and zealously have I labored for the reformation of the Christian world, in proof of which I need only refer to my numerous oral debates and voluminous writings. That these labors have not been unsuccessful, is attested by the numerous *disciples* called by my name. From the first I was satisfied that the reform, in order to be effectual, must begin at the fountain head—in other words, that the Bible itself needed to be partially remodelled. With this view I have executed an improved translation of the New Testament, which I here present as a small specimen of the alterations which we think desirable. There are indeed many other amendments I would have been pleased to introduce, but was precluded by the corrupt state of public sentiment. I would have stricken out or modified all those passages from which the Christian world deduce the doctrine of the Trinity, of spiritual regeneration, and of sanctification by the direct influences of the Spirit. I would have expunged that which enjoins the "holding fast of the form of sound words." I would also have added a few verses clearly evincing the doctrine of baptismal justification, or remission of sins by immersion in water. Should these and the corresponding amendments be adopted, I offer, for a reasonable remuneration, to publish the new work at my own printing press, reserving to myself the privilege of slightly modifying the phraseology in a few places."

The instant he retired there stepped forward a very plain

looking person with hard German features and a long flowing beard. He was clad in the costume prevalent two or three hundred years ago. He thus began:—"If, respected stranger, there must be any change in the Bible, we hope that above all it will be put in, that it shall not pass for baptism unless the body is dipped three times under the water, and that face foremost. The denominations that have last spoken cut the matter quite too short; as if one dipping were sufficient to wash away sins. Surely that is no baptism at all; and for that good reason we cut them off from our communion."

A large company of persons then approached the throne, most of them mounted on fine horses. They were very elegantly drest, and their faces were plump and ruddy. They moved forward with singing and shouting, the foremost one carrying a banner on which was inscribed the name of JOHN WESLEY on one side, and on the other, "*We are no republicans, and never intend to be.*" Their leader, who I understood was a bishop of their church, after a respectful salutation of the celestial stranger, proceeded:—"The highly respectable body of Christians of which I am the honored representative, is pre-eminent alike for its numbers and its usefulness. With a zeal and self-consecration not surpassed since the days of the apostles, we have gone out into the highways and hedges and compelled multitudes to come in and partake of the free salvation of the gospel. And there are hundreds and thousands in every part of the land who daily bless the Lord for the existence of Methodism. At an early period we saw clearly that if we would impart the utmost vigor and efficiency to our system, there was need of a centralization of power hitherto unknown in Protestant churches. Accordingly we, the bishops and preachers, found it necessary to exclude the people from all participation in the government of the church, and to take upon ourselves the whole control in legislation, judicial and financial matters, as well as in the appointment and removal of officers. Thus the membership were subjected to the imperial dominion of the preachers, who in turn were subjected to that of the bishops. Nor can there be reasonable ground for suspicion that so holy a body of men will ever abuse the extraordinary powers they have assumed. This system, 'worthy of all eulogy,' would have worked to admiration, were it not

for the disciples of Calvin, those pertinacious sticklers for popular liberty, who declaim against us as arbitrary and despotic, and demand by what authority we do these things. We would therefore respectfully suggest that it would add greatly to our authority, and consequent usefulness, if a few passages were added to our Bibles, excluding the membership from all interference in church matters, and investing the ministry with absolute irresponsible powers; let also the passage, 1 Pet. 5:3, 'Neither as lords over God's heritage,' and other similar expressions, be erased. There is a peculiarly pressing necessity for these amendments at the present time, when, notwithstanding our aversion to agitate so delicate a subject, our opponents force us into debates, in which we are almost certain to experience the mortification of defeat."—[*Here a confused murmur of voices arose among his attendants; and I could just distinguish the words, "Glade Spring"—"Magazine"—"Iron Wheel."* The Bishop proceeded:]—"I have not yet done, celestial stranger; and here, first, I must observe, that from the origin of our body we have regarded ourselves as set for the defence of a free salvation, against the soul-destroying, God-dishonoring blasphemies of Calvin. And, thank God, our sermons and publications all bear witness to the zeal with which we have labored to exterminate that hell-born system of impiety: and not a few of us have thought the use of almost any means justifiable in the accomplishment of so desirable an end. So successful have been our efforts in some instances, that we were led to predict the speedy return of that heresy to the pit whence it came. But alas, like the heads of the fabled Hydra, it starts up in two places for one in which it is destroyed. All experience shows that it can never be overthrown as long as the Bible retains its present phraseology. Thank God, Mr. Wesley was so thoroughly convinced of this truth that he prepared and published an improved version of the New Testament, in which he labored to Anti-Calvinize the language of the sacred writers. And we are sorry to say that this work has hitherto met with a cold reception excepting from his own followers. We will not deny that there are scattered throughout the Sacred Volume many expressions which we would not have recommended. We would never have said, "it is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that

showeth mercy.'—Rom. 9: 16. Still less would we have advised the unqualified declaration, that the Gentiles and Jews in crucifying Christ did "what God's hand and counsel determined before to be done."—Acts, 4: 29. Nor is the objectionable language confined to a few of the sacred writers. Almost all of them use expressions which we consider not sufficiently guarded, and therefore we cannot adopt them in our prayers and sermons. Even our Saviour himself uses much language of this kind. But thank God, an opportunity is now afforded for a revision of the Sacred Writings, which we hope will be made quite thorough. And I am authorized to recommend the modification or erasure of all those passages from which our opponents derive the doctrines of Divine appointment and fore-ordination, personal election, effectual calling, the saint's perseverance, justification by imputed righteousness, indwelling sin, together with their kindred doctrines. In doing so we think it will be found necessary to omit altogether the latter part of the eighth chapter to the Romans, the whole of the ninth and a part of the eleventh, also the whole of the seventeenth chapter of John and part of the tenth. Then let a verse be added to the seventh chapter to the Romans, showing that Paul was then speaking of himself as an unconverted sinner. Let a few clauses more be inserted, proving that God could not justly have passed by all men, and that he is bound to afford to every man grace sufficient for his salvation; let also the foreknowledge of God be expressly denied or limited; and then the very foundations of the Calvinian heresy will be overturned. Next, let the doctrine of the direct witness of the Spirit, by which every believer infallibly knows himself to be a child of God, be clearly taught in the Sacred Volume; and let such passages as 2 Cor. 13: 5—"Examine yourselves whether ye be in the faith," be stricken out, for why should a man examine himself in relation to the matter when he already knows he is in the faith? Expunge also the passage, 1 Cor. 14: 26—34, which seems to forbid a confusion of voices in the worshipping assembly, and consequently to reflect severely upon some of our most delightful meetings. Then add a few verses enjoining the use of the mourner's bench as an ordinance of God, and approving of class and band meetings, and we shall be content. If the changes we pro-

pose are numerous, thank God, our numbers, our respectability and usefulness are such as encourage the hope that our wishes will not be disregarded."

After a short pause a grave and intelligent looking personage drew nigh, holding in his right hand a Bible, and in his left a Confession of Faith. Numerous attendants followed him in good order, carrying a banner, on one side of which was represented an open Bible, and underneath it the words—"*The law of the Lord is perfect.*" On the other side was inscribed in large letters, "SUPREMACY OF THE BIBLE"—"EDUCATION—POPULAR LIBERTY." He thus briefly spoke:—"We appear before you, exalted messenger of God, on behalf of a large body of professing Christians, who, however divided into different communions, still adhere to the same Confession of Faith. We have no motive for desiring any change whatever in the Holy Scriptures, since we believe them to have been written by inspiration of the Holy Ghost, and therefore written in the best manner that was possible to accomplish the end in view—the glory of God and the highest good of mankind. They contain all things necessary for life and for godliness—in a word, they constitute a perfect rule of faith and practice. Any change in them, therefore, would be a change from perfection to imperfection. Besides, we have no sectarian interests to be promoted by such changes, since in the compilation of our doctrinal formularies it was our sincere desire to set forth the unadulterated counsel of God without addition or diminution. We did not first form for ourselves a system of doctrines and precepts, and then resort to the Bible for texts to support it, but we betook ourselves first to the Bible to learn the religion there revealed, with a determination to acquiesce in its teachings. We did not first determine what the will of God ought to be, and then try to compel his Word, by perverting its meaning, to teach our opinions; on the contrary, we went to the Scriptures, there to learn the will and pleasure of our Maker. The result of our investigations is contained in this Confession of Faith, which we receive and adopt simply because we believe it to be a full and faithful exhibition of the truths of the Bible. We have ever refused to accommodate the teachings of revelation to the pride and carnal prejudices of an ungodly world, by softening down or

explaining away; on which account we have been more hated and calumniated than others. We are however consoled by the reflection that we are thus, in some respects, conformed to our Divine Master, and that those very truths which are a stumbling block to some and foolishness to others, are the wisdom of God and the power of God. Instead of indulging a wish to remodel the Sacred Records in adaptation to a man-pleasing system, we are satisfied to take as our rule of faith and practice, **THE BIBLE, THE WHOLE BIBLE, AND NOTHING BUT THE BIBLE.**"

And I awoke, and behold it was a dream.

A. G. F.

Blessings of the Righteous.

BY THE LATE REV. GEORGE A. MATHIES.

"Say to the righteous, that it shall be well with him: for they shall eat the fruit of their doings."—ISAIAH, 3: 10.

God's ancient people in this chapter are warned of public calamities that were coming upon them for their sins. Similar warnings had been multiplied to them during the whole of their previous national existence. Yet, strange as it seems, they were prone to depart from God and substitute idolatry for his worship. Still, however, there were many individuals who listened to these threatenings, and lived in the fear and service of God? To these the words of our text were addressed for their comfort. They were in effect told, that though judgments were about to be poured upon their nation, yet the favor and kindness of God would be sure to them—their reward would nevertheless be certain.

In applying these words to ourselves, we will

- I. Show the character of the righteous.
- II. Show that it will go well with them.
- I. The character of the righteous.

1.—It does not necessarily follow that they are really righteous who are esteemed so by others, or who are popular with mankind at large. The good opinion of others concerning us is so far from being a proof of our uprightness, that it is sometimes just the opposite. Hence the Saviour pronounced a wo

against those who are spoken well of by all men. But why is this? We answer, because the majority of mankind are wicked. It is not probable, therefore, that any one will be applauded by mankind at large who is not himself wicked. The world has given us many examples of this in those wholesale murderers who have waded through human blood to sovereign power, and erected their thrones upon the carcasses of fallen heroes. The applauses which have been heaped upon their names are no proof that they were righteous, but evidence that they were fit victims for the avenging justice of God.

2.—It does not certainly follow, that those are *really* righteous who are so in their own estimation. It is no uncommon thing for persons to claim, on the ground of their superior merit, an exclusive right to God's mercy. The Jewish church did this in the days of Christ. And no proof is needed that this same spirit has descended to our own times. There are many who fancy themselves more intelligent, more correct in their doctrinal views, or more exact in certain religious observances than others. And they are quite sure, therefore, that they occupy a more elevated position than the great mass around who call themselves christians. They depend on these excellences for pardon and acceptance—hesitate not to recount their many good deeds to justify themselves, and, with the pharisee of old, to thank God that they are not as other men. But this self righteous feeling is so far from being a proof of righteousness, that it is just the opposite; no one professes it whose heart and soul is imbued with the righteousness of faith.

3.—Nor are we to allow that the righteous in our text are such as are *legally* so—such as are just before God on the ground of their own works. For we are told that by the deeds of the law shall no flesh be justified. And again it is said, "Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things written in the book of the law to do them." There are none who have not incurred this curse, since there are none who have not broken this law many times. And since no after righteousness can ever atone for previous acts of sin, therefore if the law be violated but once, justification by the deeds of the law in *that case* is forever excluded.

4.—Nor are we to suppose that the righteous in our text are those who have grown up from a state of sin to a state of

perfect holiness in this world. It is not denied that many have claimed this for themselves, but the Scriptures abundantly falsify all such claims. And the great current of christian experience, in all ages, shows that such pretensions are unfounded. While this is true, it is equally true that God requires every man to be perfect—to aim at entire holiness. But still it is a revealed fact, that innate depravity rankles within, more or less, until life's lamp is extinguished. We are assured that "there is not a just man upon earth that doeth good and sinneth not." A New Testament writer also, addressing himself to christians, teaches that if they should say they had no sin they would be liars. These texts cannot be misunderstood, nor can they be explained consistently with the notion of sinless perfection in this life.

5.—We remark that the righteous, in our text, originally meant, those of God's ancient people who feared and served him according to the modes, forms and ceremonies in use under that dark dispensation. But when we apply the term to gospel times, it means those who, unencumbered with the Jewish ritual, worship God in spirit and in truth, and live lives of faith in Christ. But to be more particular. Righteousness, in a moral sense, must always signify obedience to some right rule of action. The holy angels are called righteous, because they have obeyed that law under which they were made.—Their righteousness consists wholly in perfect obedience to that law. Adam too, previous to his fall, was clothed with perfect righteousness, and that righteousness had its whole existence in obedience to the law of his God. Jesus Christ also, as man, previous to his crucifixion, had a perfect legal righteousness, which was made up entirely of obedience to the law and commands of his Father. All these cases bring to view a righteousness consisting in obedience to the *law*, regarded as a rule of action. But fallen man does not possess this righteousness in view of the divine law, because he has not obeyed that law. Hence, when *he* is called righteous in Scripture, the allusion must be to some rule of action different from the law, and that rule of action must be the gospel of Christ. The gospel, being an arrangement for sinners, prescribes several duties which the law did not require. Among these we may reckon repentance for sin, faith in Christ, a life of prayer, and all

those religious performances included under the head of self-denial. Those who sincerely do all these things, with others which are required, are righteous in a gospel sense, because the very performance of these things is obedience to the gospel, regarded as a rule of action, and this obedience is gospel righteousness therefore. It is in this evangelical sense alone that fallen men are termed righteous in the Scriptures; and not in a legal sense. And it is worthy of remark, that those who are righteous in this gospel sense, are not so in the eyes of the law. The very persons whom the Scriptures call righteous when tried by the gospel, would be condemned as sinners if tried by the law. There is no inconsistency in this. For since the gospel contains several rules of action, not found in the law, it is easy to see that a man may be righteous in view of the gospel, when he is not so in view of law.

But it may be asked, if those whom the Scriptures call righteous are still so imperfect as to be condemned by the law, how then are they to be saved? We answer in the language of Paul—"Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth." It is through the abounding merit of Christ that the righteous are saved. Remove this, and you throw the righteous back again under the curse of the law, and leave them to suffer its burning penalties for their past sins. Christ's merit, then, is the only true and real ground of salvation to all those who are called righteous in Holy Writ.

If it should be asked why it is necessary for an individual to possess a gospel righteousness in his own character, since Christ's merit is the sole ground of his salvation? we answer, because such is God's plan of saving sinners. He has nowhere intimated that he will save a single individual without his personal obedience. But he has promised to save those for Christ's sake who become evangelically righteous, by obeying the gospel. We say, then, that it is God's design to save, through Christ, all who are righteous in a gospel sense, and to condemn to punishment all who are not righteous in this sense. And from this it follows, that an individual can no more expect to be saved without a gospel righteousness in his own person, than without the righteousness of Christ. And yet Christ's righteousness is the exclusive ground of his salvation. All the good his own righteousness does him, is to make him fit to be saved

through Christ. We see, then, that the righteous are not certainly those who think themselves so, or who are viewed in this light by others. They are not righteous legally, for none since the fall can claim this. They are not those who have grown up on earth to sinless purity and perfection, for christian experience and the Bible both condemn such a sentiment. But the righteous are those who are living in obedience to the gospel, and are justified or pardoned by faith in the merits of Christ.

II. We are to show that it will go well with the righteous.

1.—It shall be well with them in this life. Christ teaches us that if we seek first the kingdom of God and his righteousness, all the blessings of this life shall be added to us. And Paul asserts that godliness is profitable to all things, and has the promise of the life that now *is*. This may seem a paradox to some, since we are told that the afflictions of the righteous are many, and that it is through much tribulation they are to enter into the kingdom of heaven. This is all true—observation confirms it. When we look around we see that the righteous are mortal as well as others. We see that sighs and tears, and groans and death, are the inheritance of them as well as of the wicked. But still it goes well with them in this life. Do they walk in darkness? The Lord directs their steps and they are safe. For we are told that the steps of a good man are ordered by the Lord. Are the righteous surrounded with many formidable enemies? God himself is their friend, and promises never to forsake them until these enemies are subdued and their redemption is completed. Have they to contend with inbred lusts and corruptions? God has sent his Spirit to root out these seeds of sin, and to implant the christian graces in their room. Does the Psalmist say that “their afflictions are many?” He adds immediately that the Lord delivereth them out of them all. And Paul teaches that these light afflictions of the righteous work for them a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory. Surely, then, however afflicted the righteous may be, yet it must go well with them on the whole, even in this life.

2.—It will be well with the righteous in death also. *Then*, when the soul most needs support the righteous shall have it. Death is terrible to most men. It was a truth that Satan utter-

ed, when he said that all that a man hath will he give for his life. An inspired writer, too, represents some of the wicked as being held in bondage all their lives by the fear of death. There is perhaps nothing to which our race cling with such fondness, and which they give up with such reluctance, as *life*. The gloomy silence and damp of death and the grave are fearful and revolting to the living. Death, too, is sometimes rendered doubly appalling, because it separates from every object of enjoyment and affection, and launches the guilty soul into endless sorrow and despair. But notwithstanding all this, it is well with the righteous in death, as they themselves testify. David was a righteous man after God's own heart, and he uses this exulting language, "Yea, though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death, I will fear no evil." Surely David felt that it would be well with him in death. Simeon, too, was as fearless of the king of terrors as was David. As soon as he had beheld and embraced the infant Saviour in the Jewish temple, he prayed devoutly that God would permit him to die. This he would not have done had he not felt that in death it would be well with him. St. Paul likewise represents himself at one time in a great strait betwixt two, having a desire to depart, or to die. And at another time he affirms that he did not, like most others, count his life dear to him. And again he says of himself, "for me to die is gain." Paul certainly was abundantly assured that in death it would be well with him. And how many christians are there around us, who, like these Bible saints, rejoice at death, and tell us, as they enter their last conflict, that all is well! In view of all this we may confidently affirm that it is well with the righteous in death—we may say with Solomon, that "the righteous hath hope in his death," and with St. John in the Isle of Patmos, "Blessed are the dead which die in the Lord."

3.—It will be well with the righteous after death until the resurrection. This long intermediate state, we suppose, is one of perfect happiness and holiness to all who die in Christ. It does not seem consistent, either with reason or Scripture, that the souls of the patriarchs, Bible saints, and other pious persons, should exist until the resurrection in a state of insensibility, engaged in no employment and conscious of no happiness. Paul, including other christians with himself, says, "We

are confident and willing rather to be absent from the body and present with the Lord. This language takes it for granted that so long as the soul and body are united, the christian will be absent from Christ, and so soon as they are separated by death he will be present with Christ. The apostle too, in this place, states the christian preference to die and be with Christ. But why should he prefer this? Not because his soul will be in a state of inaction and insensibility with Christ, but rather because it will be perfected in holiness and happiness. The same apostle in another place also, speaking of the souls of departed saints, calls them the spirits of just men made perfect, which implies not insensibility and sleep, but purification from sin and glory in the presence of Christ. Again he says, in a passage already noticed, "For I am in a strait betwixt two, having a desire to depart and be with Christ, which is far better." These words express the apostle's conviction that when he died his soul would go at once to Christ. This he regarded as far better than to stay here. But why better? Surely not because he was to sleep with Christ in heaven until the resurrection, but because in a wakeful and sensitive state his redeemed spirit was to enjoy such holiness and happiness as he had never known on earth. Again, Paul, as observed a while ago, says of himself, "For me to die is gain." But what gain? Surely not to sleep in silence, soul and body, for thousands of years until the resurrection. This is too much like the gain of the skeptic, to please a christian, especially such a christian as Paul was. But the gain which he anticipated by death, consisted in immediate freedom from sin, and in the possession of happiness, found nowhere this side of heaven. The conclusion from all this then seems inevitable, that the souls of believers at death immediately pass into a state of holiness and happiness, in which they remain until the resurrection. They may not enjoy that exceeding weight of glory which will be given them, after their souls and bodies are reunited by the resurrection. But still their separate spirits will be holy and happy with Christ. Surely then it will be well with the righteous from death until the morning of the resurrection.

4.—It will be well with the righteous *at* the resurrection. Though their spirits will enjoy much of heaven previous to

that event, yet these spirits and their bodies must be re-united, as just intimated, in order to enjoy the fullness of redemption. Their resurrection bodies will not be subject to pain, decay and death, as our bodies now are. St. Paul, speaking of the present and resurrection body of a saint, says, it is sown or buried in corruption, but raised in *incorruption*. It is sown in dishonor but raised in glory. It is sown in weakness but raised in power. It is sown a natural body but raised a spiritual body. And in another place he shows that the resurrection body of the saint will be fashioned like to the glorious body of Christ. What an assemblage of bright qualities are here made to centre in the resurrection bodies of the righteous! Those bodies are to be incorruptible, glorious, powerful and spiritual, just like the glorified body of Christ, their head. What more on this point could the righteous desire? And how unlike will these glorious bodies be to the crazy tenements which the souls of the righteous inherit here? But these wonderful bodies, so well adapted to the high nature of the soul, and so capacious for happiness, are to be given to the righteous in the morning of the resurrection. What a preparative for the overflowing blessedness of heaven! Surely it will be well with the righteous when the resurrection of their bodies takes place.

5.—It will go well with the righteous in the judgment which immediately succeeds the resurrection. The judgment scene will be attended with pomp and solemnity unwitnessed before. The Psalmist says a fire shall devour before the judge, and be very tempestuous round about. Daniel says that a fiery stream shall issue and come forth from before the judge, and that ten thousand times ten thousand shall stand and minister to him. St. Paul represents the judge as coming in flaming fire attended with his mighty angels. St. Peter says, that in this great day the heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat, the earth also and the works that are therein shall be burnt up. When all this shall rush on the vision of a world rising from the grave, the sight will be pompous and grand beyond description. It will strike dismay and dread through every guilty spirit. Thronging culprits, waiting to hear their doom, will blacken with despair, and tremble, and shriek out amid these wild scenes of terror. But the righteous, like Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego, in the

fiery furnace, will remain unmoved and unhurt while surrounded with the roar and ruin of this mighty conflagration. They will not be lost in the chaos of mingling and dissolving worlds, but will survive and live when time and nature are no more. They will escape that wrath which will sweep the wicked to deepest, blackest hell. They will be publicly justified through the merit of Christ. And the judge will say to them, "Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world." Thus it will go well with the righteous in the day of judgment.

6.—It will go well with the righteous in eternity, for the following reasons:

1. Because they will be freed from sin and made perfect in holiness. Nothing destroys the happiness of the good man so much as the conscious imperfection of his life, and the prevalence of vice around him. These two sources, in fact, give him greater heaviness of heart, and wring more tears from his eyes, than all other things taken together. Freedom from sin, and holiness of heart and life, are the objects for which he prays and strives. These objects will be granted him in eternity. *There* he will no more be called to weep over sin in himself or others. But purity and perfection will reign within him and around him without restraint. In this particular, then, it will be well with the righteous in eternity.

2. The righteous, in eternity, will be blessed with positive happiness until their capacities will be full to overflowing. True, their holiness will naturally be productive of much happiness, but in addition to this, God will bless them with direct and positive enjoyments, as the Scriptures show. Paul calls the reward of the righteous an exceeding weight of glory. And he says, that "eye hath not seen nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man, the things which God hath prepared for them that love him." These quotations prove that the righteous in eternity will possess as much happiness as they can enjoy—as much as their capacities can receive. God, too, is represented here as having *prepared* this unseen, inconceivable, and unheard of weight of glory for the righteous. But if God has thus prepared or created the glory that awaits the righteous, then it follows that he bestows positive enjoyments on them, besides the happiness which arises to

them from their holiness. The spiritual bodies which the righteous are to have, will render them capable of a wonderful increase of happiness, over and above what they enjoyed before their resurrection. And this increase of happiness cannot be said to arise naturally from their holiness, but it is bestowed positively by the agency of God.

The society which the righteous will enjoy among themselves, and their intercourse with the angels, will be sources of direct enjoyment to each of them.

Their presence and communion with Christ, and the intellectual discoveries which they will make in the great plans and operations of God, will likewise bring in to them a great amount of happiness different from what grows up out of this holiness.

And it does not seem too much to suppose that all the circumstances in the future condition of the righteous, will co-inspire to create new joys for them—will be so many sources, aside from their holiness, whence streams will issue to swell the tide of their bliss. It seems abundantly evident, then, that the righteous will enjoy a great amount of happiness not arising necessarily from their holiness, but bestowed upon them by the direct agency of God. We see, too, the exceeding weight of glory on which the righteous will enter hereafter. In the item, then, of perfect, overflowing happiness, it will be well with the righteous in eternity.

3. The blessedness of the righteous is to increase and continue forever. Were this not the case it would not be so well with them after all. Did they enter heaven under the prospect of enjoying it but a short time, their condition would be far less desirable. The very thought of losing their heaven would embitter their possession of it—would make them unhappy in the very midst of its songs and raptures. But such a reflection will never invade a single ransomed spirit in glory. The redeemed will enter on their heavenly inheritance under the assurance that it will increase in richness and preciousness, and that their title to it, and possession of it through Christ, are for eternity. When ages have rolled away, too great to be enumerated by the arithmetic of man or angel, still beyond an endless eternity of increasing blessedness stretches before the righteous, and their growing happiness is

no nearer ending than when the crown of rejoicing was first placed upon their heads. The righteous, then, as to the duration of their happiness, will find it well with them through vast eternity.

We see now that the righteous hereafter are to be delivered from all sin and made perfectly holy. They are to be blessed with all happiness, continuing and increasing forever. Surely then it will be well with the righteous in eternity. If any thing can meet and gratify their highest and holiest aspirations, it will be the enjoyment without end of such happiness as this. A remark or two and we are done.

1.—Our subject shows us who among mankind are righteous in the Bible sense. Not the self-righteous—not the hypocrite, or the empty, noisy professor—not those, it may be, who have the esteem and confidence of others. But the humble, penitent, prayerful, believing soul, whose hopes and aims centre in Christ, and who weeps, and trembles, and confesses, as often as duty is neglected or sin committed, and seeks above all things to serve and glorify God and reach heaven. This is the character in which the elements and fruits of gospel righteousness are to be found. This is the soul that is bound to Christ by the strong ligaments of faith and love, and is heir to the untold joys of heaven.

2.—Our subject presents the highest consolation to all such. When life's short dream is o'er, their warfare will cease and their glory commence. God will wipe all tears from their eyes and bring them up to Zion's hill with songs and everlasting joy upon their heads, to sorrow and sin no more, but to rejoice in the increasing blessedness of heaven forever. May God grant that this subject may bring consolation to the righteous among us, and warning to the impenitent and unrighteous, and to his name shall be the praise. Amen.

A good work has recently commenced among the priests and laity of the Greek church in Zante, one of the Ionian isles. By the study of the Bible, to which they have free access, the island being under British protection, a number of them have been led to abandon the Greek church; and they have applied to the Free church of Scotland for a minister to preach to them.

The Synod of Tennessee.

THIS body held its fall meeting in the town of Tazewell, Ten., commencing at 11 o'clock on Friday, Oct. 12, and closing at 12 at night, on Monday following, when its members separated with hearts cheered and hands strengthened by the sweet and delightful intercourse they had held with each other, and the cordial and warm-hearted hospitality and kindness of the citizens of the town and neighborhood.

Many circumstances gave pleasure and interest to this meeting. A new and splendid church had just been completed, equally evincing the piety, taste, and liberality of those who had erected it. The attendance on public worship was such as to show that it was highly appreciated, and to excite in the minds and hearts of their visiting brethren the strongest desire for their spiritual good.

A pleasing emulation evidently existed among the inhabitants, as to who should surpass the other in affectionate regards to the servants of God who were casually among them. "How beautiful upon the mountains are the feet of him that bringeth good tidings," seemed to be the language of their hearts.

The measure of leading importance in Synod, was filling the Chair of Professor of Sacred Literature at Maryville, to which the Rev. Wm. Eagleton, D. D., was called by an unanimous vote. Next to this was the appointment of an Agent to visit all the churches, to form societies, raise funds, and, if possible, place on a more permanent footing the interests of home missions within its bounds. This duty, it is probable, will be assumed by the Rev. L. R. Morrison, than whom there is none better qualified.

A new impulse was given to the Calvinistic Magazine, and the hearts of its editors were much encouraged by voluntary pledges given by members of Synod, that they would individually exert themselves to procure a given number of new subscribers; some pledging themselves, if possible, to obtain ten, some more, some less, making in all one hundred and forty-seven.

Resolutions were passed in reference to the better observance of the Sabbath; directing each minister to preach on that subject—beginning on the Sabbath before Christmas.

This body will hold its next stated meeting at Greenville, Ten., commencing on Friday, 11th October next.

NARRATIVE OF THE STATE OF RELIGION IN THE SYNOD OF TENNESSEE.

TO THE CHURCHES WITHIN OUR BOUNDS.

Dear Brethren in Christ:—In the capacity of a Synod we once more address you. It should be done with the deepest gratitude, for while God has smitten other portions of our country, the wasting pestilence has not been sent upon us. The rod of affliction has been upon some of our families, nor do our ministerial ranks remain unbroken. Our beloved brother Meek is no more. Cut down in the morning of his days, and just after his entrance upon his ministerial labors, he has gone to join the great company of the redeemed. We have reviewed the past year, as is the custom, and, while the retrospect is not as cheering as we could wish, we are not left without the smile of our Heavenly Father.

A lively, and, in several instances, an increased interest has been felt in the cause of Sabbath-Schools. There has been a good attendance on the preaching of the Word, and in many congregations a solemnity has been manifest, which we trust is the harbinger of a season of the precious revival of God's work. Many churches have begun to understand better that God has ordained that they which preach the gospel should live of the gospel. The subject of ministerial support is of vital importance to the cause of Christ here. Our churches must sustain the ministry better, or there will be found no young men willing to turn aside from other employments and enter the sacred ministry. With some exceptions the cause of temperance is on the advance. There seems still to be a desire to improve houses of worship, and the day is near when none of the members of our churches will have it to say, "We dwell in houses of cedar, but the ark of God dwelleth" within cabins of logs.—2 Chron. 2: 7.

The salvation of the dying heathen has not been wholly overlooked, and the friends of Christ have done something towards contributing their money for the cause of foreign missions; but we fear that the monthly concert is not observed as regularly as it should be, and that all of our churches are far

behind their duty in this matter. The cry from the heathen world waxes louder and louder. They are perishing in the darkness of despair, while we have the Lamp of Life.

You have some idea of the importance of building up the waste places in our own land, and especially within our bounds; but you do not fully realize what are the wants even here. We trust you will welcome the Home Missionary Agent we have appointed to bring before you this subject, and that you will give him your most hearty support and co-operation.

The great doctrines of grace appear to be better understood and loved, and in the increased attention given to the study of the Shorter Catechism we have a pledge that the next generation of christians in our churches will be strong in the faith. There has been an ingathering of souls in some of our churches. Mt. Horeb, Greeneville, Davidson's River and Jonesborough have been blessed in this respect.

We cannot conclude, dear brethren, without urging upon your attention the importance of seeking a time of refreshing from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power. We need other things, but nothing more than this. The life of our churches depends upon this. Unless the Spirit of God is poured out from on high, none of the young men in our midst will be willing to prepare to preach the Gospel, and hence our altars will be left vacant when those who minister now shall be laid in the dust. Your sons and your daughters will grow up in impenitence and unbelief, and when you die none will stand in your places.

Call upon God, then, for the out-pouring of the Holy Spirit. Let this be the burden of your prayers in the closet, at the family altar, and in the social circle. The case is urgent. Before we meet again many now within the reach of your prayers and efforts may be in hell. While you go forth then, and seek to win souls to Christ, cease not to cry, "O Lord revive thy work in the midst of the years, in the midst of the years make known; in wrath remember mercy."

THE SYNOD OF TENNESSEE ON THE SABBATH.

The committee appointed to bring in some plan for the adoption of Synod, to secure the better observance of the Sabbath,

would submit the following report, and respectfully recommend its adoption by Synod, to wit—

In view of the great and increasing evils of Sabbath desecration by almost all classes in our community, by travelling unnecessarily on that day, attending to worldly business, engaging in worldly conversation, reading political news, visiting friends, attending *more than is needful* to culinary concerns, &c.,

1. *Resolved*, That it be and it hereby is enjoined on all the ministers in connection with this body, to preach on the great importance of the proper observance of the Sabbath to all the interests of men, and the evils of profaning that day, in each of his churches, commencing the Sabbath before Christmas next; and at the close of these exercises that they read to their congregations the first chapter from our excellent Directory, on the "Sanctification of the Lord's day."

2. *Resolved*, That it be and it hereby is earnestly recommended to the respective Presbyteries belonging to this Synod, to enjoin it on all their Church Sessions to be vigilant and prompt in the exercise of proper discipline in the case of church members who may be guilty of Sabbath-breaking.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

THOS. BROWN, *Chairman*.

From the New York Observer.

The Posterity of Abraham

The families of Ishmael and Isaac have their millions of sons still living. Ishmael still holds his primitive and secure home in the Arabian peninsula. Though other nations have often planted their tents on his borders, and gone into the midst of his land, he still has, along with the posterity of Jectan, his genuine Arabian sons, who are wild like him, who live just as he lived, and who glory in their circumcision, independence, and patriarchal descent. And as to the other branch of the great family, the posterity of Isaac, the most proper inquiry is, *Where are they not?* Here they are, in thousands, among us. There they are, all over the world—known by their looks—still preserving many customs which no foreign people would ever willingly and presumptuously have taken

upon themselves. These two families of brethren recognize each other. The rabbies call the Arabic language the language of Kedar, and the empire of the Caliphs goes among them by the name of the kingdom of Ishmael.

These are two lines of descent from one patriarch, of wonderful length, and most wonderfully preserved. And when we come to examine closely the facts in the history and present position of these two nations, we find ground for increasing wonder. We will arrange our thoughts under the two simple and novel inquiries, How are the two families alike? and how are they unlike?

Ishmael and Isaac resemble each other in the following points:—

1. In a numerous posterity and mighty influence.

The prophecy before the birth of Ishmael, that he should become a great nation, has been literally fulfilled. The Arabs stand forth in history, wild, isolated, terrible and unconquerable. They have never suffered long under the arm of foreign oppression. The family of Isaac now numbers probably more than six millions. These two families have been transcendently great in influence among the nations of the earth. Mohammed produced a register of his descent from Ishmael, and his family to this day boast of the same descent. Ishmael, through his son Mohammed, gives this day to more than one hundred millions of mankind their religion; and Isaac, through his son Christ, gives the profession of faith to more than two hundred millions.

2. In their Unitarianism.

The leading doctrine of the Koran is Unitarianism in opposition to the Trinity. It asserts and repeats that God is one, and cannot have any son. It warns the reader, for the sake of his soul, not to think that God can have a son. The Mohammedans consider themselves especially designated in providence to be the witnesses for the Unity of God. They are pre-eminently wise in this point, and wisdom would die with them. Mohammed, as the faithful prophet of God, brought the heavy charge against the Jews that they had made Ezra a son of God, and protested against the Trinitarian blasphemy of the Christians. The Jews are equally proud of their supposed position as witnesses for the Unity of God. They teach their

children, as soon as they can, to repeat several times every day in Hebrew the assertion of the Unity of God. The child opens his eyes in the morning to speak out the Unity of God, and the last thing he says as he closes his eyes at night is the same Unity. This is a coincidence between the Jews and Arabs worthy of special notice.

3. In their abhorrence of idolatry.

The repugnance of the Jews to idolatry ever since the captivity in Babylon, and the same feeling among the Mohammedans, are matters of universal notoriety.

4. In their attachment to a religion of stated ceremony.

Mohammed received fifty daily prayers for the faithful from the Almighty, but his remonstrance, in consideration of human weakness, reduced the fifty to five, and these must have their place in the course of every day, without any surrender to necessity or business or pleasure. Ablutions are also a matter of particular enactment. Every year has its month for fasting. Benevolence has its well defined measures. The law is very particular and imperative in all matters of food and drink. Pork and wine are entirely excluded from the supports and refreshments of life. Circumcision is one of the immemorial sacred rites. The other branch of the Abrahamic family have, with similar formality, their three daily prayers, their annual fasts and feasts, their laws in food and drink, and their many other corresponding ceremonies.

5. In their striving for justification from the law.

The Mohammedan, equally with the Jew, expects his happiness after death to be the corresponding reward of his obedience here. Each holds his Law to be the tree of life. The one as well as the other, has no sympathy with the Christian doctrine that we are justified and saved in the name and by the imputed righteousness of a divine representative. Neither recognizes any ground for the hope of justification, except the ground which our own deserving furnishes, or the ground which it is hoped justice will give over to divine mercy. If the Apostle Paul was correct in representing the Jews as in bondage to Mount Sinai in Arabia, he might have represented the Arabs themselves as in like bondage to their own mountain.

6. In intercessions for their suffering dead.

Mohammed has promised that all his disciples, through his

intercession and their faith, shall be delivered from eternal pain: and the Jews have their special prayers and intercessions for their relatives who have lately died.

7. In the nature of their hopes of future happiness.

The Arabs look forward before them with an almost realizing faith and transporting rapture, to the objects and enjoyments of paradise, the groves, fountains and rivers, "the pearls, diamonds, robes of silk, palaces of marble, dishes of gold, rich wines and numerous attendants." The Jews, with equal enthusiasm, look forward to their expected King and General, their triumph over the infidels, their new temple and golden altar, their restored Jerusalem with its fountains and cisterns of sacred water, their hills crowned with vineyards, their land flowing with milk and honey, and their universally acknowledged pre-eminence in the earth. There is indeed this difference, that the Jews locate their Messianic golden age on this side of the grave, though some of them are in doubt whether the grave lies on the other side or not; while the Arabs despise the enjoyments of this life, and see beyond the grave the realities on which they rest their highest hopes.

8. In the early reception and rejection of Christianity.

There is some evidence that Christianity was first planted in Arabia by apostolic laborers. Origen, the great Alexandrian pastor, took a special interest in the third century in the Christian communities in Arabia; but almost every trace of Christianity in Arabia eventually disappeared. All are acquainted with the abundant evidence that tens of thousands of Jews once embraced Christianity, but Palestine has, in this particular, a history very similar to that of Arabia. The Mohammedans in foreign countries are often seen putting their fingers in their ears and running away when they hear the Christian missionary speak of the Divine Redeemer; and the Jew has a strong sympathy with this Mohammedan aversion.

9. In being marked out with special favor in ancient Hebrew prophecy.

The spirit of prophecy had its rich blessing for Ishmael. Isa. 42: 11—"Let the wilderness and the cities thereof lift up their voice, the villages that Kedar doth inhabit: let the inhabitants of the rocks sing, let them shout from the top of the mountains." Prophecy also looked forward with special fa-

vor on the dispersed family of Isaac. Lev. 26: 44—"And yet for all that when they be in the land of their enemies, I will not cast them away, neither will I abhor them, to destroy them utterly, and to break my covenant with them."

According to our arrangement, we now mark some points in which Ishmael and Isaac are unlike. The following are the leading points.

1. Ishmael and Isaac disagree, as Isaac alone inherited the Abrahamic promise.

Both were to become great nations, but Ishmael was excluded from the special promise. It was in the seed of Isaac that all the nations of the world were to be blessed. This is the clearly marked difference in prophecy, acknowledged by both Jews and Christians. Is there now a corresponding difference in history? Will the intelligent Jew look us in the face, and contradict us, when we add that, according to the best authority which we have, Ishmael has given the world Mohammed, while Isaac has unquestionably given the world Christ? Will he reflect further on what we mean when we remind him of this?

2. Ishmael and Isaac disagree, as Ishmael still holds his land.

Ishmael does not give that history of dispossessions and captivities and dispersions which Isaac gives.

3. Ishmael and Isaac disagree, as Ishmael has successfully propagated the religion of Arabia by the sword.

The Arabs once marched forth from their deserts to teach the world by their preaching, and especially by their swords, the Unity of God; and they did so effectually, and established one of the greatest empires that has ever existed, extending from the confines of China to the Atlantic. Wherever they carried their arms, they impressed a sincere and lasting conviction of the Unity of God, and of the duties of circumcision, prayer, fasting and alms. We need not except Syria and Jerusalem itself. The cherished hopes of Israel can scarcely place on the head of their own Messiah, the glory of a more effectual teaching of the Unity of God, or of more extensive and wonderful conquests. How remarkable the fact on the contrary, that the God of providence has frowned on every attempt of the posterity of Isaac to propagate their religion by the sword. When they attempted to do so under the Emperor Hadrian,

580,000 Jews were, according to the tradition, the offering on the altar of their folly. The Koran enjoins and commends the use of the sword in the propagation of the faith: The New Testament lays it aside. These wonderful facts in providence appear clearly to teach that God has appointed Isaac to work by some other instrumentality than that of the sword for the spiritual welfare of mankind. And he may well rejoice in this peculiarity in his appointment.

To Christians it appears very clear, that if, according to the present views of the Jews, the posterity of Isaac were destined to convert the world to Unitarianism, and thus become a blessing to all the families of the earth, Ishmael has thus far imparted the blessing to mankind infinitely more than Isaac: Mecca and Medina rather than Jerusalem and Samaria.

We might trace out many other lines of agreement and variation in the two branches of the Abrahamic family. It is pleasant to hope that the hand of time will trace a more interesting parallel in a simultaneous, general, and true conversion to Christianity.

W. D. R.

Items.

The amiable and gifted Jane Taylor, the last time she took up her pen,—it was on the day preceding her death—wrote as follows:—"Oh, my dear friends, if you knew what thoughts I have now, you would see, as I do, that the whole business of life is preparation for death."

How much time is spent in preparing to live! How little in preparing to die!

One who had lived more than fifty years said, as the hand of death was upon him, "I have all my days been getting ready to live, and now I must die."

Seek the Lord and his face continually; let this be the business of your life and strength; and let all things be subservient and in order to this. You cannot find nor behold the face of God but in Christ: therefore labor to know God in Christ—which the Scripture makes the sum of all, even life eternal.—*Cromwell.*

THE
Calvinistic Magazine:

[NEW SERIES:]

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

Vol. IV:

December, 1849:

No. 12:

The Practical Tendencies of Calvinism;

Wherefore by their fruits ye shall know them.—MATT. 7: 20:

[We have read with much pleasure, a sermon with the above title, preached by the Rev. Wm. Eaton, before the Synod of Wheeling, and published by order of that body. We give it almost entire to our readers.—Eds.]

“We may raise from our text then, the following DOCTRINE:
That the truth or falsity of all systems of doctrines may be known by the uniform effects which they produce, in the hearts and lives of men.

This doctrine is capable of very general application. But as you have imposed upon me the solemn responsibility of addressing you, at present, on “The practical tendencies of Calvinism,” I propose applying the test of the text, to this particular system of doctrines. I desire to present to you some of the fruits of this system. The Calvinistic Tree is not of yesterday’s planting. It has been bearing fruit so long, that the world has had a fair opportunity of judging whether its fruits are good or corrupt. The friends of the Calvinistic doctrines desire that they should be judged by their fruits.—They believe that if all men would form their opinions with these fruits clearly before their minds, they would be satisfied that those doctrines, which produce such, must be from God. Wherever they have been faithfully disseminated, there you will discover the most manly and sterling virtues. In every age they have had a purifying tendency upon the polluted

heart of man—a tendency to assimilate him in his ways to the Angels of God.

In the discussion of our subject we shall inquire

1. WHAT IS CALVINISM.

Our answer to this inquiry must under present circumstances be brief. Those who hold that system of doctrines, with which the great name of Calvin has become associated, do not subscribe to every thing he has taught. They do not appeal to him as an umpire, in all doctrines and duties. They venerate his name, and are ever ready to defend him from those rude and ungenerous assaults, which began in his lifetime, and which have been continued with new virulence down to the present time. But we do not direct those who ask us, What is Calvinism? to the writings of this man, great as he was in the sight of God and men. Some of his opinions we think were entirely erroneous. Others have been expressed, in a manner calculated to produce wrong impressions, and to prejudice the mind against the truth. Calvinism, as held by the Presbyterian Church, and as it is preached by the Ministers of that Body, and that which we think produces glorious results, is found embodied in the formularies of the Presbyterian Church. The doctrines there taught were not invented by Calvin, or any body of men; but they have been drawn from the word of God. They are such as these:—That God created man after his own image, in knowledge, righteousness and holiness; that he entered into a covenant of life with him upon condition of perfect obedience; that man being left to the freedom of his own will, fell from the estate wherein he was created, by sinning against God; that the covenant made with Adam, included all his posterity; that since he fell, all are guilty of his first sin; that all want original righteousness; that the whole nature of all is corrupt; that all have lost communion with God, are under his wrath and curse, and so made liable to all the miseries of this life, to death itself and to the pains of hell forever; that God did not leave all mankind to perish; that out of his mere good pleasure from all eternity he elected some to everlasting life; that he entered into a covenant of grace to bring them into a state of salvation by a Redeemer, the Lord Jesus Christ; that Christ became man and was made under the law; that he underwent the miseries of this life, the

wrath of God and the cursed death of the cross, to redeem a people given to him by the Father; that in the salvation of the gospel there is an infinite sufficiency; that it is freely and sincerely offered to all; that left to themselves all would reject it; that the disposition to accept of this salvation comes from God and is all of grace; that God by his spirit convinces of sin and misery, enlightens our minds, renews our wills, persuades and enables us to embrace Christ as he is freely offered to us in the gospel; that he was under no obligation to send a Saviour, that in giving his spirit he acts as a Sovereign; that he was not influenced in his eternal choice by foreseen faith and good works; that he chose a people to salvation that their redemption might be to the praise of the glory of his grace; "that as salvation is all of grace, and as it is evident from scripture and from daily observation, that all men are not believers, and, of course, that all are not saved, so it was not God's original intention to save all; for it is granted that he does not actually save all; and that which he now does, if he be such a God as the Bible represents him, he always intended to do; that all the dispensations of his grace, as well of his providence, and among the rest, the effectual calling and salvation of every believer, entered into his plan from all eternity; yet so as that thereby neither is God the author of sin, nor is violence offered to the will of the creatures, nor is the liberty or contingency of second causes taken away, but rather established;" that the Bible is the only infallible rule of faith and practice; that God alone is Lord of the conscience; that the rights of private judgment, in all matters respecting religion, are universal and inalienable; that no religious constitution should be aided by the civil power, farther than may be necessary for protection and security, and at the same time be equal and even to all others; and that in the ministry there are no orders, but that all are equal.

* * * * *

2. THE PRACTICAL TENDENCIES OF CALVINISM.

* * * * *

1. Then, *Calvinism affords strong support and consolation under affliction.* In a world like ours where death reigns, and where affliction visits man in a thousand varied forms, some strong support and some source of pure consolation are much needed. These are ever at hand to the man who cordially em-

braces the doctrines of the Calvinistic system. He belongs to the number of those who "know that all things work together for good to them that love God, to them who are the called according to his purpose." This is a part of his creed. It is engraven upon his memory. Hence, let affliction meet him where it will, or in what form it may, he has his comforter at hand—the assurance that all things are working for his good, if he is a child of God. He belongs, also, to the number of those who see God on the throne of the Universe, and who view his government as extending to the numbering of the hairs of the head and to the falling of a sparrow. He is conscious that a righteous government is around him, and all with whom he stands connected. Placed in these circumstances health may fail, long days and nights of suffering may be his, friends may sicken and die, property may take to itself wings and flee away, and yet he desponds not, nor is he a stranger to comfort. David was a doctrinal Calvinist. Hence he had a secret source of comfort even in the cursing of Shimei—"because the Lord hath said unto him curse David." Again: when affliction pressed sore upon him he could say, "I was dumb and opened not my mouth; because thou didst it." Paul was a doctrinal Calvinist. Hence, although called to endure extraordinary trials, he had extraordinary comforts. He could say, "we are troubled on every side, yet not distressed; we are perplexed but not in despair; persecuted, but not forsaken; cast down, but not destroyed." Such consolations have the doctrines of Calvinism afforded the afflicted and persecuted people of God, from the days of Paul down to the present time. They have lit up for them the chamber of sickness with a light from the eternal world. They have cheered them in the dungeon. They have filled their hearts with joy and tuned their lips to praise even in view of the rack and the flames. What would yon suffering saint do without them? Take from him the hopes which they inspire, the consolations which they afford, and you blot his sun from the heavens; but give him these, and like the Israelites in Egypt, he has a light in his dwelling while all is gloom without—give him these and he will calmly lay his dying head upon his pillow and with his last breath "hail his immortality."

2. Calvinism prompts and encourages men to pray. That

system of truth that tends to make men feel their dependence upon God, will also tend to lead them to a throne of grace. It is the dependent, and those who feel their dependence, that ask favors. And who so dependent upon his God as the Calvinist? That system of truth which he has embraced, strips him of all merit by nature, and at the same time cuts off all hope of acquiring any by his works. Its direct tendency is to make him feel his dependence upon God for life and breath and all things. And feeling thus, will he not pray to God? Will he not just as naturally cry to him for help as the child, sinking in the waves in sight of its parent, would cry to that parent for assistance? He rejoices that there is a throne of grace to which he may repair and offer up his prayers. He is well satisfied that he has an errand there, and at the same time is strongly encouraged to believe that he will not go upon a fruitless errand. The whole of the Calvinistic system draws him to the mercy seat. It speaks of his ruin, of his trespasses and his sins. It speaks of love—of redeeming love. It speaks of the grace of God—of his purposes of mercy to the guilty—of the infinite efficacy and sufficiency of the merit of Christ, and of the willingness of God to confer that merit upon all that call upon him in sincerity and truth. Speaking to him thus day by day, must it not make him a man of prayer? Has it not made him such? Let the writings of Calvinists speak. Is not prayer every where recognised in these not only as a duty, but as a sweet, a precious privilege? Where will you find this duty urged with more importunity and more force of argument than in these writings? Let the lives of Calvinists speak. Calvin himself was characterised pre-eminently for his love of this holy exercise. No day passed in which Luther did not devote at least three hours to prayer and meditation. The Covenanters of Scotland would meet in their houses at the dead hour of night and call upon their God—in the glens and in the caves of the mountains their prayers would be heard even when blood-thirsty soldiers were prowling round ready to shoot them down for engaging in this duty. The Puritans of England and of our own country were men who prayed much, and that loved this exercise more than life. Modern times, also, have furnished a Calvinistic Nevins, who has summoned the people of God to duty, saying, “we must pray dif-

ferently, we must pray more;" and a Calvinistic Payson, who spent days and nights in his closet in watchings, in fastings and in prayers.

3. The *moral influence of Calvinism in all ages has been pure.* We might go back, in illustrating this head of our discourse, to the days of Paul. We might speak of those moral fountains which he opened up, through the doctrines which he preached. How pure were those fountains! How many lands, by their streams, have been blessed and been made glad! We might go back to the days of Augustine, and contemplate the influence of his labors and his teachings. He taught many things, it is true, that were erroneous, but he also taught much genuine Calvinism. Hence he exerted a pure moral influence, not only in his own day, but long after he ceased from his labors. Look, also, at the Waldenses. They believed and taught in substance the same doctrines found in the standards of our Church. And concerning them Seisselius, archbishop of Turin, has said, "Their heresy excepted, they generally live a purer life than other Christians." Why, too, were two thousand Calvinistic ministers in the time of Charles the II. ejected from their livings, and many of them cast into prison? Was it not because they so closely resembled the Master they served in holy living? "Among these sufferers," says Macaulay, "were some of whose genius and virtue any christian society might well be proud." We ask you, again, to look at Calvinistic Scotland—that bright north star, that has been pouring its light for ages upon the moral darkness around it. How attractive that star! Who tires in gazing upon its pure, mild lustre? Popery, Prelacy, Socinianism, Rationalism or Arminianism never had such a star in their crown of moral glory. See, too, our own Puritan New England. Before its Calvinism became adulterated, the world knows, that it was emphatically the "land of steady habits." And, though not what it once was, in point of moral excellence, it is still a region blest and purified by the *relics* of a Calvinistic creed.

We might quote numerous testimonies, given by those who hold different theological sentiments, in favor of the pure moral influence of Calvinism. We have time, however, only for two. Macaulay, speaking of the effect of the revocation of the Edict of Nantes, says, "It was calculated that in a few

months, fifty thousand families quitted France forever. Nor were the refugees such as a country can well spare. They were generally persons of intelligent minds, of industrious habits and of austere morals." The term "austere," when applied by Macaulay to morals, embraces in it the highest eulogy. Again: Sir James Mackintosh, a man familiar with history, and whose opinions are not likely to be warped by religious preferences, says, "The Calvinistic people of Scotland, of Switzerland, of Holland and of New England, have been more moral than the same classes among other nations. Those who preach faith, or in other words a pure mind, have always produced more popular virtue than those who preach good works, or the mere regulation of outward acts." Those therefore, who have no love for Calvinism, are constrained, as honest historians, to bear testimony in favor of its pure moral influence.

4. Calvinism *has shown itself the powerful antagonist of error.* Very soon after the planting of the christian church, the seeds of error were scattered within it by the great Enemy of souls. These seeds have sprung up and borne their deadly fruit—cast their seeds and borne again in new and multiplied forms, even unto the present time. In every age, too, there have been multitudes, in the church and out of it, who have loved the fruits of error more than the fruits of truth. Hence, at all times there has been a sharp conflict between the friends of truth and the friends of error. Every form of truth has been called upon to come up to the help of the Lord against the mighty. Every form, also, has had a fair opportunity of showing what it is capable of accomplishing, in this contest with error—a fair opportunity of testing the temper of its armor. In this conflict, the Calvinistic form of truth has ever shown the utmost readiness to engage. It has manifested a power to grapple with and to crush every monster error, which no other form has exhibited. Errorists of every class, have trembled when it summoned its forces and prepared for battle. It was this form of truth that fought so valiantly, in the days of Luther and his illustrious compeers. It has been foremost and fought hardest in every battle with Popery, from the days of the Reformation to the present time. And when that monster form of error shall fall to rise no more, Calvinism will be found in

the van of conflict; battling nobly for the Lord. Again: Is Socinianism error? And who has shown its want of accordance with the word of God; and its dangerous tendency; with the ablest pen or the most eloquent tongue? Let the writings of Fuller; and those of a host of others of the same doctrinal views answer. Is high-toned Episcopacy error? And who lifted up a standard against it; in the days of its pride and its power? Go, for an answer; and study the history of the days of Laud. And who now are the most powerful antagonists of Puseyism—this new form of high-toned Episcopacy? The writings of doctrinal Calvinists will furnish a satisfactory answer. Again: Is Arminianism error? And who has put its armies to flight in more than one memorable engagement? The history of Presbyterianism will tell. Thus we might specify every class of errorists, and show that their most powerful and successful antagonists have been men whose minds have been deeply imbued with the theology taught at Geneva. Calvin himself was, in the hands of God, the destroyer of error. He preached and wrote against it; as it appeared in his own day; and his writings, even now, are a strong rampart around the citadel of truth. The doctrinal system, then, which wears his name, has this to recommend it—that it inspires those who embrace it with the love of truth; and rouses them to contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints.

5. Calvinism has shown itself *the firm friend and patron of Education*. Before an audience like the present; nothing need be said to show the importance of education. All admit its highest importance, both in a civil and religious point of view. The friends of Calvinism, therefore; can point with exultation to what it has done in this great and good cause. They are willing that it should be judged by its fruits in this particular. Are they not found in many lands? Are they not beautiful to the eye and pleasant to the taste? The friend of education, who follows Calvinism in its course through the nations, must love it as the patron of sound learning; the founder and supporter of schools, from the lowest to the highest grade; though he may hate its humbling doctrines in his heart. Its pathway through the earth for ages, like that of the sun through the heavens, has been one of light. All the Calvinistic Reformers were patrons of learning. They hated in their inmost souls

the Popish dogma, that "ignorance is the mother of devotion." The world is familiar with Luther's influence in the cause of education. The history of his life forms one of the finest chapters in the history of sound learning. Knox planted in Scotland not only the Kirk, but also the school. And where, since his day, has education taken deeper root, found more able supporters, and produced more glorious results than in Scotland—that land that still clings to his faith and loves to do honor to his memory? Calvin, too, was the great patron of education in all its departments. Perhaps this great man has never had a higher compliment paid him, or more ample justice done him, than he has received at the hand of one of America's distinguished authors—a Unitarian as to his religious creed. I allude to the testimony of the Hon. George Bancroft. In that he says, "We boast of our common schools. Calvin was the father of popular education, the inventor of the system of free schools." But Calvin was not the father of popular education only. He labored with all his zeal and great abilities to found colleges and seminaries. When he died he left a college and seminary at Geneva. He left a system of education there which its degenerate sons rejoiced over two hundred years after it had been planted—a system, the blessed influence of which Geneva feels even at the present day.

But leave Geneva, leave Scotland, leave the land of Luther, and come to America. What has Calvinism not done for learning here? Let those who know our history, give an impartial answer and we ask no more. Did not the Puritans bring the schoolmaster with them? Did they not plant Harvard University, and endow it with those funds which are now employed to destroy the faith of its founders? Under whose influence was Yale built? Who laid the foundations of Princeton? Who erected Dickinson? Calvinists. Who carried the torch of learning across the Alleghanies? We need not tell this audience what was the faith of M'Millen and his companions in the work of the gospel and the work of education. Let Jefferson College then, and Washington, and most of those other institutions of learning, that now adorn and enlighten our great West, stand forth as the fruits of Calvinism. Long may it have an honored and cherished home in them all! Long may

their sons love, and defend that faith which laid the foundation stones of their Alma Mater!

Need I ask, also, what Calvinists are now doing, in this and other lands, to promote the great cause of education? Are they lagging behind the rest of the world, in their patronage of institutions of learning, male and female? Do they attach less importance to, and plead less earnestly for a learned ministry, than other christians? Do their pens contribute nothing to solid literature or sound theology? Has their faith dried up the fountains of learning, put out its lights, torn down its temples, and filled this and other lands with the clouds of intellectual darkness? We boldly ask these questions, and cheerfully rest the claim which Calvinism has to be considered the friend and patron of education, upon an impartial answer.

6. Calvinism tends to *promote Civil Liberty*. It has ever taught subjection to the powers that be; but it has never taught that the King can do no wrong. Abject, unconditional submission to civil rulers, never has been a part of its creed. It renders unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsars, but resists unto blood his claim to those things which are God's. Kings have never had more dutiful subjects than it has furnished while they have ruled with the affection and justice of a kind father, and never have they had subjects more ready to hurl them from their seats of power, when they have acted the tyrant. History furnishes copious examples to substantiate these statements. Point me to any period in the history of christian lands, in which liberty has struggled hard against her tyrant foes, and I will show you Calvinism struggling shoulder to shoulder with her in the great contest for human rights. Go to the days of Charles the First and of Cromwell, to the days of Charles the Second, to the days of James the Second and of Louis the Fourteenth. Go to the days of George the Third—those days in which our fathers took up arms in defence of their inalienable rights, and in all these contests of Liberty with tyrants, you will find Calvinism on the side of Liberty.

Popery and Prelacy have been taken to the bosom of despotic monarchs. They have been clothed in purple and fine linen, and have fared sumptuously every day; but Calvinism has been driven from their presence with expressions of loathing and abhorrence. They have given it many a trial of cruel

mockings and scourgings, yea, moreover, of bonds and imprisonment. They have doomed it to wander in deserts and in mountains and in dens and in caves of the earth. Macaulay, speaking of Louis the Fourteenth, says, "As a prince fond of arbitrary power, he detested those Republican theories which were intermingled with the Genevese divinity." Again: this same distinguished author says, after the revocation of the Edict of Nantes, "All Calvinistic ministers were commanded either to abjure their religion, or to quit their country within a fortnight." Yes, Calvinism, in the estimation of this bloody tyrant, must be driven into exile, or his despotic throne must fall. And do we need any better evidence of its tendency to promote civil freedom, than the fact that despots have hated it, and have driven it into exile when they had the power?

Calvin himself was the firm friend of civil liberty. He did as much to promote it, perhaps, as any man that has ever lived. "His genius," says Bancroft, "infused enduring elements into the institutions of Geneva, and made it for the modern world the impregnable fortress of popular liberty, the fertile seed-plot of democracy." Again: says the same writer, "We are proud of the free States that fringe the Atlantic. The pilgrims of Plymouth were Calvinists; the best influence in South Carolina came from the Calvinists of France. William Penn was the disciple of Huguenots; the ships from Holland, that first brought colonists to Manhattan, were filled with Calvinists. He that will not honor the memory, and respect the influence of Calvin, knows but little of the origin of American liberty." Such is the honorable testimony which this eminent politician and historian has borne in favor of Calvinism. That you may see still further the origin of our independence, we would ask, whose voice first broke the solemn silence that reigned in the continental Congress, immediately after the reading of the Declaration of Independence? Was it not that of the venerable Witherspoon; a Presbyterian minister? That voice was then heard to say, "There is a tide in the affairs of men, a nick of time. We see it now before us. To hesitate is to consent to our own slavery. That noble instrument upon your table should be signed this very morning, by every hand in the house. He that will not respond to its contents and strain every nerve to carry into effect its provisions, is unwor-

thy the name of a freeman. For my part, property I have some, of reputation more. That reputation is staked, that property is pledged on the issues of this contest. And although these gray hairs must soon descend into the sepulchre, I would infinitely prefer that they should descend thither by the hand of the executioner than desert the cause of my country." Here was the voice of Calvinism in that hour "that tried men's souls." Again: who fought some of the bloodiest battles in the days of our revolution? Who was Gen. Pickens, who planned the battle of the Cowpens, and who was Col. Morgan who fought it? Presbyterian Elders. In that same battle, also, there were five other officers, members of the Presbyterian Church.

But, perhaps, some may think there was nothing peculiar in finding Presbyterians at this time on the side of liberty. They may suppose that all classes of men, and all denominations of christians, were making common cause against the enemies of our country. If this opinion were correct, it would, at least, prove that Calvinists were not behind others in the cause of freedom. But I would here raise the enquiry, where was Arminianism at this time? Particularly where were the Arminian clergy? Wesley himself has told us, "All the Methodists," says he, "were firm for the government, and on that account were persecuted by the rebels."—(Wesley's works, vol. 3, p. 411.) Yes, they were firm for the government of Great Britain, and we know what such were called in the days of the Revolution. We make these remarks, not with unkind feelings for any of our race—not in the spirit of bigotry—not to fasten odium upon any class of christians; but that Calvinism may not lose the advantage of a single contrast with its great antagonist—Arminianism.

The love for freedom, which the Calvinistic faith excited in the minds of men, was not peculiar to the days when our Fathers took up arms in defence of their civil rights. Its effect in this particular is the same at all times and in all lands. A striking illustration of this remark has been furnished to the world since the speaker was appointed to address you. Who led the hosts of freedom to battle and to conquest in the late struggle for liberty in Hungary? A Calvinistic Kossuth. Who made the most determined resistance to the tyranny of Austria?

Who drove back the minions of despotic Russia till overwhelmed by numbers? Calvinistic Magyars. And who are at the head of the emancipation movement now in progress in Kentucky? Who is the great leader of the friends of emancipation? A Presbyterian minister. And who are those that are rallying around him? Mainly persons of the same church and of the same faith.

Let all know, then, that the civil liberty which this and other lands enjoys, is one of the fruits of Calvinism—planted and nourished by this faith and bought with the blood of those who have loved it more than life; and that when despots shall have crushed all the friends and institutions of freedom, if that day shall ever arrive, Calvinists will be the last to retire from the field of conflict—the last to wear a tyrant's fetters.

7. Calvinism tends to promote *Religious Liberty*. That system of doctrines which makes God the Lord of the conscience, and which teaches that the rights of private judgment in all matters that respect religion are universal and inalienable, must promote religious freedom. It knows no King in Zion but Jesus Christ. While it admits civil government to be of divine authority, and holds itself under obligation to obey that government, as long as it does not usurp inalienable rights, yet it denies the right of the State to rule in the Church. It denies, also, the right of any particular branch of the church to rule in the affairs of other branches. What, then, is the result? Is it not spiritual liberty?—liberty to each individual to act according to the dictates of his own conscience, and liberty to each branch of the church of Christ to act untrammelled either by Church or State. This is the *Liberty of Calvinism*—that which it claims for itself and that which it grants to others.

Have not Calvinists contended more than once for this liberty, both with Church and State? Their struggles to maintain it fill many a stirring and bloody page in history. Would you see them in actual conflict with some of the enemies of the church's freedom? We invite you to go to the First Diet of Spire. "This Diet," says D'Aubigne, "forms an important epoch in history: an ancient power, that of the middle ages, is shaken; a new power, that of modern times, is advancing; religious liberty boldly takes its stand in front of Romish despotism; a lay spirit prevails over the sacerdotal spirit. In this

single step there is complete victory: the cause of the Reform is won." But the cause here won was only one of the triumphs of those peculiar doctrines preached by the Calvinistic Reformers. Would you, again, see Calvinism contending for religious liberty, against tyrannical hierarchy and a hostile government? Go to the Grayfriar's Church in Edinburgh, on the 28th of February, 1638, where 60,000 Presbyterians were assembled, and see them entering into a covenant, in which they bound themselves in the most solemn manner, to maintain the liberties of the church of Christ. See some signing this covenant, with blood drawn from their own veins, and as they ceased writing, exclaiming "till death!" Would you, again, at a later period, see Calvinists contending for the honor of Christ's crown—the right of his church to execute his laws uncontrolled by the civil power? Go once more to Edinburgh, to the church of St. Andrew's, and witness the Exodus of the Free Church of Scotland. Christ's servants "had been required to rivet the chains forged by illegal resolutions. They burst those disgraceful fetters, they threw them at the foot of the throne; and poor but free, they left those walls wherein their fathers had so hardly fought in the cause of liberty, and which powerful men were attempting to change into a house of bondage." The Free Church of Scotland, then, stands before the world as a living witness, that Calvinists love religious liberty, and that they will maintain it at every hazard. We may, with feelings of pious exultation, point to what she has surrendered of this world's goods, and to what she has suffered at the hand of the oppressor, in order to maintain her spiritual freedom. These are the fruits of that holy faith which she has so long loved and honored.

If, therefore, there is any one of the tendencies of Calvinism more strikingly characteristic than another, it is that it fills the minds of those who embrace it, with the love of religious freedom. It will allow no ecclesiastical government to lord it over God's heritage; no civil power to infringe upon the rights of that Divine government which Christ has set up in the world. It pleads with eloquent tongue for a free conscience—a free pulpit—a free Bible—and a free church.—These, it claims, as its birth-right, and sooner than surrender them, it will go into exile, to prison, to the rack, to the fires of

Smithfield, or it will choose all the horrors of a Bartholomew's night.

8. Calvinism tends to promote *the cause of Missions*. Its legitimate influence is to rouse the church to missionary effort. The leading doctrines connected with this system are the springs of all true efforts of this kind. That missionary spirit which is abroad in the churches, and which has marshalled the armies of the living God for the conquest of the world, and under the influence of which the church has already gained so many glorious victories over the hosts of darkness, has been called into life by these doctrines. From them it derives its chief nourishment. And when the missionary spirit is not fed by these, it must either be feeble or spasmodic. The zeal which it will kindle in pious hearts will burn only with a flicking glare, or so fiercely as to consume rather than to enlighten and warm. But that missionary spirit which the doctrines of the Calvinistic system is adapted to create in the church, must be permanent as to its life and healthful as to its influence. Is it not one of the leading doctrines of that system, that Christ has a people in the world, given to him by the Father? That he died to redeem these and to purify them unto himself a peculiar people zealous of good works? And what an argument here for missionary effort? What encouragement to persevere in that effort in the face of all opposition and all discouragements? This doctrine comes to the church in every night of difficulty, and says to it as the Lord did to Paul at Corinth, "Be not afraid, for I have much people in this city." Here, then, is the stimulus arising from the certainty of success.

Look, again, at the *condition* of the Heathen, as seen in the light of the Calvinistic system. They have sinned. They have all sinned. They are the children of apostate parents. They have received from those parents the sad legacy of total depravity. Without the gospel, therefore, and an interest in its glorious provisions they must all perish. Is it not, then, the legitimate tendency of this view of the condition of the heathen to awaken sympathy in the breasts of christians on their behalf, and, also, to arouse them to action? Can christians believe that all the heathen without the gospel are going to the bar of God in a state of condemnation, and yet, feel no interest in the great missionary work? Oh! no. Their faith will affect their

hearts, and their hearts thus affected, will prompt them to labor earnestly for their salvation.

But, not only is this the *legitimate* influence of Calvinism in the cause of missions. It has been its *actual* influence. Geneva, baptized with the spirit of Calvin, sent forth some of the first missionaries, which the Reformation furnished. And who were the men that were honored of God in kindling the flame of missions in this land? Elliott and Brainard, those Apostles to the Indians, were Calvinists. And Edwards, whose labors had such an important influence in rousing the churches to this work, is known as such the world over. And have no others, holding the same faith with these men, labored since their day for the salvation of the heathen? Take a missionary map, and write the name of Calvin on every station planted by churches having the same creed with him, and may you not claim for him a majority of all the missionary stations, which now bless the heathen world? Again, who give most liberally and freely of their gold and silver to carry forward this blessed cause? Let the receipts of the different missionary societies and Boards answer. Let Calvinism, then, be judged in this particular, by its fruits. Are they not found in many a dark land? How many, who once sat in the region and shadow of death, famishing for the bread of life, have ate of these fruits, and found them pleasant to the taste and life to the soul?

9. Calvinism tends to promote *Revivals of Religion*. It is the opinion of many that those churches which embrace this system of doctrines, are opposed to revivals of religion, and that these doctrines are adapted to seal up the heavens, and prevent the refreshing showers of the spirit from descending. No opinion could be more erroneous. What is the great agent in every genuine revival? Is it not the Holy Spirit? It is the spirit that revives and refreshes God's people. He kindles the flame of love. He abases in the dust and causes the tear of penitence to flow. He pours down that wrestling, agonising spirit of prayer, in behalf of sinners, which will take no denial. He alone convicts and converts sinners, dead in trespasses and in sins. Now what system of doctrines places such absolute dependence on the influence of the spirit, as Calvinism? The voice which it raises to heaven, is

‘Awake, O north wind; and come thou south,’ and blow upon the garden of the Lord, “that the spices thereof may flow out.” “Awake, awake, put on strength O arm of the Lord.” And when it prophesies over the dry bones in the valley, it says: “Come from the four winds O breath, and breathe upon these slain, that they may live.” The doctrine which thus honors the Holy Spirit—which places such entire dependence upon his influence, and which leads christians to get down in the dust and cry in agony for these influences, must be friendly to genuine revivals of religion.

Has it not been friendly to revivals? Have the Calvinistic churches been characterised by nothing but dead orthodoxy?—mere formalism, or an entire absence of the special influences of the spirit of God? Since the times of the Apostles no churches have been more blessed with great awakenings; with precious seasons of refreshing and with glorious ingathings. In confirmation of this remark, we need only mention such names as Cambuslang, Kilsyth, Baldernock, Kirkintilloch, Stewarton, Shotts, Ulster and Skye. He who has studied the history of revivals, knows that in all these places, seasons of refreshing have been experienced pentecostal in their character. And what were the doctrines preached in these churches at all times, and especially during the days of revival? The same that Calvin preached.

Again, were there no revivals under the preaching of Edwards? Let those who desire a satisfactory answer read the history of his life and times. Often were the windows of heaven opened and the spirit poured out with power, while that man of God preached of election, total depravity; the sovereignty of God, irresistible grace, vicarious atonement, human inability, imputation, and justification by faith. Again, come down to still later times—to the days when Presbyterianism was first planted in this and the adjoining regions, and do not our hearts grow warm with love and gratitude to God, while reading of these times of the right hand of the Lord? The history of the Planting of Presbyterianism in western Pennsylvania, is a history of revivals. Or, would you see the influence of these doctrines in still later times. Go to Scotland and witness the results which followed the preaching of such men as Burns, Bonar and M’Cheyne. What glorious

seasons were their eyes allowed to behold! Or, come back again to America and study the history of the Presbyterian church for the last twenty years. How many churches during that period have been enabled to say, "Thou hast done great things for us whereof we are glad!" Even during the last ecclesiastical year the God of revivals has been in our midst, and about forty Presbyteries have seen his stately stepplings in the sanctuary.

Calvinism, then, is the friend and promoter of revivals—revivals free from fanaticism and enthusiasm, and whose blessed results are lasting. Thousands converted to God, at such times, have honored religion in life and died a triumphant death. Yea, thousands have gone to swell the sacramental host of God's elect in the skies, who were born again, in those seasons, when converts to God, in Calvinistic churches, were numerous as the drops of the morning."

For the Calvinistic Magazine.

Support of the Ministry.

MESSRS. EDITORS:—Our early home was not here. Yet we love these mountains and valleys, and we have felt, for many years, that we have a home in the always kind and pleasant, and often *refined* society of the sons and daughters of East Tennessee and Western Virginia. We have smiled at the simple questions of the denizens of cities, respecting this part of our country, which they call "the back woods;" and often we have seen the expression of incredulity, only restrained by good breeding, as we told the true state of things in this region. We do not speak of New England, which we have never seen, that land over which the light of religious freedom first shone, when driven from its trans-atlantic home; but we will say, and we dare contradiction, that the state of society here will bear a very favorable comparison with any other like portion of America; that there is an amount of intelligence, a noble bearing and a high-toned moral feeling, not to be found in the country and villages a few miles' distance from many of our largest cities—not even in a large portion of our city population. But it is not to eulogize and

fill with self-love, that we now employ the pen; we have another object in view, namely, to point out *one great draw-back*, and that, too, the source of others, which is found among the citizens of this beautiful, healthful, heaven-favored country.

It is well known that we Presbyterians of East Tennessee and Western Virginia have not hitherto done what we ought for the support of a gospel ministry among us. We are sorry to make this confession, and we would not say a word on the subject, were it not that we think publicity ought to be given to facts of this kind. Besides, we think it possible that in many instances this melancholy state of things is not so much occasioned by the want of kindness and honest-heartedness, and certainly not by the want of means, as by ignorance of the fact, or thoughtlessness on the subject, and more than any thing else, *a want of system in the arrangements of the eldership*.

Where a Presbyterian community organize themselves into a church, with elders and deacons, according to the rules given in the Confession of Faith, it is taken for granted that they wish to have a pastor over them to labor for their spiritual interests, and that he is to be a man of education and mental attainments, fitted for his station. The question then comes up, how is the minister to be supported? In some places the answer given in actual practice to this question, cannot reflect much credit upon the christian community in which he labors, namely, *they get as much of his services as they can, and let him support himself and family as he best may*. About such cases, and we could name several, in which church members have been mean, I had almost said DISHONEST enough, to receive the pulpit labors of excellent ministers for years, and leave them almost without any support. On such cases we cannot dwell. But we prefer to look at a state of things where christianity has made more progress in rooting out selfishness—where the Bible is read to some purpose—where the texts, “Even so hath the Lord ordained that they which preach the Gospel should live of the Gospel;” “For the workman is worthy of his hire;” “For the laborer is worthy of his hire;” “Owe no man any thing but love,” and others of similar import, are studied prayerfully—where not only a minister for the sanctuary is prized, but a faithful pastor, feeling it his duty and privilege to visit from house to house, as a benevolent and beloved friend of

each family in the congregation. In some congregations with which we are acquainted, the support of the pastor is volunteered by a few individuals, some of them, it may be, *not* members of the church, while the majority of the congregation, and perhaps more than three-fourths of the members, do not pay one cent. Now we wish to show that *this is not* as it should be; that the prosperity of the churches, spiritually and temporally, would be much furthered if *every member did personally share* in the support of the preached gospel. Suffer a thought or two on this subject.

There are a few things which we think must be admitted by every one of even the smallest observation, namely, 1st. That we set *little or no value* on that which *costs us little or nothing*. 2d. We are interested in any work *just so far as we take a part in it*. 3d. We do not feel that we belong to a family unless we in some measure share in its support and its condition, its joys and its sorrows. We may have the family name, but we are not in heart a member of that family. So, we conclude, that *every member of a church must share, as he or she is able, in the support of a minister*, in order to *value* his ministrations, and be *deeply interested* in the *result of his labors*.

Other thoughts crowd upon the mind. A minister's salary may be very heavy on a few individuals; whereas, if all would do their duty, it would be a delightful privilege instead of a burden. The poor, as well as the rich, ought to be permitted to join in the support of their minister; both male and female, young and old, none ought to be shut out from the happiness of paying what they honestly feel to be due. If this is admitted, why cannot it be put in practice? Let us present a case for such experiment. Suppose there is a small Presbyterian church, at which some 150 or more attend every Sabbath. Let us suppose that in this congregation there are 54 church members. Let us see now how these 54, at a very moderate calculation, can support their minister. Remember, all are on an equal footing—the widow with her mite, and the rich man with his abundance. Both are alike welcome. No pride which *vaunteth itself* on the gold which is but given as a loan in charge, and no pride that *maketh ashamed* of the poverty which is also God's blessed gift, and which He can make the richest blessing, ought to be tolerated in the bosom of any

one who bears the humble name of christian. All who sit around the Lord's table are on an equality, and ought to be the humble disciples of Jesus. Let us, then, see how this church of 54 members could support a minister in this plentiful country of East Tennessee and Western Virginia.

Let the richest, say 2 in number, give \$30 per annum, \$60

Other	2	"	"	25	"	50
Other	4	"	"	20	"	80
Other	6	"	"	15	"	90
Other	10	"	"	10	"	100
Other	20	"	"	5	"	100
Other	10	"	"	2	"	20
Members	54					\$500

A BETTER SCALE.

3 members at \$30 each,	\$90
3 others	25 " 75
4 others	20 " 80
5 others	15 " 75
9 others	10 " 90
10 others	5 " 50
20 others	2 " 40
Members	54
	\$500

Now suppose these sums be collected regularly every quarter-day, on a set Monday of every third month, by the deacons; how little trouble would this be, and how much satisfaction in comparison with the usual mode? We know to a moral certainty that each member of the church would feel far happier. But it may be asked, ought not the congregation, who are hearers but not communicants, to have a share in the support of the ministry? Certainly they ought, if they wish to do so. For all the kindness which the Lord puts into their hearts to do the church we ought to be very grateful. We know some noble examples of liberality among those who still stand at a distance on communion Sabbaths. May God's Spirit touch their hearts!

And we have no doubt that in such a congregation as that we have imagined, some kind gentlemen would feel it a pleasure to make the home of the minister one of much more comfort than, if he had a wife and family, a salary of \$500 could even make it to be. Yes, indeed, we should welcome every act of love done to our minister as if done to ourselves personally. The duty as church members is, for each of us;

whether male or female, to give for the support of our minister to the best of our ability, and be thankful if God's providence adds from the congregation to the little that we in the church can afford. We must not forget, that a man whose education makes him a profitable preacher, has, with such a salary as has been mentioned, but a poor remuneration in comparison with what he might have in any secular employment, for which the same education has fitted him.

The writer is exceedingly anxious that this subject be brought before the minds of the numerous readers of the Calvinistic Magazine. Much, very much more might be said.— We would wish it to be made the subject of conversation at every fire-side among church members, that if better plans be thought of they may be proposed and adopted. Let every one, male and female, ask himself or herself the question—“What *have I done* in years past for the support of the Gospel ministry? Can I afford to give \$30? Can I afford \$20? Can I afford \$5? Can I afford \$2 a year for the blessed privileges of hearing God's holy ordinances dispensed, and hearing that Gospel preached every Sabbath-day—that Gospel, those ordinances, which have been so richly blessed to the salvation of my soul? Let me give to the utmost of my ability. Whatever else I deny myself, let me not stint my subscription to God's ambassador in the cause of eternal salvation.”

We are not honored to minister in the sanctuary. A deep interest in the welfare of the church to which we belong—an interest in the keeping of the Sabbath-day holy, which cannot be done without the privileges of God's house, if they are within our power—an interest in the rising generation, who must have the best Sabbath instruction, for without it, their week-day “knowledge,” gained at the best schools, may prove only to be “power” for *evil*. These abiding feelings of interest have urged us to send you, Messrs. Editors, these unconnected, and, it may be, ill-expressed thoughts; and we hope they will take effect upon your readers, till better are supplied by abler writers, to remedy the evil here presented by

A TRUE PRESBYTERIAN.

The revenue of the established church of Mexico is said to be \$250,000,000 per annum.

From the Richmond (Va.) Religious Herald.

Divine Efficiency.

THE doctrine of man's absolute dependence upon God, has always met with opposition from the period of its announcement by the Great Teacher, down to the present day. When Christ declared, "no man can come unto me, except it were given unto him of my Father," the truth gave great offence; for we are informed by John, (vi. 66,) "From that time, many of his disciples went back, and walked no more with him."

The truth met with the same reception when enforced by the apostle Paul. In the ninth chapter of his epistle to the Romans, he asserts the sovereignty of God in the bestowment of his favor—"Therefore hath he mercy on whom he will have mercy, and whom he will he hardeneth"—and replies to the oft-repeated objection that it is incompatible with human responsibility. "Thou wilt then say unto me, why doeth he yet find fault? for who hath resisted his will? Nay, but, O man, who art thou that repliest against God? Shall the thing formed say unto him that formed it, Why hast thou made me thus?"

Notwithstanding the specious cavils of objectors, Paul continued to preach the doctrine; for he had received it not from men, but from God. Reason and experience combine to prove that it is a most wholesome doctrine. One of the most successful preachers of the word, in modern times, remarks, in a sermon from John vi. 44, "It is the very one which breaks down the pride of the sinner's heart—which causes him to feel that he lies at the mercy of God—and the very thing which, humbling the loftiness and self-sufficiency of his soul, prepares him, and inclines him more earnestly to seek, and more highly to prize help from on high. And I have noticed that the sinner never will come to Christ, until he finds that he cannot save himself—never will come to Christ until he finds that he must, positively must, or perish. This is human nature," &c.—Baker's Revival Sermons, p. 269.

To the same effect is the testimony of President Edwards, whose experience, during the most powerful revival of religion which has ever been witnessed in this or any other country, entitles his judgment to very great respect. * * * * *

As the practical influence of this doctrine is a fact which is

to be decided by experience, we will, even at the risk of prolixity, adduce the evidence of another eminent and successful minister of the Lord Jesus—Dr. E. D. Griffin.

“In consequence of the prevalence of Arminianism when he first entered the ministry, he was led to study profoundly the great doctrines of the Bible. He often sounded the depths of depravity in the heart, and brought out the sovereignty of God in a strong light. Soon after his first settlement in Newark, he preached a sermon on the offensive doctrine of election. Many of his hearers were offended. Some of his principal supporters expressed a determination to leave him. They went to Dr. Richards, who lived in the vicinity, with their complaints. A great excitement was got up. A heavy blow had been struck. Dr. R. told them to be calm—not to act rashly; if that doctrine was of God, it would stand; and he cautioned them not to be found fighting against God. Soon Dr. Griffin called to see him. He was greatly agitated; he said—‘I have ruined myself—I have broken up my congregation.’ ‘I hope not,’ said Dr. R. When Dr. G. inquired what he should do, ‘I will tell you,’ said his excellent and sound adviser. ‘Go home and write two sermons on the doctrine of election, with as much care and consideration as though your life depended on every sentence. Pray over them, and next Sabbath preach them, under the consciousness that the eye of the Saviour is upon you.’ He sat with a fixed look while his friend was speaking. No sooner had he ceased, than Dr. G. sprang on his feet, and said, as he left the room, ‘I’ll do it.’ The Sabbath came. Dr. Richards obtained a supply for his pulpit, and was present to hear his friend. In the interval he had seen the disaffected persons and others, and urged all to attend. He sat in a retired part of the house, and observed Dr. G. as he entered the church. His great soul was oppressed—his noble countenance beamed with light. His eye was full of fire. He preached like a dying man. The house was still as death. The Spirit of God was there. In the afternoon every seat, and aisle, and corner was crowded. All Newark was moved. Dr. G. stood up and vindicated the law and government of God. He rose with the subject, till an awe was felt which subdued every heart. The effect was wonderful. Those very men came round him as he descended from the pulpit,

and wept. The Spirit of God subdued them. That day, the 'great revival,' of which every one has heard, began, and before it ceased hundreds were converted to Jesus Christ."—*Christian Review*, 4, p. 358.

Such are the fruits of the doctrine which affirms the dependence of the sinner upon divine influence for the origination of spiritual life in the soul. "Wisdom is justified of her children."

The Scriptural and Liberal Character of Presbyterian Church Government.

Let me specify the elements of which it is composed. They are the clergy and the ruling elders. Of the clergy, we maintain that they are all equal and that their authority is derived from Christ himself. The christian minister is called of God, to his work. When the Spirit has called a man to this holy office, the Church echoes the voice of her Lord. "The Spirit and the bride say come." The candidate presents himself, and the ministry, or the Presbytery which, by its plurality, represents the whole body, ordains him and receives him into their number and fellowship. This "laying on of the hands of the Presbytery" conveys no mysterious influence. The Presbyterian Church does not believe in a sacramental grace conveyed by a sacred rite. On the contrary, it maintains that such observances are only appointed symbols, designed to express in a striking and effective manner an important truth, and that just as baptism expresses a reliance upon the sanctifying Spirit, as the cleansing power that washes the soul from its pollution—so, the imposition of the hands of the Presbytery upon the head of him whom they receive as called to the sacred office, designates their trust in that anointing of the Spirit, which must call and qualify the true minister. It is, also, a public recognising of the individual before the whole Church, in his ministerial office.

Consistently with these views, the perfect parity of the clergy is maintained. If one minister possesses more influence than another, it is only as one private member of the Church exercises a more distinguished influence than some of his

brethren. It is because he possesses a greater degree of learning, or more distinguished gifts, or a heavenlier piety. We hold that in the ministry we have but one master—that Christ is our Bishop, and “all are our brethren.” The ministry thus constituted is the primary element in the government of our Church.

Another element is that of ruling elders. In enumerating the several denominations of persons in the Church, on whom its edification depended, the Apostle Paul names, as distinct from various classes of teachers by him specified, one whom he calls “governments.” In another place he speaks of elders who “ruled without laboring in word and doctrine.” These officers we denominate ruling elders.

It is evident that the object of these officers was the spiritual edification of the people. “They were intended to instruct them in the knowledge of divine truth, to inspire them with pure principles and spiritual affections; to form their individual and social habits to practical holiness and moral order, in one word, to render them meet for the inheritance of the saints in light.”

While such is the object of the ministry and eldership, the pastor or bishop of the congregation and the elders which have been elected by the people, and solemnly set apart to the office, constitute together the primary court of the Church. Of this court, the pastor is moderator or president, and one of the elders is appointed by themselves as secretary. The body thus constituted and denominated the Church Session is charged with the duty of providing for the instruction of the congregation, the religious training of the young, and the discipline of erring members. It is governed in its proceedings by a code of laws adopted by the whole Church, and is required to keep a written record of its proceedings, which record is subject to the review and control of a superior court. It has power to admit members to sealing ordinances, to exculpate and protect those who are unjustly accused, to admonish such as may be reasonably expected to be reclaimed by gentle means, to suspend from the communion of the Lord’s supper gross offenders, and to sever incorrigible members from their connexion with the Church.

Every trial is open and public. A fair record is required to

be kept of all proceedings, and parties interested are entitled to a copy, at their request. If through the imperfections or biases of this court, or any part of it, any person feels himself aggrieved by its decisions, he has the right of appeal to the superior court or the Presbytery.

The Presbytery is constituted by the bishops of several Churches and one ruling elder from each. Before this court a bishop may be arraigned, and any layman, after having passed through his trial in the court below, may claim the right of a new hearing on an appeal from the Session.

The Synod is a union of several Presbyteries, and is in every respect only a large Presbytery and a court of appeal from the individual Presbyteries comprised in it.

The General Assembly is differently constituted. It is a representative body, in which the Synods are not represented; only as they are represented by the delegates from the Presbyteries of which they are composed. This is the highest court in the Church. It may devise means according to its wisdom, only within the prescribed limits of the constitution, for promoting the interests of the whole Church, exercise a review and control over the Synodical records, and issue finally all complaints or appeals from the courts below.

It is not pretended that we have an apostolical warrant for these four courts constituted in this exact form. But, we do maintain that the principles involved in this organization are all found in the primordial Church as described incidentally in the New Testament. The parity of Christian ministers is plainly asserted. Bishops and elders, or presbyters, are acknowledged by all scholars to be the same. The same persons are in different places called by each of these names.— There were elders that ruled well who did not labor as preachers. The Churches consisting of different congregations acted in unison, and assemblies representing the whole were convened to concert measures for promoting the general good.

Such a government is eminently popular and liberal. No man can be tried but by his peers. If prejudice has unfortunately been permitted to exercise sway, the injured party can remove the cause to a higher and an impartial tribunal. No great interest can be sacrificed by the tyranny of an individual raised high in office above his brethren. The dangers of eccle-

siastical ambition are diminished by the representation of the people in the eldership. There would be a little more perfect popular representation, it is true, if our Church, like the Presbyterianism of the Reformed Dutch Church, elected its elders for a limited term, thus securing rotation in office in the Session. Indeed, such an arrangement has been made by some of our Churches, and the General Assembly, when discussing the subject at its last session, did not pronounce it contrary to the principles of our government. Without that feature, our Church possesses more analogies with our excellent confederated representative republic than can be found elsewhere, and if rotation in office in the eldership were introduced as a general usage, our Church would move with our political government, *pari passu*, two free federative republics, one spiritual, the other temporal, neither infringing on the rights, or curtailing the privileges of the other.—*Rev. Joel Parker, D. D.*

Notice.

The "Great Iron Wheel"—No. 7, is ready for the January No. The "Wheels" will appear more frequently and regularly next year. The January No. will be issued as early as practicable. All who wish to subscribe for 1850 should do so without delay. *Many of our brethren have yet to inform us of the fulfilment of their promise made at Synod.* ALL, we believe, so far as heard from, have *done better* than they promised, So can *all* the others.—EDS.

CHANGES.—The Rev. Mr. Bergen states that when he first went to Illinois, twenty years ago, "there were but seven Presbyterian ministers in the State, no New School, no Congregational ministers. Now we have a Synod composed of seven Presbyteries, about sixty ministers, and more than 100 Churches. In the New School and Congregational connection, there are more than 100 ministers."

AT CONSTANTINOPLE, five children of the mission families have recently united with the mission Church, and five native Armenians from the mission schools.



059172109742800