

William Spiro
THE

91142

CHRISTIAN'S MAGAZINE:

DESIGNED TO PROMOTE THE

KNOWLEDGE AND INFLUENCE

OF

EVANGELICAL TRUTH AND ORDER.

Όσα εις αληθειαν, εσα σεμνα.—PHIL. iv. 8.

VOL. I.

NEW-YORK:

PRINTED BY HOPKINS AND SEYMOUR, NO. 118, PEARL-STREET.

INTRODUCTION.

DEFERENCE to public opinion, and that frankness which is generally safe and always honourable, demand an explanation of the origin, design, and nature of the present work. This is the more expedient, as considerations of some force appear hostile to the undertaking. The vanity of authorship might find ampler means of gratification than the fugitive numbers of a magazine: it is a temper of no amiable cast which delights in measuring the weapons of theological warfare: and it requires some hardihood to renew, though under a different form, attempts which, in past years, have enjoyed a very small share of literary patronage; and have perished for want of pecuniary support.

Yet there are times when all such considerations must yield: when no voice may be silent, nor any hand be idle, which can aid the great interests of scriptural religion: and when their friends are bound, at the hazard of reproach, and loss, and other evil issues, to “display a banner because of

truth." Such a time is the present. Many own the gospel of salvation more from custom than from conviction; and, accordingly, pass their lives in a dry and sterile profession. Many treat it with indifference under the name of liberality. Many corrupt its doctrines; fritter away its sense; and in exchange for the life-blood of its consolation, offer to the perishing soul a vain theory, or a frigid criticism. Many, and that among our youth, to show, in appearance, their bravery of spirit, but in reality to shield their lusts, reject it altogether as unworthy not only of credence, but even of inquiry. The mischiefs arising from these sources are increased by the activity of a "zeal not according to knowledge." Some, excluding the light of the understanding, place their religion in fervour of feeling. Some clamour incessantly for doctrine; as if the heart had nothing to do in the service of God; or as if practical holiness were a necessary fruit of speculative orthodoxy. Some, like the self-justifiers of old, "tithe mint and anise and cummin;" and like them, too, "omit the weightier matters of the law, judgment, mercy and faith;" little concerned about either "receiving Christ Jesus the Lord," or "walking in him," provided they be exact in their routine of ceremonies. Some, poisoning the gos-

pel in its fountain head, shut out the unconverted from all interest in the invitations of its grace; and, as if the authority of God were to be annihilated with the same blow which fells the hope of the sinner, do, with their might, what Paul declared he and his fellow Apostles did not—"make void the law through faith." Some appear to lay as much stress upon their external order, as if the key which opens the door of their communion opened, at the same moment, the doors of Paradise; although, upon that supposition, it is evident that the "gate" and "way" which "lead unto life" are no longer "strait and narrow." Some, in the opposite extreme, account the external order of the house of God a matter of no importance; and are chargeable, for this their negligence, with countenancing, at least indirectly, violation of their Lord's commandment, invasion of his prerogative, and assault upon his truth. And as though all this were not enough, there are not wanting others to lay their axe at the root of entire Christianity, by endeavouring to set aside the distinctive character, and the authentic call of the gospel ministry. Addressing themselves to the avarice of one class, to the conceit of another, to the credulity of a third, and to the ignorance of all, it is not wonderful that they should draw many after

“ their pernicious ways.” Their proscribing from the ministry all learning, taste, and talents, through an avowed jealousy for the glory of *divine teaching*, may impose for a while upon a guileless Christian, who suspects no harm when the grace of God is extolled ; but it will be well if the mask shall be found to have concealed the tendency of their principles from their own view.

Whether this representation be just or not, is known to every one who has the faculty of observation, and the will to use it. And whether or not such a state of things, conspiring with the intemperate pursuit of wealth, with the gradual relaxation of every social bond ; with the violence of political ferment ; and with the approach of those fearful days which are coming upon the earth, can fail to grieve the serious, to ensnare the unwary, to stumble the thoughtful, to multiply the profane, and to spread “ confusion and every evil work,” will admit of but one answer. What, then, is to be done ? Shall we slumber on till the midnight cry awake us, and the season of action be over ? Shall we, because prospects are bad, give up all for lost ; and sit down desponding, till the deluge of abominations sweep us away ? God forbid ! It is the dictate of both reason and revelation, to “ *redeem* the time because the days

are evil." No man can tell what an extent of ruin the efforts of those, or a considerable number of those, who love "the truth as it is in Jesus," commencing at this hour, may avert from their families, from their country, and from the church of God. One of the most obvious means of success is the calling their attention to those subjects of faith and practice which derive a new interest from the "signs of the times." The precious truths of the gospel must be maintained, vindicated, urged upon their consciences. They must be stimulated where they are slack, and instructed where they are ignorant. They must be taught to contemplate in a juster light than has been common, the nature, and value, of the Redeemer's institutions—They must be put on their guard against the many "Antichrists" which, in various shapes, are "abroad in the world." They must be cautioned against those "swelling words of vanity," and those "fair speeches" of craft, by which they are in danger of being misled. They must learn to explore the foundations not only of that saving truth, but of that comely order, and those costly privileges, which were "once delivered to the saints," and have been consecrated by the blood of martyrs—to "walk about Zion, and go round about her; to tell the towers thereof; to mark well

“ her bulwarks, and consider her palaces, that
“ they may tell it to the *generation following.*”
They must be able, with meekness and dignity,
both to “ give a reason of the hope that is in them-
“ selves,” and of their opposition to the errors of
others—They must be led to a better knowledge
of the Holy Scripture than can be acquired from
the repetition of elementary principle, however
“ beautiful in its season,” or essential in its place
—They must be persuaded to seek after those
ministrations which shall “ feed them with know-
ledge and with understanding;” and to exert them-
selves, in the application of suitable means, for
procuring to the ministry a succession of “able”
and “ faithful men,” who “ need not to be ashamed,
rightly dividing the word of truth”—They must
look at Christianity, not merely as it lies in the
pages of their Bibles, and their confessions of faith;
but also as it has been embodied in the holy cha-
racters, the active lives, and the peaceful death of
their brethren who are gone to the “ recompense
of reward,” and whose “ faith” it is their duty and
happiness to “ follow.” Their solicitude is also
to be excited toward their children. Perhaps there
is no obligation disregarded with less remorse, or
more fatal effects, than that of bringing up youth
in the “ nurture and admonition of the Lord.”

Christian families are as certainly the nurseries of the church upon earth, as she is herself the nursery of the church in heaven. Nor is there a more alarming symptom of her condition than the few, the very few, who tread in the steps of their religious parents. Old Christians are dying off, and a proportionable number of young ones does not step forward to occupy their stations. Wo to that generation by which the testimony of God shall be abandoned! But wo also to that generation which is preparing the "seed of evil doers" that shall perform the accursed work! They who now fill the Christian church ought to tremble lest at their doors be laid the guilt of rearing an infidel progeny; and at their hands be required the blood of sons and daughters to be born in ages to come. If any thing vigorous is to be expected in remedying the evil, Christians must pause. They must ask whether or not they do right in courting for their offspring that "friendship of the world" which is "enmity with God:" whether they can now excuse themselves to their consciences, or will hereafter stand blameless before their judge, for their unfaithfulness to the children "whom he hath given them;" for their connivance at those profligate habits which are carrying pestilence into the bosom of domestic soci-

B

ety; for the pitiable and criminal vanity of qualifying their boys and their girls for entering with *eclat* into that very *world* from which the voice of their God has enjoined them and theirs to "come out and be separate," if they hope to be acknowledged by him as his "sons and his daughters."

All these are things of unutterable moment. They must be pondered with solemn regard. They must so mingle themselves with convictions and feeling, and conduct, as to change, in a great measure, the face of the visible church; or there is nothing before us but that desolation which will come "like a whirlwind," and will carry away in its course every individual and denomination that shall be unprepared for the shock. Let no man deceive himself, nor those who listen to him, with vain words. Let him not smile at these forebodings as childish, nor contemn them as fanatical. Let him, at least, before he venture upon such security, hold up the light of revelation to the objects which surround him, and he will perceive that the alarm is not without cause. Unbelief in suggestions founded upon the word of God, and enforced by his providence is an ancient folly; "when they say peace and safety, then sudden destruction cometh." To ward off, or lighten the impending stroke, every minister of reconciliation

should be alert at his post ; every Christian parent should redouble his diligence in training up his children ; every man of talents should consecrate his power ; every man of wealth be forward in offering his substance ; every man of devotion wrestle before the throne of God.

To throw something into the common scale is the design of the *Christian's Magazine*. To require in its numbers an exemplification of all that energy and those excellencies which have just been pronounced indispensable to the Christian weal, would be unreasonable ; as it would demand from a few individuals what cannot be accomplished but by the conjoined piety and labour of thousands. This work will fulfil its task by erecting a standard round which the friends of truth may rally—by discussing topics which may prompt the spirit of research—by diffusing religious information ; and by firm resistance to attempts from the press to pervert scriptural principle, or undermine the scriptural institutions.

The general Prospectus is sufficiently intelligible. In order, however, to avoid unmerited blame, and to preclude misconception with regard to some material articles, the following observations may not be impertinent.

1. The editor is not pledged to introduce into

every or any number, matter belonging strictly to every head mentioned in the Prospectus. He will contract no such engagement: nor was it the intention of the Prospectus to create such an expectation. It specifies merely the subjects which are to be handled; but nothing as to their order or proportion. The quantity of religious intelligence, in particular, must greatly vary: not only because events do not happen at regular intervals; but because it is often hard to ascertain the truth. The Editor does not dissemble his fears that he shall frequently be unable to gratify, on this point, the laudable curiosity of his readers; and he can tender them no equivalent for occasional disappointment, but his care not to amuse them with fiction instead of fact. The design of printing *sermons* in this miscellany, has, upon mature reflection, been relinquished. They are commonly too long to be inserted at once: if well composed, they are injured by disjunction; and they have always a set of appendages, which, though needful in the pulpit, and to their appropriate form, can very conveniently be spared in a periodical publication.

2. The Magazine will support that Ecclesiastical government which combines the visible unity of the Church Catholic with perfect equality of

rank among her ministers; and the chief of those tenets which are known as the *doctrines of the reformation*. The attacks now made in various directions upon the former, and the odium so industriously heaped upon the latter, have no influence in shaking the editor's attachment to either; nor in deterring him from vindicating both before the face of the sun. Deeply convinced that in this system of government, and these doctrines of faith, are contained the law of God's house, and the "wells of salvation," he cannot admit into the Magazine any thing repugnant to them. That pruriency of debate, which sets up falsehood for the pleasure of knocking it down, is a compound, in nearly equal parts, of vanity and weakness. It would be quite as wise and commendable in a physician to poison his patient that he might try the force of his antidote. The antidote might be good, and upon the whole successful; but if, by any accident, a life should be sacrificed to his experiments, the fame of his skill would be a costly purchase. There are enough to propagate falsehood without the aid of those who should destroy it. The duty of Christians is to confront and repel, not abet the enemy, nor admit him into their camp in order to subdue him. According to its resources, the Christian's Magazine will not be backward in strengthening their

hands and stirring up their zeal in this contest. It can never descend to altercation; yet if it should, on any occasion, be so unfortunate as to misrepresent persons or things, a correction of the mistake, when demonstrated to the editor, will be thankfully received and cheerfully inserted. It also engages that while it will maintain and expose error without reserve or scruple, no abuse nor virulence shall pollute its pages.

3. In reviewing books, considerable latitude must be allowed. On the one hand it would be trifling to examine every thing which may get through the press: and on the other, it would be fastidious to confine the censorship of the Magazine to books published or republished since its commencement. More regard should be paid to the propriety of animadversion than to the date of publication. For it is not to be doubted that many old books need reviewing as much as the new ones. It may also, at times, be necessary to notice some of the more common vehicles of information, which are but too accessible to things unfriendly to Christian doctrine and pure manners.

This part of the work is arduous, as it demands more than ordinary self-denial, and cannot be executed without sometimes risking the displeasure even of those whom we have neither

interest nor inclination to offend. Authors, in general, are not the most patient or least irritable of beings. Even good men are apt to be intractable when they array themselves in print, and to be nearly as much disconcerted by a critical rebuke, as if they had been libelled for a crime. But there is no help for it. *Justice* must be distributed without "fear, favour, or affection." There is no other way of informing the reader or improving the writer. It is, indeed, common for reviewers to profess *impartiality*. And if by impartiality be meant, giving to every writer his due, according to one's best judgment, the Christian's Magazine claims to be impartial. But if impartiality consist in strictures on an author's style and manner, and a fair statement of his opinions *without deciding on their quality*, then it solemnly disclaims all such impartiality. The very use of a religious Review is to distinguish the "precious" from the "vile." Is it in religion only that we may prevaricate? In the most tremendous of all concerns that we are to be undecided? Are we to punish every transgression of literary law; and to let slander upon the gospel, and assassination of the souls of men, pass without reproof, lest we should be branded as uncharitable? The good Lord deliver us from such charity. It has

always appeared to the editor, how plausible soever the appellations bestowed upon it, to be treason against the highest allegiance, and to mark the union of cowardice and fraud. If, therefore, any one shall hope to see in this Review no discrimination of religious doctrines; no preference shown to those which guide to the "path of life," over those which lead to "bottomless perdition," he will be much disappointed. Whatever may be its other imperfections, no man shall accuse it of *trimming* on the points of faith and duty.

4. As the objects of this Magazine cannot be attained without the editor's control over its materials, he will feel himself not only at liberty, but under obligation, to make such alterations in the pieces which may be offered for insertion, as he shall judge expedient. His literary friends will be considered as acceding to this condition in all their communications which shall not be accompanied with a contrary request. When such cases shall occur, and the pieces be thought exceptionable, they will of course be suppressed, and remain subject to the disposal of their authors.

New-York, December 6, 1806.

THE
CHRISTIAN'S MAGAZINE.

On Religious Controversy.

As one of the avowed designs of this work is to assert the truth and refute error, it has to combat, in the outset, a fashionable and imposing prejudice. It seems to be taken for granted, that how perfect soever the right of judging and professing for ourselves, there exists no right of inquiry in to the judgment or profession of others. In religion, at least, this maxim is held to be incontrovertible by many, who never think of applying it to any other subject. To disquisitions on topics in which all denominations agree, they can listen with pleasure: they can even permit the peculiarities of each to be detailed in succession; but from every thing which wears the form of *controversy*, they turn away with spontaneous contempt. Their aversion is so fixed, that hardly any plea of excellence will be allowed in behalf of a work which stands convicted on the charge of being controversial. The fact is sufficient to preclude every other trial, and to infer condemnation as a matter of course.

C

That these summary and oftentimes injurious decisions have been unprovoked on the part of disputants, I shall not affirm. On the contrary, I will freely concede, that the unfairness, the heat, and the rudeness, which too frequently occur in polemical writings, are most offensive to the discreet reader; and make him shy of authors from whom he may expect such entertainment.

But while there can be no apology for conduct which offers equal violence to the rules of good breeding and the precepts of Christianity, there is ground to suspect that more is attributed to its influence in producing the prevalent dislike to controversy, than it can justly claim. For as our age must not arrogate to itself the praise of all the meekness and candour which have been in the world; so it is certain, that men great and good, pacific and modest, have studied the most controverted themes in an age when harshness and incivility were more common than they are now. In accounting, then, for that prejudice which we are considering, much must be deducted from the current professions of courtesy and candour, and transferred to that *indifference* which will not be at the pains to examine on which side lies the right of a question concerning eternal hope! For such a morbid state of feeling we can suggest no remedy; and can only pour out our most fervent prayer, that the first admonition which it will be compelled to regard, may not be that awful voice, "Son, remember that thou in thy life time hadst thy good things!" The prejudice itself, unlike those lessons with which truth and wisdom preoccupy the heart, will appear, upon a close in-

spection, as destitute of solidity as it is assuming in manner—For, in the

1. place, It admits not of dispute, that the holy scriptures point out an opposite course. Their injunction is to *buy the truth, and sell it not—To cease from the instruction that causeth to err from the words of knowledge—earnestly to contend for the faith once delivered to the saints—to try the spirits whether they are of God.*—All these directions imply, not that men are to spend their lives in laying the foundations of their faith; but that they are to employ their opportunities and faculties in selecting the true from the false; that they are to prize it when selected; to enrich it with fresh acquisitions; and to defend it with their utmost skill. How this can be done without controversy, so long as there are “deceivers in the world,” it is incumbent on them to show, who would suffer the truths of the gospel to be sacrificed, one after another, by men of “corrupt minds,” rather than raise a finger, or press an argument for their protection. It is, indeed, not more lamentable than true, that a host of candidates beset the inquirer. Every sect cries out, *we are the people, and the law of the Lord is with us*; every partisan enforces the pretensions of his sect. But this, though frequently urged, is the weakest of all reasons for keeping aloof from investigation. The amount is, “the danger of going astray is great; the consequences fatal, therefore I will shut my eyes.” Good sense would say, “the danger of error is great, the consequences fatal; therefore I will use all my diligence that I may not be misled:” For certainly, if “strait be the gate and narrow the way which leadeth unto life,” we have the strongest

inducement possible to search out and embrace the few who find it. We are, therefore, reduced to this alternative, either that there is no truth at all, or that we are bound to seek it through every peril, to distinguish its voice amid all clamours, and to possess it at any price. If this condition seem hard, let it be remembered,

2. That it is not left to our discretion whether we shall choose or not.

The determination to choose *nothing*, is a determination *not to choose the truth*; and this draws after it the condemnation of those who "love darkness rather than light." The most high God having given us his word as the rule of our faith and duty, a neglect to seek its counsel, because men wrangle about its meaning, is to make the hazard of going wrong a reason for never being anxious to go right. It would belike the excuse of a servant, who having, in common with others, received his master's orders to repair to a certain place, should resolve not to stir, because his fellow servants quarrelled about the road. Their disobedience could never justify his. Nor is there a man upon earth who would not pronounce it to be the plea of a fool, that out of his pure love of peace he had never been at the trouble to ascertain the import of his master's instructions! The fact is, that no medium can be assigned between receiving and rejecting the truth. If rejected, we seal our own perdition—If received, we must reject whatever is hostile to it; that is, we must institute a comparison between conflicting claims; which is precisely the object of controversy.

Pursuing the argument a little further, we shall perceive in the

3. place, That in disclaiming all controversy,

we set out with a principle which it is impossible to carry through.

In what department of society, or on what subject of discourse, do the thoughts of men accord? The law has long been celebrated for its fertility in litigation. Medicine is hardly inferior to the bar: agriculture keeps up a sharp debate with commerce: and the politician has always to navigate a "tempestuous sea." Not a project, a character, nor an incident, can be introduced into common conversation without calling forth different strictures, according to the views, habits, relations, and tempers, of the company. And it is by no means unusual for some who abhor controversy in *religion*, to be both talkative and disputatious, if not dogmatic and bitter, on other matters. The world is a vast scene of strife. A man must either take it as he finds it, and bear his part in the general collision, or else go out of it altogether. It is the inevitable consequence of imperfect knowledge, and depraved appetite; of that confusion of intellect and corruption of heart which flow from sin. When, therefore, we are under the necessity of either being exiled from society, or of giving and receiving contradiction; and when we submit to this necessity without murmuring in all cases but those which concern religion, what is it but to declare that principles affecting our duty toward God, the highest happiness of our nature, and our responsibility for a future state, are the only things not worth contending for?

The pretence, that religion is a concern too solemn and sacred for the passions of controversy is like the pretence with which some justify their "restraining prayer before God;" that he is too high and holy to be approached by such beings as

they are. And thus, to display their reverence, they become profane ; and live like atheists from pure devotion ! Both are cases of error without excuse ; we may neither be light in prayer, nor wrathful in debate.

If it be alleged that religion loses more than she gains by controversy ; this, with an allowance for the mismanagement of unskilful advocates, is a direct censure of her champions, and a surrender of her cause. Are they who espouse such an opinion prepared for its consequences ? Are they willing to say, that when the world was lying in ignorance, in wickedness, and in wo, the introduction of light from above produced more evil than good ? That the gospel is a plague and not a blessing, because, through the malignity of its foes, it has often brought a sword instead of peace ? That it had been better for men never to have “ known the way of righteousness,” than risk opposition in following it ? That the reformation of religion was a senseless scheme ; that the martyrs died like fools ; and that all the heroes who have been “ valiant for the truth ;” all the “ ministers of grace ” who have explained and established it : all the “ apostles and prophets and wise men,” whom the wisdom of God commissioned to reveal it ; and that WISDOM itself in the person of Jesus Christ, were disturbers of human tranquillity, and spent their time in no better labour than that of “ turning the world upside down ?” If you start at these things, what do you mean by asserting that “ religion suffers from controversy ?” For all, prophets, apostles, wise men, and the Redeemer himself, fought her battles, and yielded their latest breath in her defence !

You cannot stop even here. Religion, you say,

suffers from controversy. Then it cannot endure investigation. It shrinks from the touch of reason, for controversy is reasoning: and, of course, it cannot be true; for truth never yet declined the test, nor sustained the slightest harm from the most fiery ordeal. On the assumption, therefore, that religion has truth on her side, you can hardly do her a greater injury than to forbid her entering into the lists with her antagonists. They will represent, and argue, and declaim. They will solicit, and sooth, and flatter, and sneer, till they pervert the judgment of many, and seduce the affections of more: and religion, betrayed and insulted, her banner thrown down, her weapons shivered, her lips sealed, her limbs bound "in affliction and iron," is to be laid at their feet and left to their mercy, in testimony of the respect and attachment of her friends! It was not in this way that they formerly treated her; nor is it to this treatment that we owe our privileges. Her enemies, potent, subtle, and persevering, were encountered by her sons and defeated as often as they ventured into the field. Those masterly defences of revelation, those profound researches into its sense, that flood of light which has been poured upon its peculiar doctrines, and its benign institutions, are the recompense of the war which Christian zeal and talent have waged in its cause. Had apathy like ours enthralled the spirit of our fathers, we should hardly have been able, at this day, to distinguish, in religion, between our right hand and our left.

The prejudice, therefore, against religious controversy, is irrational and hurtful. It is a prejudice against the progress and victories of truth. The misconduct of opponents to each other, is a

personal concern. It disgraces themselves, but belongs not to the nature or merits of any controversy. This, in itself considered, is but the comparison of jarring opinions; with a reference, in matters of religion, to the scriptural standard. There is no more necessity for falling into a rage when demonstrating a proposition in Christianity, than when demonstrating a proposition in mathematics: although the infinitely interesting quality of the one above the other, will involve a deeper feeling; will furnish an explanation of the warmth which is apt to accompany it; and will draw from candour an allowance for our common frailty.

Controversy, then, being unavoidable; as truth and falsehood often meet and never agree, it must, occasionally, occupy every one who wishes to "have a good conscience." But as great evils result from an *improper manner of conducting* it, the remarks in this paper are to be understood as contemplating it, under the following restrictions:

1st—There should be no personal asperity. The greater part of feuds arises from the rash use of names and epithets. If one is obliged to expose weakness or disingenuousness, let not the exposure separate decorum from strength; nor forfeit respect in the act of forcing conviction.

2d—There should be no impeachment of motive, where facts to justify such a censure are not too palpable to be set aside. The bosom is a sacred retreat: God alone can explore it without the aid of external evidence. And, therefore, a man must be his own betrayer before his fellow man may presume to judge of what passes in his heart. Bad as the condition of the world is, it would be unutterably worse, if men always meant whatever their words convey, or even their actions

indicate. Many persons have said and done, with the utmost integrity of motive, things which could not have been said or done by some others without an absolute sacrifice of principle—though it is not hence to be inferred that the things were right.

3. No consequence of an opinion should be attributed to those by whom it is disowned.

As the number of correct reasoners is comparatively few, positions are often advanced of which their authors are far from perceiving the real tendency. This observation solves a difficulty that otherwise would be very embarrassing. Many a one whose piety it would be insolent to question, has held tenets which lead to the most impious conclusions. What then? must we say that these conclusions form a part of his creed, and arraign him when he denies them, as being, at once, both a blasphemer and a hypocrite? For example: because we are persuaded that opposition to the imputed righteousness of the Lord Jesus, and to the doctrine of the reformed churches concerning the divine decrees, will drive the opposers, if closely followed up, through the Socinian and deistical camps, into atheism itself; are we, therefore, to brand them as Socinians, deists, or atheists?—God forbid! It is our consolation to know that multitudes of them would, with horror, abjure their views on these points, could they see them to be connected with such results; and to believe that they renounce in words things, which, without being aware of it, they love in their hearts. It is ignorance of this sort which, in some cases, reconciles with the existence of grace, a notion subversive of the gospel. Let me not, however, be supposed to favour, in the

D

slightest degree, that monster of modern philosophy—the innocence of error.—Detect it; pursue it; hunt it down; urge it over the precipice: but permit those who started with it, to disengage themselves in season, and save their lives. In plain words: Charge home upon error its most tremendous consequences; but charge them not, when solemnly disavowed, upon the man whom it has misled. If you reason fairly, he must either quit his ground, or maintain it feebly; and while your triumph will be complete, neither mercy nor justice will forbid you to let him shelter himself from crime amid the thickets of contradiction.

The reader will, doubtless, apply the foregoing rules, without abatement, to the disquisitions in the present work. And his right to do so is unquestionable. That he shall never, in perusing it, meet with an instance of transgression, it would savour of boasting to affirm. But that it shall not be often repeated, nor long continued, he may reasonably demand. Care shall certainly be employed, that the Christian's Magazine be not unworthy of its name; but if, unhappily, any thing of a different mark should steal into its pages, let the Christian critic remember that he owes to its writers the same indulgence which they owe to him: and he will enter an occasional trespass into his account current with human imperfection.

FOR THE CHRISTIAN'S MAGAZINE,

On Liberty in Religion.

A WRITER of celebrity* has said, that where
 “men are without some fundamental and sci-
 “entific principles to resort to, they are liable
 “to have their understandings played upon by
 “cant phrases and unmeaning terms, of which
 “every party in every country possess a vocabu-
 “lary. We appear astonished when we see the
 “multitude led away by sounds: but we should
 “remember, that if sounds work miracles, it is
 “always upon ignorance. The influence of
 “names is in exact proportion to the want of
 “knowledge.”

As it is the truth of these remarks which gives a point to their severity, it would be some consolation, were they applicable to the multitude only. But the same foible, though in a less degree, is discernible in men who are not to be ranked with the multitude; and to whom, if we cannot yield our confidence, we may not deny our respect. The influence of fashion is so subtle and so imperious; the levity of social intercourse is so adverse to reflection; dissent from the circling opinion is, for the most part, so ungraciously received; a fling, whether in jest or earnest, is so convenient a substitute for fact; and a popular epithet, without expense either of thought or

* Paley. Pref. to his “*Principles of Moral and Political Philosophy.*” The above quotation must not be construed into a recommendation of his book. His merits, as a teacher of *morals*, we shall discuss hereafter.

knowledge, is so expeditious a mode of determining controversies which otherwise would be of stiff debate, that the judgment is surprised through the imagination; and the mind is hurried into its decisions without firmness to resist, or leisure to pause. He who has access to that sort of company which wears the reputation of intelligence, and does not recollect to have seen this course of things, has made a bad use of his eyes or his memory. How roughly individuals, communities, and even truth itself is often handled by such summary sentences, every writer on logic or ethics accounts it his duty to show. The design of this paper is not so much to dwell on the general evil of the practice, as, on the one side, to repel an opprobrium, and, on the other, to set a claim, which it has been employed to sanction.

From the present state of society we look back on the intolerance of former ages with a surprise which does honour to humanity: but at the same time, it is to be feared, with a loftiness of self-complacency which proclaims that the retrospect administers as much food to our vanity, as to our benevolence. The pendulum of fashion vibrating in morals, as in dress, from an extreme point to its opposite; we are now required to open the bosom of charity to every class of religious tenets, if we hope to be enrolled among *liberal* Christians, or to escape the pains and penalties decreed against *bigots*. As revolutions seldom happen in but one thing at a time, this exchange of feeling appears to have been accompanied with an exchange of principle; and to have included a large portion of the *creed* of our fathers in the same proscription with their sternness of temper.

So that what bishop Butler said of Christianity, may truly be said of orthodoxy:—"It is come—to be taken for granted, by many persons, that orthodoxy is not so much as a subject of inquiry; but that it is now, at length, discovered to be fictitious. And accordingly they treat it as if, in the present age, this were an agreed point among all people of discernment; and nothing remained but to set it up as a principal subject of mirth and ridicule, as it were by way of reprisals, for its having so long interrupted the pleasures of the world*." Or if dislike to principles once held sacred by the most enlightened and excellent of mankind, has not gone all this length, it has, at least, thrown them into the rubbish of obsolete prejudices. Zeal for their purity and propagation is supplanted by a sort of community of persuasions; in which every one is not only privileged to assert his own right, while he lives in peace with his neighbours, but to demand their aid in repulsing an invader. Whoever shall dare to condemn the opinions of one, is the enemy of all the rest: he must be shunned as an intruder into the sanctuary of conscience; as a stranger to religious civility and liberal refinement, and unworthy of any rank but that which philosophical Christianity has assigned to the *bigot*.

All this looks grand and magnanimous; and, no doubt, has its effect; especially upon youthful, undisciplined, and timid minds. But if it have more of show than of reality; if it be as intolerant in its own way as any thing which it calls bigotry; and if, under the pretext of oblations to charity, it sacrifice

* Butler's Analogy—Advertisement.

the truth of God and the eternal interests of men upon the altar of practical infidelity; we cannot turn away from it with too open disgust, nor hold it in too deep abhorrence.

One of the things which first strike a critical observer, is the indefiniteness of the ideas attached to the terms "liberal" and "bigoted." It is easy to couple them with a man or a principle; and to extol or decry accordingly: and few are so loud in their panegyric or abuse, as those who do both by signal. But still, what is your liberality? Is it measured by any standard, or confined within any limits? If not, for aught I can see, it is an attempt to abolish all intellectual and moral distinctions. If it is measured and limited—by what rule? By the word of God? Then you are bound to ascertain its sense, and to oppose every opinion which contradicts it; or else you must contradict yourself: for a rule which you do not apply, is no rule at all.—By your own good pleasure, or your conviction of right? Then you assume the office of dictator as much as any man to whom you impute that arrogance; and if you intend to "pluck the mote out of his eye," you must begin with taking "the beam out of your own."—By your particular associates? Every sect under heaven does the same. The Arminian calls the Calvinist a bigot: the Socinian applies the epithet to the advocate of the atonement, and chaunts forth his own liberality: the deist pities the slavish being who believes in revelation: and the atheist smiles at the "prejudices" of the deist*.—Or are you

* *Il a encore quelques préjugés*, "he has some prejudices left," said the atheists of Paris, concerning David Hume, when he hesitated to shoot the gulf of atheism. He appears, however, to have got rid of his "prejudices," shortly after his acquaintance with those philosophers!

liberal because you think and speak well of those who think and speak well of you? So did the publicans, and so do thousands with whom you would not wish to be suspected of any connexion. If your "liberality takes a middle path between the contractedness of some men, and the licentiousness of others, so that while you cherish the primary interests of religion, you overlook the minor differences among its professors, and embrace them as brothers upon the broad ground of the common Christianity," you are indeed more definite, but not less embarrassed. For it is impossible not to perceive, *first*, that your very medium implies a boundary which you may not pass; and consequently, that your liberality is commendable, not for its own sake, but as it is controlled by truth: and *secondly*, that the character of your liberality must be fixed by the relative value of those points which it surrenders under the title of "minor differences." Until this be settled, you can have no permission to glory in being liberal; and to bestow contemptuous appellations upon those who will not go in your train: for you may take credit to yourself for that which shall turn out to be a crime.

Our next inquiry, then, respects these "minor differences." A soft sound with dreaded sense! For, unless the writer grievously err, the characteristic of the liberality now in vogue, is to ask nothing more than a *general* profession of Christianity; and to refer all its modifications to the head of "minor differences;" which, in the affair of Christian and ministerial fellowship, should make no difference at all. If, therefore, one of these liberal Christians shall explain away the whole faith of the church of God concerning the

new birth—if another shall teach the dogma of universal salvation for men, and, if he please, for devils too—if a third shall give up the plenary inspiration of the scriptures—if a fourth shall argue against a particular providence—if a fifth shall deny the influences, or dispute the being, of the Holy Spirit—if a sixth shall abjure the sacrifice and deity of our Lord Jesus Christ: all this, instead of diminishing confidence, or communion, is to be a matter of compromise. Every one retains his own views without contradiction. The generic term “Christian” belongs alike to all: and he who refuses to recognize their Christianity, must be branded as a bigot.

Three questions arise out of this subject:

First, How far such liberality is consistent with the love of *truth*?

Discrimination belongs to the essence of useful research. The man who transposes cause and effect; who classes phœnomena without regard to their nature; or who huddles together a mass of incoherent facts, will never enlighten the community, nor obtain the suffrages of its well informed members. They all agree that to encourage such blunderers, would be to banish knowledge and science from the world. The effect of such a chaos is the same, whether it be produced by individual folly, or by a sort of *pic-nic* collection, in which numbers contribute their respective shares, and fairly *club* a medley of contradictions. Why should that which is absurd in every thing else, be rational in religion? It is evident that within the domain of this idol-liberality, there is not a spot on which truth can rear her temple or plant her foot. Because truth of every kind, under every form, and in every degree, is necessarily and eter-

nally intolerant of falsehood. And therefore to exempt from challenge a host of discordant sentiments, and that on the most interesting topics, is to wave the rights of truth to the whole extent of the exemption. It takes for granted, either that the truth on these topics is not discoverable; or that it is not worth the trouble of contention. The first of these assumptions is a libel on the word of God; and the second on his wisdom. They who thus abandon the claims of truth, by putting them virtually on a level with the claims of error, are not her friends; and the alternative is plain.

The next question is, How this liberality of theirs consists with fidelity to our Lord Jesus Christ?

He was himself the great witness to the truth; and has commanded all his followers to imitate his example. Not one instance can be pointed out, of his countenancing, in the slightest manner, a catholicism which treats with nearly equal regard all opinions and doctrines that shelter themselves under his name. He has charged us to beware of "false prophets who come in sheep's clothing, but inwardly are ravening wolves." And the apostle who lay on his breast and imbibed most of his tenderness, has written "if there come any unto you and bring not this doctrine," (the doctrine of Christ) "receive him not into your house, neither bid him God speed, for he that biddeth him God speed, is partaker of his evil deeds." What the doctrine of Christ is, can be determined only from his word. But the liberality which is now on its trial, draws its chief praise from *never determining that point at all*. Here, then, are two divine precepts of which it mocks the authority by frustrating the application. Who

E

is to seize the "ravening wolf," if it is a settled rule in theological etiquette to look no further than the "sheep's skin?" Who shall chase the "Antichrist" from his door, if it be unmannerly and boorish to ask what "doctrine" he brings? There cannot exist a doubt, that if the Lord Jesus himself were to descend with his apostle, in veiled glory, and mingle again with men, one such sentence a piece as are quoted above, would expel them both from the circle of "liberal" Christians! That evangelical hero, Paul, took the elders of Ephesus to record that he was "pure from the blood of all men." Why? Because he had thrown the reins on the neck of his charity? had represented the precious truths of the gospel and their opposites as well qualified to harmonize; and had refrained to enforce particular views of doctrine lest he should infringe liberty of judgment, or the maxims of good breeding? No! But because he "had not shunned to declare the WHOLE counsel "of God." And they who do, must go to their Judgment with "blood-guiltiness" in their consciences. Let this be solemnly pondered by those ministers who, having had the "form of sound words," have been carried away by the current of a spurious liberality; have gradually dropped the peculiar doctrines of Christianity; and now, through fear of offence or the ridicule of singularity, avoid them altogether. So that the utmost which can be said of them is, that if they do not preach the gospel, they do not preach *against* it—i. e. that their discourses, in every thing, affecting the salvation of a sinner, contain—just nothing at all—*Horresco referens!* Well may their "flesh tremble," when they think, if ever they think, of the interrogatories, which await them at the bar of

Jesus Christ, concerning his suppressed truth; his abused gospel; his forgotten cross: and all this, for the feather of being thought "liberal," by men who give themselves no trouble to "escape the "wrath to come."

The *third* question is, How far the liberality under review consists with real charity to men?

The treating as non-essentials and matters of accommodation, all differences which may occur within the precincts of that general term "Christian," is not to be justified but upon the principle, that such differences cannot endanger the "saving of the soul." Is this true? One man believes and teaches that the Spirit of the living God must change a sinner's heart, and unite him to the Lord Jesus, as the Lord his righteousness and strength, before he can be a Christian, and possess a "good hope through grace"—Another man laughs at all this as fanaticism, and maintains that nothing more is necessary to constitute a Christian than a rational assent to the truth of divine revelation, and a good moral life—One man worships the Lord Jesus Christ as his Saviour and his God—another represents him as a mere creature; it may be "a frail, fallible, peccable man"—One rejoices in the sacrifice of Christ by which he is redeemed from the curse of the law; and another reposes the whole doctrine of redemption through the blood of Jesus to be an old wife's fable. Here are flat contradictions: and contradictions of such a nature, that, if what is usually termed the orthodox side, be true, the opposite involves nothing less than the eternal perdition of those who hold it. Yet all these men call themselves Christians. Now it is clear as the meridian sun, that the word of God cannot stand

with both sides ; but that the one or the other " has made him a liar ;" and it is no less clear that he who makes God a liar, by not receiving his testimony concerning his son, is under condemnation. It follows, that they who enlist themselves under the banner of the prevailing liberality, either by teaching that there is nothing in the doctrines of the different sects called Christian, which ought to excite controversy ; or by professing their charity for those who hold these most detestable opinions ; or by maintaining a studied reserve toward the peculiarities of the mediatorial plan, are leagued in a conspiracy against the " glorious gospel " of the " great God our Saviour," and those eternal interests of men, from which the faith of it is inseparable. Deceived by this traffic of complaisances, especially when they see the ministers of religion among the most active in promoting it, many rest in the conclusion, that it is of no consequence what they believe, if their character in society be fair. " Searching the scriptures," for the " words of eternal life," becomes an antiquated employment. Occasional misgivings of conscience are relieved by the soothing imagination that we are all Christians, and that is enough. Gross ignorance of the gospel thickens apace, in a clime illuminated by its broadest sunshine. The barriers which ought to divide the church from the world, are swept away, and every trait of discrimination effaced. " What fellowship hath " righteousness with unrighteousness ? and what " communion hath light with darkness ? and what " concord hath Christ with Belial ? or what part " hath he that believeth with an infidel ?" is a tale of other times. And thus, in a " land of bibles,"

which cannot be opened without the lightning of God's reprobation of their folly flashing in their faces, miserable sinners, unjustified, unwashed, unsanctified, are praising each other's Christianity! The delusion is often fostered by the very men whose office should impel them to counteract and destroy it. And there is too sad reason to fear that the loss of the soul is the first thing which awakens numbers from their dream.—Yes, they “die in their iniquity; but”—but “their blood shall be required at the hand” of those pastors who “warned” them not. That liberality, therefore, which lets all sorts of opinions pass under the large cloak of “Christian;” or which forbears to urge, without qualification, the peculiar topics of the gospel, deserves another epithet than “charitable.” Of charity it has nothing but the abused name. Instead of executing her benign functions, it comes with perfidy, and cruelty, and death, to the souls of men.

If we look a little closer at this affected liberality, we shall perceive that, exclusively of its tendency, the very attribute which it vaunts the loudest, universal *tolerance*, has no existence.

The proof is short. No men are more impatient of contradiction in the affairs of common life, than these liberal thinkers—no men contend for their political views with fiercer zeal, or deeper animosity. Why? Because human speculations are more certain than the truth of God? or civil arrangements of higher moment than the concerns of a future world? That cannot be pretended. Why, then, do the bosoms of these “liberal” philosophers swell with rage against a political opponent? And surely no men can pursue others with more contempt and rancour,

than do they whomsoever they are pleased to stigmatize as bigots. Yet, what have the bigots done? By the nature of the case, they are under no obligation to be as condescending to a "liberal" man, as this latter to them. He is bound by his profession to be as charitable to a bigot as to any other. But the contrary is true. "Bigot" is a brand of infamy; not less than "heretic" or "infidel," and quite as freely applied. Serious as the subject is, one can hardly forbear smiling at the mistakes which we are apt to commit in estimating our own characters. The man who supposed himself inaccessible to flattery, was not aware, till his acuter friend detected him, that this supposition was precisely the point in which his vanity was centered, and was assailable by the flatterer. As little do they who plume themselves on their freedom from bigotry, suspect that their "liberality" is the point on which they betray the very temper they denounce in others. Touch this darling of their's, and you will find that they have as much bigotry as other folk. There are no more decided bigots on earth, than those who are *bigoted to liberality*. The fact is, that modern liberality is of the same kind and spirit with the old heathen tolerance. One was at perfect liberty to worship his calf, provided another might burn incense to the queen of heaven. And thus Baal, and Jupiter, and Moloch, and Mithras, and all the rest of them, fraternized in the most liberal intercourse. "If you have "but a god, no matter who or what; only do not "interfere with your neighbours." And it is very possible that, upon the same terms, Christians might, for a time, have fared easier than they did. But the moment they taught men to turn from

these vanities to serve the living God, the worshippers of Baal, and Jupiter, and Moloch, and the whole rabble of pagan deities, rushed upon them, and drenched the earth with their blood. So now: compliment my dogma, and I will compliment yours. But let unbending truth fall in with the confederacy, and accost the members of it without ceremony. Let her arraign the carnality of one, the corruptness of another, and the unfaithfulness of a third. Let her deny, at once, the Christianity of all who reject the divinity and atonement of our Lord Jesus; or who, admitting both, live without the practical influence of either; and immediately the cry will be raised. "Bigot," "fanatic," will start from a hundred mouths; and, short of open violence, as little mercy will be shown to wisdom's children by modern, as by ancient toleration. Instead, therefore, of a pure and effective benevolence, this liberality of the age is a mask drawn over the face of enmity to God's holiest truth, and to all who espouse it. That "love" which is "without dissimulation," wears no such guise. It consists in kind affections and offices. It can do men good without flattering their corruptions, or sanctifying their mistakes. It is he "who converts a sinner from the error of his way," not he who treats it as harmless, that "shall save a soul from death, and shall hide a multitude of sins." Between the incessant agitations of dispute, and the oblivious calm of indifference, there is a wide scope for the exercise of Christian forbearance.

But let those who desire not to be entrapped into a fatal security, beware how they listen to the siren song. Let them remember, that an air of affableness and magnanimity is often a pass-

port for error, both speculative and practical, to an undefinable extent. There is so much dignity in freedom from little prejudices, and so much flattery in the reputation of it, that generous minds are thrown off their guard by its very appearance. Impressions, slight at first, are deepened by repetition: advantages are imperceptibly gained over the sternness of truth, and the caution of virtue: and the head and the heart are perverted, under the seductive notion of overcoming prejudice. But one image is presented to the eye, and that is liberality. Her features, her attitude, her voice, her weapons, and her attire, are always the same. Her broad mantle covers the approach of the fiend, till the treacherous blow be given, and "truth fall in the streets." Certain it is, that such has been the ordinary course of those who have "turned away from the holy commandment delivered unto them." They began with a show of liberality, and ended in downright apostacy. Nor can there be a worse symptom of a professor of Christianity, than an anxiety to be accounted liberal on points of principle. It is an anxiety which Christ and his apostles never displayed. It is the mark of one with whom the "answer of a good conscience" is of less value than the breath of a passing compliment; one who "loves the praise of men more than the praise of God."

FOR THE CHRISTIAN'S MAGAZINE.

On the formation of a good Conscience.

THE intention of this essay is to throw out a few remarks on the formation of an intelligent and operative conscience. There are two errors on this subject, which are to be avoided as equally pernicious. The first is the hypothesis that conscience is a sort of internal light, shining by I know not what necessity, and operating on conduct independently of education and habit. If the existence of such a principle were admitted, it would be absurd to talk of its improvement. Nothing would be left but to reject the scriptures, and every other system of moral instruction, as useless. The truth is, that conscience, like our other mental powers, was given to us for cultivation.

The other error is this, that no divine agency, no gracious operation of the Spirit of God, is requisite to the formation of a good conscience; an opinion which nothing but weak reasoning can save from atheism. The coincidence of divine and human agency in the moral actions of men, is a principle both of faith and philosophy: "Work out your own salvation with fear and trembling; for it is God that worketh in you, both to will and to do," and that "of his own good pleasure." The blood of Jesus, who, through the eternal Spirit, offered himself without spot unto God, must purge the conscience

F

from dead works, to serve the living God. The God who caused the light to shine out of darkness, must shine into men's hearts, to give them the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in Christ Jesus, before any effectual exertions can be made for the formation of a Christian conscience. Waving the consideration of the divine agency in the production of a good conscience, let us consider those means which God blesses, and which we, depending on his blessing, should use for that end.

I begin by remarking, that the scriptures, attending to the operations of the human mind, ascribe a twofold agency to conscience. The first is occupied in ascertaining our duty before we proceed to action; the second in judging of our actions, after they have been performed. The former bears an analogy to the legislative functions of civil government, the latter to its executive; in both, God is recognized as Lord of the conscience. The first office of conscience is to perceive our duty, and impel us to fulfil it. I join these two operations together, because a good conscience combines speculative light with practical energy. The absence of either of these renders the other useless, I might have said pernicious, to man. For if conscience possesses light without power, what can a man do more than verify the adage, "Video meliora proboque, deteriora sequor;" and thus become one of those unprofitable servants, who know their master's will, and do it not? A blind but energetic conscience, on the other hand, wreathes the yoke of superstition around the neck of its unhappy possessor.— Let us attend to its operations, as portrayed in the animated description of the prophet Micah.—

Chap, vi. 5, 6, 7. "Wherewith shall I come before the Lord, and bow myself before the high God? Shall I come before him with burnt offerings, with calves of a year old? Will the Lord be pleased with thousands of rams, or with ten thousands of rivers of oil? Shall I give my first born, for my transgression, the fruit of my body for the sin of my soul?" These interrogations display a conscience of great energy, but lost in darkness. Light bursts forth. "He hath shewed thee, O man, what is good; and what doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God?"

Those operations of conscience which are antecedent to conduct, are of the utmost importance. It often happens, that human corruption and gracious principle are obliged to adopt the same means for their gratification; and hence the best and the worst of men are found engaged in the same pursuits. But it is not a casual coincidence of conduct with the divine law, that can be called *religious* conduct. Satan, transformed into an angel of light, is still a devil. The duty enjoined by God, must be performed from a regard to his authority. I shall quote on this subject two passages of scripture. Romans xiii. v. 6 and 7. "Wherefore ye must needs be subject, not only for wrath, but also for *conscience* sake. For, for this cause pay you tribute also; for they are God's ministers, attending continually upon this very thing. Render, therefore, to all their dues: tribute to whom tribute is due, custom to whom custom, fear to whom fear, honour to whom honour."

The Apostle knew that the dread of punishment, and its associated principle the hope of civil distinction and benefits, would ever prompt the

bulk of mankind to obey the laws and revere the magistrate. But to render such obedience and reverence acts of religion, he directs Christians to view the magistrate as God's minister; by whom, as his instrument, God restrains human wickedness, promotes human virtues, and diffuses his goodness among mankind. It is thus that a holy conscience sublimates every thing. It is thus that it transmutes the common affairs of life into acts of solemn worship to God, the author of human society. The other passage relates to suffering. It is contained in 1 Peter, ii. 18—23. "Servants be subject to your masters with all fear; not only to the good and gentle, but also to the froward. For this is thank-worthy, if a man for *conscience toward God* endure grief, suffering wrongfully. For what glory is it, if when ye be buffeted for your faults, ye shall take it patiently? But if when ye do well, and suffer for it, ye take it patiently; this is acceptable with God. For even hereunto were ye called: because Christ also suffered for us, leaving us an example that we should follow his steps: who did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth: who, when he was reviled, reviled not again; when he suffered, he threatened not; but committed himself to him that judgeth righteously." There are unmerited sufferings, to which nothing but conscience toward God can reconcile us.

Alas! Where now are these numerous virtues, which so lately seemed to adorn society, and which some speculative men, in order to establish the hypothesis that virtue preponderates against vice in this world, detail so ostentatiously? They are evanished before these sublime truths, as the mist before the morning sun. They had nothing of

conscience toward God in them; and therefore, though honourable and advantageous, were destitute of religious worth.

But though this antecedent office of conscience be the most important; (for it is surely of more moment to do our duty, than it is to judge correctly of it after it is done,) I must pass on to state that conscience sits as judge on all our actions after they are performed; rewards upright conduct with pleasure, and punishes sinful conduct with pain. These figurative expressions are in universal use, and convey correct and impressive ideas. Better, probably, cannot be employed. The simple fact is, that when conscious of having done our duty, we feel happy; when conscious of the contrary, we feel unhappy. It is obvious that this office of conscience is intimately connected with the foregoing. In the former, conscience applied the divine law to a future action; in the latter, it applies the same law to an action past. In both cases, the law of judgment and the authority of the lawgiver are the same. But it is in the latter case only that conscience rewards or punishes. The most exquisite of human satisfactions flows from an approving conscience. 2 Cor. i. 12. "Our rejoicing is this, the testimony of our conscience that in simplicity and godly sincerity, not with fleshly wisdom, but by the grace of God, we have had our conversation in the world." On the other hand, a condemning conscience often inflicts torments which are without parallel. It is styled "the worm that dieth not." You have an instance of its power in the men who brought to Jesus the woman taken in adultery, with a view of tempting him to render himself obnoxious either to the government by the assumption of judi

cial powers, or to the multitude, by winking at a violation of the law of Moses. Our Lord avoided both snares by an answer intended to wound their conscience. John viii. 7, 8, 9. "He that is without sin among you, let him cast first a stone at her. And they which heard it, being convicted by their own conscience, went out one by one, beginning at the eldest even unto the last."

I shall conclude this part of the subject by quoting a passage in which both these offices of conscience are specified; Romans ii. 14 and 15— "For when the Gentiles, which have not the law, do by nature the things contained in the law, these having not the law, are a law unto themselves: which shew the *works of the law written in their hearts*, their conscience also bearing witness, and their thoughts the meanwhile *accusing*, or else *excusing* one another."

It will easily follow from these principles, that our conscientious pleasures and pains are often equally fallacious. Unfounded remorse, and unfounded self approbation, are among the most common of human things. An additional motive to the formation of a good conscience.

(To be continued).

THE CHRISTIAN'S LIFE OF FAITH.

This short treatise was written by the pious Professor FRANKEN, the founder of the celebrated Orphan House at Halle, in Germany. It was translated from the original German into low Dutch; and thence into English, for the Christian's Magazine.

John xvii. 3. This is life eternal, that they might know thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent.

THIS is the way of faith by which I live, the truth which I have learned from the word of God, and which the Holy Ghost has sealed upon my heart. This is the race ground upon which I run, where I am preserved from every false path, and shall obtain the prize of life.

I acknowledge myself to be a poor and wretched worm; I know that, by my original and actual sins, I have deserved the wrath of God, and am justly obnoxious to temporal death and eternal damnation.

But the son of God has given himself for me, and reconciled me to the Father by his blood, so that God doth not impute my sins to me; but imputes for my justification the righteousness of his only begotten son, which I receive by faith in his name.

That faith by which I am truly justified is of the operation of the Holy Ghost, who has filled my breast with faith.

In this my justification I have found peace with God. I am a child of God, and I am comforted while I rejoice in his grace. I am confident that I shall never see nor taste death, but that I have eternal life, and am passed from death to life.

Since God has thus graciously received me by faith in his Son Jesus, I am not justified at one time

and condemned at another ; but I am always and constantly in the grace of God, and have in my heart the witness of the Holy Spirit to my adoption of God.

I do not at all consider myself to be free from faults and infirmities ; yea, I well know that those which God hath discovered to my view cannot be numbered, and I firmly believe that those which I do not see are more numerous ; yet since I am in Christ Jesus and he is in me, these my faults and infirmities are not imputed to me, but God is forbearing and forgiving towards me as a father with his child.

Notwithstanding, his grace doth not render me careless, but excites me daily to be more and more renewed in the spirit of my mind.

God, who produces whatever is good in me, makes a filial fear to reside in my heart, and he hath implanted an awful reverence for his holy majesty, which preserves me from sinning, or turning his grace into lasciviousness.

He purgeth me as a branch of the vine, that I continually bear more fruit.

I am actually cleansed by the word which Jesus Christ hath spoken, and which I have believed. This is not a mere imagination or false conclusion, for Christ hath truly loved me and washed me from my sins in his own blood ; my salvation which comprises the pardon of my sins, is well ordered and sure.

God has let me feel my depravity, and has given me grace to acknowledge my natural pollution and inability. By this he hath magnified the riches of his mercy in working faith in my wicked heart.

What I have thus seen, and heard, and learned,

by spiritual experience, is more certain and sure to me, than what I see with my eyes, or hear with my ears, or touch with my hands.

God himself has taught me clearly to distinguish between light and darkness, imagination and reality.

But God is not only faithful to forgive our sins, but also just to cleanse us from all unrighteousness.

Therefore I confess my sins and pollution before him, and desire continually to be more and more purified.

I consequently fight against sin, and crucify the flesh with its affections and lusts; yet I cannot do this in my own strength, but through the Holy Ghost, who dwells and works in me.

My beginning, and progress, and ending, is by faith in Jesus.

While I am conscious of my utter inability, and acknowledge that I can of myself do nothing but sin; when I feel that I cannot of myself draw near to God and enjoy his communion, but depend wholly upon his grace, and look to the Lamb of God who bore my sins, and came through his blood to the Father; then a new power is communicated to me, and I feel faith in my heart as a divine light and fire; I taste the love of Christ; and the new man grows as "a good tree in its verdure," which blossoms, diffuses its fragrance, and produces fruit acceptable to God and man.

I do not seek to be justified in one way, and sanctified in another. I have but one way, that is Christ; who is the way, the truth, and the life.

As I cleave to nothing but Christ, when I plead for the pardon of my sins, so I cleave alone to him, and turn in simplicity and sincerity to his

G

grace and power, when I strive to increase in faith, in love, and hope.

Yea, I need nothing more to enable me to stand firmly in the grace received, and the renewed principle which the Son of God has given me, (to know him that is true, and to continue in him who is true) : in this way the work of God is perfected in me ; for God alone, without my aid, is the author and finisher of his own work.

When I yield myself to be formed by him as an infant, and cease to oppose his Spirit, he then works in me both to will and to do, of his own good pleasure.

But it is not his will that I should become negligent, and sink from a sense of my dependence, into carelessness and sloth : I may not, nor do I seek rest and peace in myself ; for this would produce backsliding, and I should thereby imperceptibly withdraw from his divine and blessed influences.

His living and life-giving Spirit worketh always in his people, and happy are they who eagerly drink the vivifying stream, and turn not away from the waters of life.

The Spirit fatigues none by his sanctifying influences. His operations are as a still small voice, and, through strength communicated by him, it is not difficult for a soul, justified in the blood of Jesus, to rise upon the wings of faith and love.

To the humble, the Lord is friendly ; for the graces of the Holy Ghost are richly dispensed to contrite hearts.

But true humility is grounded and rooted in that justification which proceeds from grace.

While the sinner acknowledges no merit in himself, but finds all in Christ, his soul will be filled

with heavenly peace; he will be quickened and strengthened in God; but as soon as his heart is puffed up, and whenever he ceases to seek and find his happiness exclusively in the divine atonement, he treads a path of error, strewed with anxiety and danger.

Nevertheless, God has his appointed seasons for the trial and humiliation of his people; and although the believer may not depart from the right way, he must expect to pass through many temptations and tribulations, that the secret depravity of his own heart may be revealed to him.

But, ah! how readily we deviate from the right and narrow way! how speedily objects occur to the mind, by which the believer, before he is aware of his danger, is drawn from the simplicity of his filial exercises! while he flatters himself with having obtained a better frame of mind, he often slides back imperceptibly from the gospel to the law.

The gospel has a divine simplicity; and infuses into the soul of a believer a benevolence towards all men, arising out of his temper and privileges as a child of God. The gospel is perspicuous; it is a shining light, a pure stream of peace; it gives rest from our own righteousness; it introduces us to the enjoyment of God, and puts us in the possession of his salvation. Blessed is the man who is not made ashamed of his hope; a shame which they must experience who do not look alone to Christ for redemption, while they follow the doctrines and examples of men instead of the Saviour. A shame that will assuredly be experienced whenever, with lofty flights the unwary believer indulges in spiritual pride, and esteems his growth in grace greater than it actually is. No man, by any

pretensions or efforts can add one cubit to his stature; and the new man has also his determinate dimensions.

Nature prefers her own way, and discerns no other for obtaining happiness and perfection, than by our own works, exertions, and righteousness: but the way of God is directly the reverse.

He brings down our pride, reduces our sufficiency to nothing, that he himself may be all in all.

All this is comprised in that one word: he that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life. Lord Jesus! lead me by thy good Spirit in a plain path.

SELECT SENTENCES.

The most advanced saint knows not the thousandth part of the depths of sin that are in himself; nor the thousandth part of the depths of that love that are in Christ. *Hill.*

The *notion* of grace may be abused to licentiousness; the *principle* never can. *Owen.*

FOR THE CHRISTIAN'S MAGAZINE.

IT is our intention to lay before our readers in the course of this work, a detailed but succinct account of the Church of God, embracing the chief questions concerning its nature, members, officers, order, worship, and the points directly connected with them. As we shall proceed upon a regular plan, the reader is requested not to form his judgment of the whole from an inspection of a part; and not to disjoin in his reflections, those parts which precede from those which follow; but to recur to the former as he meets with the latter, that the series of thought may be preserved unbroken in his mind; and that he may not accuse us hereafter with being superficial or negligent, when the blame ought possibly to be attached to his own memory. For having proved a point once, we shall not repeat the proof afterwards, unless for very particular reasons, and in a very summary way. We begin with

An inquiry into the meaning of the term CHURCH.

A community which has subsisted for ages, must always possess a number of usages and terms peculiar to itself. And although their origin may be remote, and their force unknown to many of its members, they suggest general ideas which serve the purposes of common conversation and common life. The fact may appear extraordinary, but it is nevertheless true; for the proportion of men in any society who analyze the words and phrases which they have been accustomed to utter ever since they were able to

speak, is comparatively small. The reader can bring this matter to an easy test by interrogating himself concerning expressions which are coeval with his earliest recollection; and he will probably be surprised to find that, in thousands of instances, they have passed and repassed through his mind without his attempting to arrest them long enough to satisfy himself as to their appropriate sense. This want of precision is accompanied with no bad effect, till something occur to touch an institution, a privilege, or an observance, when the inconvenience may be sensibly felt. A popular notion is often overturned by the interpretation of a word; and the multitude are astonished either at their own mistake, or at the effrontery of those who charge them with committing it.

That which happens to all other durable combinations of men, must happen to the Christian Society. We need go no further for an example than its very name. "Church," "Christian Church," "Church of God," are familiar to the mouths of millions. They talk of "the Church" upon all occasions, without suspecting that perhaps they understand not what they say. They possibly never asked, *what is the Church?* Possibly, they may think it too plain to deserve an answer. Possibly, also, the more they revolve it, the more they may be puzzled. Try the experiment. Put the question successively to several decent, intelligent men, and their replies, various as their previous religious habits, will convince you that their acquaintance with the subject is slight indeed. It is therefore necessary to go to first principles.

The word "Church," derived from the Greek *κίβητος*, signifies "the house of the Lord;" and marks

the *property* which he has in it. But the original words which it is employed to translate, signify a different thing. The Hebrew words *כַּהֵל* (*cahal*) and *קָהָל* (*gheda*) in the Old Testament; and the corresponding one *ἐκκλησία* (*ecclesia*) in the New, all signify *an assembly*, especially one convened by invitation or appointment. That this is their generic sense, no scholar will deny; nor that their particular applications are ultimately resolvable into it. Hence it is evident, that from the terms themselves nothing can be concluded as to the nature or extent of the assembly which they denote. Whenever either of the two former occurs in the Old Testament, or the other in the New, you are sure of an *assembly*, but of nothing *more*. What that assembly is, and whom it comprehends, you must learn from the *connexion* of the term, and the *subject* of the writer. A few instances will exemplify the remark.

In the Old Testament *כַּהֵל* (*cahal*) is applied

To the *whole mass* of the people. . . *Ex.* xii. 6.

To a *portion* of the people, who came upon Hezekiah's invitation to keep the passover.

. . . *2 Chron.* xxx. 24.

To the *army* of Pharaoh. . . . *Ezek.* xvii. 17.

To an *indefinite multitude*. . . *Gen.* xxviii. 3.

To the society of Simeon and Levi. . . . xlix. 6.

So also *קָהָל* (*gheda*) is applied

To the *wholenation* of Israel. *Ex.* xvi. 22.; xxxv. 1.

To the *particular company* of Korah, Dathan, and Abiram. *Numb.* xvi. 16.

To the assembly of the *just*, as opposed to the *wicked*. *Psal.* i. 5.

To the *judicatory*, before which crimes were tried. *Numb.* xxxv. 12. 24;

compared with *Deut.* xix. 12. 17. 18.

In like manner *ἐκκλησία*, (*ecclesia*) rendered "Church," is applied

To the *whole body* of the redeemed.

Ephes. v. 24. 27.

To the *whole body* of professing Christians.

1 Cor. xii. 28.

To *local* organizations of professing Christians, whether more or less extensive; as in the apostolic salutations, and inscriptions of the epistles.

To a *small association* of Christians meeting together in a private house. *Col. iv. 15—Phil. i. 2.*

To a civil assembly *lawfully* convened.

Act. xix. 39.

To a body of people *irregularly* convened.

Act. xix. 32.

This specimen is sufficient to show that no person can answer the question, "what is the *Church?*" without carefully examining the *thing* as well as the *name*: nor safely expound either, without consulting the original scriptures; or putting himself implicitly under the direction of one who is able to do it for him. An attempt to discuss the constitution and order of the church, without looking much further and much deeper than the mere *term*, as it occurs in our English Bibles, can never be any better than childish prattle.

I have said that the term "Church" is applied to the whole body of professing Christians; and my design is to prove that the scriptures teach the doctrine of a **VISIBLE CHURCH CATHOLIC**, composed of all those throughout the world who profess the true religion.

This great society is a "Church," because it is collected together by the authority of God in the dispensation of the gospel, and solemnly set apart from the world for sacred uses.

This church is "visible," as distinguished from

the "elect of God," who are known to him alone; and, therefore, cannot, *as such*, form a separate society among men.

This visible church is "Catholic," that is, it comprehends all those "throughout the world" that profess the true religion."

If then I am asked what I mean by the "Church?" I answer, that visible catholic society which I have now defined; which is the kingdom of our Lord Jesus Christ upon earth, where he has deposited his truth, and instituted his ordinances.

The fact that he has founded such a church, I thus demonstrate.

1. It is indisputable that such a church did formerly exist, and that by his own appointment.

The whole of the covenanted seed of Abraham belonged to it. That this "seed" made up the church of God under the law; that it embraced, at least in some periods, thousands and ten thousands within and without the land of Judea, and among them multitudes who never were partakers of saving grace, cannot be doubted. Every one who had the token of God's covenant in his flesh, whether regenerated or not, was reputed a member of this church. The Jews were scattered, by several dispersions, through distant lands; yet preserving the name of the God of their fathers, and their profession of adherence to him, they were never considered as cast out of his church. On this ground it was, that, on the day of pentecost, "there were dwelling at Jerusalem, Jews, "devout men, out of every nation under heaven*." The old œconomy was subjected to local restrictions which rendered a universal dispensation impossible while they lasted, but still the "professors of the true religion," the worshippers of

* Act. ii. 5.

the God of Israel, made up but *one* church. Reside where they might, they all belonged to the *קהל ייחוד*, the congregation of the Lord.

If, then, there is no longer any public church visible, what has become of it? Who has annulled, destroyed, blotted it out? Produce a single declaration of its divine author that it should come to an end. The disinheriting of the unhappy Jews is nothing to the purpose, or rather supports the contrary. Their being cast out of the visible church, for they could not be cast out of any other, implies the existence of that church, and the privilege of connexion with her. The abolition of those restrictions which were suited to a preparatory state, fitted her for universality. But that which fitted her for universality could in no sense whatever be her annihilation. The Jews were not cut off, till after the commencement and establishment of the new dispensation, that is, till after the Gentiles were taken in: therefore the visible church, as an organized whole, subsisted after the commencement of this dispensation, and that among the Gentile Christians. And the excision of the Jews was no more an extermination of the visible church, than the lopping off a diseased branch, is felling the whole tree. It is incumbent on them who deny a visible catholic church under the New Testament, to show at what time, by what authority, and by what means, so signal a constitution of God has been laid aside.

2. The Old Testament scriptures proceed on the principle that the visible church state, coextensive with the Redeemer's kingdom upon earth, was *not* to cease at the introduction of the evangelical dispensation.

There are numerous predictions concerning

the church, and numerous promises to her, in her *public* capacity, which are unfulfilled at this hour, and never can be fulfilled, if her visible unity be not asserted. For example: "Esaias saith, there shall be a root of Jesse, and he that shall rise to reign over the Gentiles: in him shall the Gentiles trust." Does any man suppose that the "reign" of the Redeemer "over the Gentiles" is confined to those whom his grace has subdued to the "obedience of faith?" And if not, that his kingdom, destitute of a distinctive mark, is broken down into detached fragments, resembling not a compact community, but a horde of petty democracies? The very idea of a kingdom proves that his church is one, that she is visible, and that this visible unity is one of her essential attributes. If you cut her up into ten thousand pieces, there is no more a kingdom. If you strip her of visible form, you contract her within limits of which Omniscience alone is the judge; you withdraw her from the eyes of men altogether; and shut her up in impenetrable secrecy. Where then is her light? Where her testimony? Where the use of those cautions, precepts, encouragements, which are adapted to her state as *visible*, and have no meaning in any other application?

Thus, "I will extend peace to her like a river, and the glory of the Gentiles, like a flowing stream"*—"Kings shall be thy nursing-fathers, and their queens thy nursing-mothers.†" "The Gentiles shall come to thy light, and kings to the brightness of thy rising—the abundance of the sea shall be converted into thee; the forces of the Gentiles shall come unto thee‡"—These are but a very small sample of prophecies

* Is. lxvi. 12

† Is. xlix. 23.

‡ Is. lx. 3. 5.

which run in the same general strain; and two things are obvious on the bare inspection of them. *First*, that they contemplate the church as *one*; for she is introduced as a single person; and under this idea are they addressed to her.

Second—That this unity is not ascribed to her as composed of the elect alone. The Gentiles who should flow into her were not all, nor are pretended to have been, real Christians: that “light” which was to shine upon the Gentiles, and the “brightness” of that “rising” which was to attract the “kings,” must of necessity be *external*: nor could kings be her “nursing-fathers,” nor their queens her “nursing-mothers,” but as a public society which they could *distinguish*. In any other sense the prediction is palpably false.

Further: when he foretells the transition of the dispensation of grace from the Jews to the Gentiles, the prophet uses the same style. He represents the church not as subsisting in a vast multitude of independent associations, but as a great *whole*; as possessing individual unity. He personifies it, as in the former instances: “Sing O barren, thou that didst not bear: break forth into singing, and cry aloud, thou that didst not travail with child; for more are the children of the desolate, than the children of the married wife, saith the Lord. Enlarge the place of thy tent, and let them stretch forth the curtains of thy habitations; spare not; lengthen thy cords, and strengthen thy stakes.”*

This is, unequivocally, a description of the church as exhibited under an outward dispensation. The comparison between the “desolate” and the “married wife,” can have no place in a

* Is. xlv. 1. 2.

question concerning the *internal* church, nor do the other circumstances at all agree to her.

Indeed, whoever admits that there was, at any time past, *one* visible church, and that promises were made to her, of which some have had, others are receiving, and others are yet to have, their accomplishment, must of course, admit the continuance of that church at present. For the *fulfilling* a promise to an individual or a society, supposes the existence of that individual or society. The promises, for example, to Israel, could never have been performed, had Israel perished. The adoption of another family might have been accompanied with other promises, or with the renewal of the old ones: but, in no sense could they be *fulfilled* to a race which was extinct before the time of fulfilment came. The fact, then, that God is *now* fulfilling, and to fulfil *hereafter*, promises given to the visible church ages ago, establishes her perpetuity and identity. She never has been destroyed, or she could not at *this day* enjoy the accomplishment of *ancient* promise.

3. The language of the New-Testament implies, that an external visible church state was *not* abolished with the law of Moses.

The writers of the New-Testament never go about to *prove* that there is a catholic visible church; far less do they speak of it as *originating* in the evangelical dispensation; but they assume its existence, as a point which no Christian in their days ever thought of disputing. They argue against schism, upon the principle that the visible church is one; and they record ecclesiastical deliberations and decisions by the apostles and elders, which, upon any other principle, were downright usurpation of dominion over conscience.

This last particular, will be more fully handled before we have done. Let us, in the mean time, attend to some instances in which this doctrine of the one visible church, is interwoven with the texture of their language.

"This is he that was with the *church* in the "wilderness." Acts vii. 38. Stephen refers to Moses, and we know what church Moses was with. No one, in his right mind, will undertake to say that Moses was with the elect only. "Our fathers," adds the martyr, "would not obey him." Moses himself writes that these rebels were the "people"—the "whole congregation"—"all the children of Israel,*" and this was the "church" to which Stephen refers.

"The Lord added to the *church* daily such as "should be saved." Acts ii. 47. "Saul made havoc of the *church*." Ch. viii. 3.—"God hath set some in the *church*; first, apostles," &c. 1 Cor. xii 28.—"Gaius, the host of the whole *church*." Rom. xvi. 23.—"Give none offence to the *church of God*." 1 Cor. x. 32.—"I persecuted the *church of God*." 1 Cor. xv. 9.

The list might easily be swelled; but it is needless. Let us weigh the import of these passages. The "church," to which the Lord daily added such as should be saved, was not the body of the elect, for no addition can be made to them; nor was it a single congregation, unless God had no more people to be saved in Jerusalem, than, together with mere professors, were sufficient for one pastoral charge. Nor is it to be imagined either that Saul confined his persecution to one congregation; or that he was able to pick out the elect, and persecute them. As little can it be sus-

* Ex. xxxii. Num. xiv.

pected, either that Gaius never entertained any but the elect, or that his entertainments never went beyond one congregation. Nor will a sober man allege, that God hath set no officers but in one congregation, or that they have no functions toward any but his elect; or that all whom he hath set, are themselves of the number; nor yet that "offence" can never be given to any but to the elect. The sin to be committed at all, requires both that the offending and offended, may see and know each other. But the scripture is express. The Lord added to the *church*—Saul persecuted the *church*—Gaius was the host of the *church*—God hath set officers in the *church*—Christians are not to offend the *church*. Now as these and many similar phrases, are utterly inapplicable either to a single congregation, or to the body of the redeemed, they must designate another and different society, which can be no other than what we have called the visible Church Catholic. Too extensive for partial assemblies, too notorious for any secret election of men, and yet a church; *the church*—it is *general, external, and but ONE*.

In truth, the phraseology of the New Testament on this subject, as on many others, is borrowed directly from that of the Old. The expression "church of God," is a literal translation into English of those Greek words which are themselves a literal translation from the Hebrew. For every scholar knows, that $\epsilon\kappa\kappa\lambda\eta\sigma\iota\alpha$ or $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\kappa\eta\lambda\eta\sigma\iota\alpha$; $\epsilon\kappa\kappa\lambda\eta\sigma\iota\alpha$ $\theta\epsilon\acute{o}\upsilon$; and "Church of God," signify in their respective tongues, exactly the same thing. Conceive, then, of an apostle's addressing himself to Jews, as Paul did, in the Hebrew tongue. By what phrase would he designate the church? Evidently by that which is used in the Hebrew scriptures, and

was familiar to his hearers. And what sense could they put upon it? Evidently that which had long been settled, and no other. Would the Jews, then, have understood him as meaning by "the church," either a section of their nation no bigger than could be contained within the walls of a synagogue; or those favoured ones whom God has predestined to life? The thing is impossible! because he would use the current phraseology of both their holy and their popular language in a sense quite different from any which had formerly been affixed to it. They would understand him as discoursing of that great visible society which God had publicly set apart for himself.

Conceive again of the apostle, as addressing Gentiles on this subject; and speaking Greek. He would evidently express himself in the terms which he *has* used in his epistles. What *ἐκκλησία* (*ecclesia*) means, every Grecian could tell. But how was a Heathen to understand the meaning of *ἐκκλησία θεῶν* (*ecclesia theou*), or the "church of God?" He was perfectly ignorant of Christian doctrine, and the structure of Christian congregations. Nor could he form any correct notion of the thing intended, without an explanation drawn from the Old Testament scriptures.

The result stands thus: The apostle, when preaching or writing to Jews or Gentiles, speaks of the church of God in terms well known to the one, and entirely new to the other. The alternative is obvious. Either he used these terms in their ascertained sense, or not. If the former, he has recognized the visible unity of the Church Catholic; and so our position is proved. If the latter, he deceived all his hearers; all his correspondents; all who in every age adopt his letters as a rule of faith. Undoubt-

edly, had he used the terms "church" and "church of God" in a sense unknown to Moses and the Fathers, he would not have omitted to mention it; that we might not be led into error. But the fact is, that there is not throughout the New Testament any exposition of these terms. They are employed as terms of the most definite import; as terms which no one who chose to consult the earlier scriptures could mistake. The law of interpretation to the primitive Christians, must, of course, be our law; and the same issue returns upon us; the expression "church of God," used without qualification, means an external society comprehending all those who profess the true religion.

If any one think that too much stress is laid upon the coincidence between the phraseology of the two Testaments, let him reflect, not only that they relate to a common whole; but that the same coincidence happens in other things. Thus, "Christ," is but the English form of *Χριστός*, which is the literal translation of *מָשִׁיחַ*, (Messiah) all signifying "the anointed." When, therefore, the Lord Jesus was proclaimed as the "Christ of God," how could either Jew or Gentile understand the preacher but by going back to the Old Testament? There the word was perfectly familiar, although, in its sacred sense, utterly unknown to the Heathen. And this explains why a profession that "Jesus is the Christ," was deemed, in the first age of the church, a sufficient criterion of one's religion. No man could make it without being instructed, from the scriptures of the Old Testament, in the Redeemer's character and work. The reason why many now suppose such a profession extremely easy, is, that they do not perceive its relation to truths pre-

↓

viously revealed. And this, too, is the reason why there is so much blundering about the nature of the church. People imagine themselves at liberty to interpret the word at their pleasure: whereas it is referrible to the Old Testament as really as the word "Christ." Neither the nature of the church, nor the office of her head, is to be understood without an appeal to the same scriptures. Consequently, that very rule which expounds "the Christ of God," as signifying one who was qualified by the father's appointment, and by the measureless communication of the divine Spirit, to be a Saviour for men; will oblige us to expound the "church of God," as signifying that great visible society which professes his name.

4. The account which the New Testament gives of the church, confirms the doctrine of her visible unity.

One of the most common appellations by which she is there distinguished, is, "the kingdom of Heaven." This can be but one: or else it would not be a kingdom, and *the* kingdom, but several. And this one must be visible, because its ordinances are administered by visible agency*. Nay it is only *as visible* that it admits of the exercise of any part of its government by men. The church invisible, which eludes every human sense and faculty, cannot be the object of human functions. And to preclude mistake in this matter, our Lord informs us that his kingdom, while in the world, shall, like other kingdoms, have false as well as true subjects. That hypocrites shall so intermingle with saints as to render their separation in the present life impossible by any means which will not exterminate both. Such is

* Mat. xvi. 19. xxviii. 19, 20. John xx. 21—23.

the manifest import of the parable of the "tares." Mat. xiii. 24—30.

An attempt has, indeed, been made, to repel this argument, by supposing the parable to represent, not the mixture of Christians with hypocrites in *the church*, but their mixture with wicked men in *civil Society*. Let us see:

The parable is a likeness of "the kingdom of heaven." A phrase which never signifies the world at large, or civil society; but the church of God under the evangelical dispensation. There was no need to teach the disciples, by a symbolical lesson, that good men and bad are mingled together in civil society. This had been sufficiently attested by the experience of all previous ages, and was at that very moment evident to their eyes. But considering the expectations which they might be led to form from the introduction of a spiritual œconomy, it was altogether needful to apprise them that in her best estate, in her noblest appearance as the kingdom of Heaven, the church would be still imperfect, and injured by unworthy members. Nor could the officers of Christ, answering to the "servants of the householder," ever entertain so wild an idea as that of severing Christians from the society of other men; for were it even practicable, it would defeat one of the high ends for which they live in the world; that of "letting their light shine before others;" and would gradually extirpate them from the face of the earth. But it would be very natural for the disciples to imagine that, with the keys of the kingdom of Heaven in their hands, they should endeavour to exclude every one whom they had reason to suspect of insincerity. Many are infected with such a notion to this day. No

rotten-hearted professor shall pollute their communion; they will rest the right of admission upon the *reality* of conversion. And some waste their lives in pursuit of that chimera, a perfect church. Nor have either the admonitions of Christ, nor the rough tuition of disappointment, cured them of the folly. There was, therefore, much cause for guarding his disciples against so imposing an error. And he has taught them that there are no human means of effecting a complete expulsion of the unconverted from his church: that the attempt would destroy his own people: and therefore, that they must be left, like the tares and the wheat, to "grow together until the harvest." Then, that is, at "the end of "the world," he will "send forth his angels, and they shall gather out of"—what? Civil society? No, but out of "*his kingdom*, all things that offend; and them which do iniquity, and shall "cast them into a furnace of fire: there shall be "weeping and gnashing of teeth"—v. 41. 42.

To the same amount is the parable of the net, in verses 47—50. "The kingdom of heaven is like "unto a net that was cast into the sea, and gathered of every kind." Is this, too, a description of civil society? It is evident, that "the sea," with its swarms of fishes, represents the world with its multitudes of men. Like a net cast into the former, the kingdom of heaven introduced among the latter, gathers a mixed assemblage from the common mass. And as it is impossible, while the net is in the waters, to divide the good fish from the bad; so it is impossible, while the kingdom of heaven exists here among men, to divide saints from hypocrites. The alternative is alike in the type, and the thing typified. The net must be drawn

“to shore,” before the fish can be distributed; the kingdom of heaven must close; “the end of the “world” must come, before “the wicked can be “severed from among the just.” Nothing can be clearer, than that mankind at large correspond, in the parable, with the fish of the sea; consequently, that the kingdom of heaven, which, like a net thrown into the sea, gathers a *selection* from among men, cannot possibly mean civil society. To make this out, it should be proved that the net catches *all* the fish wherever it is cast into the sea.

To crown this argument; the kingdom of heaven is likened unto “ten virgins, of whom five were “wise, and five were foolish*.” This also must mean “civil society,” or the hypothesis we are considering is ruined. But what man in his senses will venture upon so extravagant an assertion? *All* these virgins professed to belong to the train of the bridegroom—*All* the members of civil society make no such profession. It is wasting words to press the point further. This notion of the state of civil society being represented by the parable of the tares, &c. is a fable invented in order to get rid of a troublesome truth: and adds another to the numberless examples already given by zeal without knowledge, of its being much easier to contradict the scriptures, than to explain them. The sum is,

That the kingdom of heaven cannot designate the election of grace; because no one belonging to that will be “cast into the furnace of fire.”—We have proved that it cannot signify the state of civil society, and it would be superlatively ridiculous to confine it to a single congregation; therefore,

It must mean the *external Visible Church*, which,

* Mat. xxv. 1.

according to the conditions of description, can be but ONE.

If we proceed a little further, we shall meet with the same thing under a different form. The apostle Paul, in his first letter to the Corinthian Christians, chap. xii. treats, at length, of the various gifts which the Holy Spirit had bestowed upon various individuals. He argues that these gifts ought to be no ground of dissention, for these two reasons: *first*, that they were all of the same divine original; and *secondly*, that they all contributed to the common good, and most effectually by retaining each its appropriate place. The latter reason is illustrated by the analogy of the human body; and winds up with declaring—"Now ye are the body of Christ, and members in particular." The question is, what are we to understand by the "body of Christ?"

That it signifies a *whole*, is as plain as that words signify any thing. Then, *what* whole? Not the church at Corinth, far less a particular congregation, unless the commission of the apostles and the use of all spiritual gifts, extend no further.

Not the church of the elect; for there are no "schisms" in that body, as *such*. A schism which cannot be perceived is no schism; and the moment you render it perceptible, you are in a visible church. Nor can it be affirmed, but at the expense of all fact and consistency, that God hath set no officers except in the church of his Redeemed. For, upon that supposition no church-officer could ever exercise his office toward any non-elected man; the pastoral relation could never be fixed without knowing beforehand who are the elected of God; or else, no person, however blasphemous and abominable, could be kept out of a

church, because such "blasphemer and injurious" may possibly be "a chosen vessel." These are absurdities.

But a body, a church there is, in which "God hath set, first, apostles; secondarily, prophets; thirdly, teachers," &c. An individual congregation it is not. A partial coalescence of congregations it is not. The "church of the first-born whose names are written in heaven," it is not: and yet it is a church; *the church to which God hath given his ordinances.* There is no escape; it can be no other than what we have called the *Visible Church Catholic.*

The reader has been more inattentive than it would be fair to suspect of any who shall peruse these sheets, if he has not remarked, that all the *means of salvation* are external. The scriptures, the sabbath, the solemn assembly, the sacraments, the ministry; in a word, the whole system of instituted worship, is visible. Now, is it not a most incredible thing, that the church and the ordinances committed to her, should be of opposite natures? Or rather, that the ordinances should have a solid, external existence, and the church to which they are given, no such existence at all! A visible bible, visible ministry, visible worship, visible sacraments, visible discipline, and no visible church! Nothing but a phantom, a metaphysical idea, as the repository of God's truth and institutions! One fact in the history of revelation, is enough to dispel these visions. It will not be controverted that the scriptures are God's testimony to his church. But more than one half of this testimony was delivered to the Israelites in their public covenanted character; for "unto them were committed the oracles of God." Unto whom, then,

have the subsequent scriptures been committed? "Unto the New Testament Church," you will say. Agreed. But the question falls back upon you, what is the New Testament Church? If she is not the very same great society which God formerly erected for the praise of his glory, and has caused to pass under a new form of dispensation, three consequences follow:

1st. That the Old Testament is no part of the trust deposited with her, and belongs not to the rule of her faith.

2d. That God has divided his testimony between two churches of the most different nature; and of which one has long been extinct. Therefore,

3d. That the whole scriptures, as the testimony of God, never were, nor can be, committed to any church whatever, unless in virtue of another special revelation.

But if, on the contrary, these scriptures are the testimony of God deposited with his church, then it irresistibly follows, that she is now, and ever has been, since her first organization, a public visible society which God has appropriated to himself; where his name is known, and his mercies are vouchsafed.

And, indeed, the general principle of the church visible is so inseparable from the Christian style and doctrine, that its most strenuous opposers are unconsciously admitting it every hour of their lives. They talk habitually of "the church; the faith of the church; the worship of the church; the sufferings of the church; God's dealings with his church," and a thousand things of like import. Let them ask what they mean by such expressions? They will not say, "a particular congregation;" and if they say "the election of

grace," they will speedily contradict themselves, and fact, and the word of God too. Their whole language, as Christians, is accomodated to the very thing, which, in form, they renounce. There is no getting along without it. No ingenuity can enable them to converse five minutes together about the church of God, as existing on earth, without the introduction of an idea different from either of those which they affix to that term: and this third idea, if they will be at the trouble to analyze it, will turn out to be no other than that of the Visible Church Catholic.

We have now developed our views of that phrase, "the church," and assigned our reasons for them: the reader will, therefore, recollect, when he meets with it in the course of our disquisitions, that we mean by it the aggregate body of those who profess the true religion: all making up but ONE Society, of which the Bible is the statute book; Jesus Christ the head; and a covenant-relation the uniting bond.

K

FOR THE CHRISTIAN'S MAGAZINE.

THERE are many who hold in great contempt, and treat with much asperity, the kindred doctrines of particular election and particular redemption, as embraced by the Calvinist. They, on the contrary teach, that Christ died for the sins of all and every man in the whole world; and yet they admit that multitudes, notwithstanding his dying for them, do eternally perish. Without pressing any general argument on this subject, we offer, for their consideration, the following *dilemma*, from Dr. OWEN's treatise, entitled, *Salus electorum, sanguis Jesu*; or, *the death of Death in the death of Christ*: book i. ch. iii. p. 22, 23. Edin. 1755. 12mo.

“ God imposeth his wrath due unto, and Christ underwent the pains of hell for, either all the sins of all men; or all the sins of some men; or some sins of all men. If the last, some sins of all men; then have all men some sins to answer for, and so shall no man be saved; for if God *should enter into judgment* with us, though it were with all mankind, for one sin, *no man living should be justified in his sight*—Psal. cxliii. 2. *If the Lord should mark iniquities, who shall stand?* Psal. cxxx. 3. We might all go to cast all that we have “ to the moles and to the bats; to go “ into the clefts of the rocks, and into the tops of “ the ragged rocks, for fear of the Lord, and for “ the glory of his majesty.” Isaiah ii. 20. 21. If the second, that is it which we affirm; that Christ in their stead, and room, suffered for all the sins

of all the elect in the world. If the first, why then are not all freed from the punishment of all their sins? You will say, because of their unbelief; they will not believe. But this unbelief, is it a sin, or not? If not, why should they be punished for it? If it be, then Christ underwent the punishment due to it, or not: if so, then why must that hinder them more than their other sins for which he died, from partaking of the fruit of his death? If he did not, then did he not die for all their sins. Let them choose which part they will."

The work from which the above is selected, we take this opportunity of recommending to all those who wish to see that weighty argument concerning the "redemption and reconciliation that is in the blood of Christ," handled with much ability and scriptural learning. They will meet, as in almost all the volumes of that pre-eminent divine, with a happy illustration of difficult passages in holy writ, and the most conclusive reasoning on the side of those precious truths for which he was the advocate: as well as the most close discussion of objections. We recommend the perusal of his doctrinal and expository works, the rather, as of late years, some men, very little acquainted with them, have permitted themselves to speak contemptuously of Dr. OWEN. Had they lived in his time, or he in theirs, and had they been so unhappy as to engage him, they would probably have found, what their superiors both in talents and literature who made the experiment, found, that in most cases, his grasp was death.

FOR THE CHRISTIAN'S MAGAZINE.

On "*The tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil;*"
abridged in a great measure from a dissertation
of the celebrated C. VITRINGA. Observ. Sacr.
Tom. ii. Lib. iv. c. 12.

THE passages on which the present inquiry is founded, are in the second chapter of Genesis, v. 9. 17. "Out of the ground made the Lord God "to grow every tree that is pleasant to the sight, "and good for food: the tree of life also in the "midst of the garden; and *the tree of knowledge "of good and evil*—and the Lord God commanded the man, saying—*of the tree of the knowledge "of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it: for in "the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely "die.*"

We propose to show why this tree was denominated, *the tree of the knowledge of good and evil*; and what was the design of *prohibiting the use of it to our first parents.*

The current opinion respecting the *first* of these points, is that the tree received its denomination from the *event*; because our first parents having fallen in consequence of eating of its fruit, knew, by experience, the good which they had lost, and the evil which they had incurred.

This interpretation, though patronized by great names, and maintained by able pens, labours under insuperable difficulty. And that, whether we suppose the tree to have been so called by God himself *before* the issue, or by Moses *after* it. The difficulties are these:

1. The Hebrew phrase דעת טוב ורע, i. e. "knowledge of good and evil," cannot well bear such a construction. "To know good and evil," in the style of the scripture, is to understand the nature of good and evil, of right and wrong; and, judging accurately concerning them, to choose the one, and shun the other. In this lies the force of the tempter's argument to the woman, "ye shall be as God (אלהים) *knowing good and evil*. God cannot know evil by *experience*; and the devil was not such a fool as to think of *seducing* our parents by assuring them that *misery* would be the reward of compliance. So afterwards, in that pathetic lamentation, not sarcastic jeer, over the poor apostates. "Behold the man, (who) was as one of "us: to know good and evil*." Here man is said to have known good and evil *before* his fall. *After* it, he knew evil by experience, but not good; and his faculty of judging correctly concerning both, was wofully perverted. He knew good and evil, *as God knows them*: not by experiment surely, but by a clear perception of their natures; for it is thus only that God can know evil: and as it is absurd and blasphemous to imagine, that man, by plunging himself into sin, could become like God; his knowledge of good and evil must have been possessed in the state of innocence, and consequently could not consist in the *experience* of both.

If any doubt remain, as to the scriptural use of the phrase, it will probably be removed by a passage in Deuteronomy, ch. i. 39. "Your little ones, which ye said should be a prey; and your children, which in that day had *no knowledge be-*

* Gen. iii. 22. vide Boston, *Tractatus stigmologicus*. p. 30. 31.

“*twain*” (or of) “*good and evil*, they shall go in “*thither*.” Little children do actually experience good and evil; but they have no *discriminating acquaintance with the nature of either*; they can form no *judgment* on the subject, so as to *choose* the one and *refuse* the other. Such being the sense of the expression to “*know good and evil*,” it is evident that tree in question was not denominated from its reference to the fall of man.

2. If we now repair to the *fact*, we shall strengthen our interpretation.

It is not true, then, that man, fallen from his state of integrity and blessedness into a state of sin and misery, did or could, by *such* experience, know good. With *evil*, indeed, he acquired a practical acquaintance, as he had previously known it only in theory. But how he should learn *good* from being thrust headlong into the depths of *calamity*, being both excluded and alienated, by sin, from the love and fellowship of God, and from all real joy, is most inconceivable! “*By contrast*,” you will say, “*his misery taught him the value of the good which he had forfeited*.” Certainly. But this solution supposes that he did not know good when he was in full possession of it; and it is inconsistent with the idea of experience. For to learn a thing by experience, implies the *presence of the thing when the experiment is made*. But the good was now gone, and therefore could not be a subject of experience.

Let us go on to ask what end was to be gained by naming the tree from the event? Did the most high God design to reveal to man, by such an anticipation, his approaching crime and wretchedness? But how does it accord with the

divine wisdom to appoint a tree as the test of his obedience, and to proclaim, in the very appellation of the tree, his future disobedience, and its dire effects? Shall we say that he did not *understand* the meaning of the appellation? With what view was it bestowed then? To the creator it was of no use; for man's sake it must have been given. But how for *man's* sake, if its *sense* was withheld from him? Will it be said, on the other hand, that the name was not annexed to the tree, till man had discovered, by his fall, the relation which it bore to his condition and prospects? But still, what benefit could accrue from his learning, when his probation was over, that his state had been prefigured by the name of the tree?

It appears, then, that the tree was not denominated from the event; and that the "knowledge of good and evil," is not such a knowledge as arises from experience.

We must look for something more satisfactory.

To know good and evil, does in truth, denote that faculty of judgment by which a rational being distinguishes good from evil, choosing the former and rejecting the latter: that which Paul styles, *διάκρισις καλοῦ τε καὶ κακοῦ**; the *discerning* between good and evil. Assuming this, as having been proved before, there are only two reasons for the denomination of the tree. Either it was endued with some *physical* virtue of sharpening the powers of man in discriminating between good and evil; or it was placed in Paradise, not as a *physical* but *moral* cause of that knowledge; warning him to avoid *death* and the source of death, which were figured by that tree; and to cleave to *life*, the opposite of death.

* Heb. v. 14.

The first of these, although it has amused some speculative minds, is hardly tenable. For it is not easy to see why the creator should forbid the use of a tree to which he had imparted the quality of perfecting man's faculty of judging; nor how, upon this supposition, he could be free from the imputation of *tempting* his creature to sin by the very means which he had selected as a criterion of duty: nor finally, how the taste of a tree possessing such singular virtue, should have produced, in our beguiled parents, an effect the reverse of its own qualities! For if it had the intrinsic charm of enlarging their knowledge and improving their faculties, then the short way to perfection would have been sinning against God! These things it surpasses all the limits of sobriety to affirm: and our conclusion necessarily is, that the tree of "the knowledge of good and evil," was so called, because, from the divine institution, it was a *moral cause* of that knowledge. i. e. it was a visible, familiar, and permanent lesson, by which man was not only admonished of the eternal distinction between good and evil; but was put upon his guard as to the quarter from which alone evil could assail him. This will receive additional light from the

Second part of our inquiry, which relates to the design of *prohibiting the use* of the tree to our first parents.

Regarding that modesty which ought to limit our researches into the divine plans, and obeying the general dictates of scripture and reason, we may perceive that the prohibition answered the threefold purpose of trial, of instruction, and of a sacramental pledge.

That man should love and obey God, would

spontaneously demonstrate itself to his pure conscience, and his sound intelligence. But in that first stage of his being, there could hardly exist an occasion of proving his obedience and love; without the intervention of a *positive* precept. Transgression of those commandments which afterwards were written on the two tables of the moral law, was either physically or morally impossible. And yet it was in itself fit, and for the ends of moral government indispensable, that man's devotedness to his God should be brought, even in his best estate, to some direct and effectual test. All the orders of rational beings of whom the scriptures give any account, were subjected, at their creation, to probationary law. But in what manner a state of probation could exist without a positive precept, is inconceivable. Nothing else could afford an opportunity of evincing submission to the divine authority; because nothing else could present to *holy creatures* a case of collision between their will and the will of their God. It is doubtful whether, without some such prohibition as that relating to the forbidden tree, the devil, sapient as he was, could have rendered a temptation to sin, intelligible to our first parents. For, as nothing else was required of them but what their own pure nature led them instinctively to do, they could have no sense of *restraint*. In every thing else, the will of God coincided with their own propensities: So that throughout the whole range of their gratifications, there was not to be found either the occasion or the matter of trespass. Some positive statute, therefore, which might control their will in a given instance, was requisite to produce and preserve in their minds the sense of

L

their dependence upon God, and his authority over them, without which his *moral government* could have no place. The very fact of their being under moral government, seems to have demanded some positive test of their loyalty: as the very fact of their being rational creatures, supposes them to have been subjects of such a government. The contrary supposition is mere atheism. The propriety, therefore, of a positive test of their obedience resulted from their accountable nature. And the more simple this test was in itself, and the more easy the duty which it prescribed; the more conspicuously was the benignity of their God revealed, and the more inexcusable was their own rebellion. What simpler test could they have chosen, than abstinence from a particular tree, however "good for food, "and pleasant to the eyes?" What duty could be of easier performance; seeing it did not trench upon a single enjoyment; as they were surrounded with similar enjoyments; the Lord God having made "to grow, *every* tree that is "pleasant to the sight, and good for food?" What could be more condescending on his part, than the appointment of so delightful a probation? And, what more wanton, more thankless, or more provoking on theirs, than the violation of its terms?

Disobedience under such circumstances, was of an aggravated sort: but it will appear still more flagrant from the consideration, that this very tree, whose touch was death, was fraught with salutary instruction. Placed in the midst of the garden, and often meeting the eyes of our first parents, it could hardly fail to teach them such truths as these:

That God is the Lord of all things; and consequently that man's dominion was neither absolute, nor independent—that in the enjoyment of God alone, is the satisfying good of man—that in judging of good and evil, man is not to be directed by his own reason or pleasure, but by the revealed will of God—that man had not yet arrived at his highest happiness; but was bound to expect and desire a more perfect state; yet in that *way* alone which God had appointed—that if he would escape death, he must avoid the cause of it: i. e. sin, or the breaking out of his desires beyond those limits which God had assigned to them. How much further the unclouded mind of the first man might have carried his reflections on the forbidden tree; to what sublime conceptions of the divine nature, and works, and providence, it might have led him, we, in our shattered state, with our discordant affections and obscure lights, are poorly qualified to judge. Yet, disabled as we are by the fall, from taking such rapid, capacious, and elevating views of whatever is fair, and good, and magnificent in the creature, and the creator, as were competent to a sinless being, we can discern enough to persuade us that the tree of knowledge of good and evil, must have been, to innocent man, a rich source of intellectual improvement, and moral joy.

The third use of the tree of knowledge of good and evil, was that of a sacramental pledge.

Our first parents were placed not only under the general obligations of moral law, but under a peculiar moral constitution, which the sovereign goodness of God superadded to their condition as accountable creatures. This constitution is ordinarily termed *the covenant of works*, by which, in

the event of their adhering to the terms of their probation, the divine faithfulness was engaged to confer on themselves and on their posterity, an immortality of bliss. But in the event of their failure, that same faithfulness was engaged to subject them and their progeny to the penalty of the law. It will be perceived that punishment upon the commission of sin, was a matter of course. For that a creature shall rise up in rebellion against the creator, and suffer no inconvenience on account of his crime, is a contradiction, if not in words, yet certainly in things. Whereas the promise of eternal life was purely gratuitous; no creature having a right to demand more than this, that so long as he continues obedient, he shall not be miserable. Nor can any good reason be assigned, why the most High God, if it so pleased him, may not create rational beings for a temporary existence only, and, when his purposes are fulfilled, remand them back again to nothing. The promise, therefore, of eternal life, converted the law of obedience into a specific covenant, of which the tree of life, and the tree of knowledge, were the two sacraments; the former being a visible document of God's faithfulness to his promise, and the latter a visible document of his faithfulness to his threatening. And thus the assurance of life or death being exhibited to our first parents, by sensible signs, they were constantly admonished of the interest staked in their hands, and of the infinitely happy or horrible issue of their probationary state.

REVIEW.

ART. I.

A Collection of Essays on the subject of Episcopacy, which originally appeared in the Albany Centinel, and which are principally ascribed to the Rev. Dr. Linn, the Rev. Mr. Beasley, and Thomas Y. How, Esq. With additional notes and remarks. 8vo. p. p. 210. New-York, T. & J. Swords, 1806. Price \$1, bds.

EARLY in the summer of 1804, the Rev. John Henry Hobart, an assistant minister of Trinity Church, New-York, published a work, entitled, "*A Companion for the Altar: consisting of a short explanation of the Lord's Supper; and meditations and prayers, proper to be used before, and during the receiving of the Holy Communion, according to the form prescribed by the Protestant Episcopal Church, in the United States of America.*" This was followed, in the fall of the same year, by another compilation, from the pen of the same gentleman, entitled, "*A Companion for the Festivals and Fasts of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America.*"

These volumes, especially the former, appeared, at the time of their publication, not only to the non-episcopal reader, but if we are correctly informed, to discreet Episcopalians themselves, to advance claims which it is extremely difficult to substantiate.

Of the nature of these claims, the following ex-

tract from the *Companion for the Altar*, will give a general idea.

“ The Judge of the whole earth indeed will do
 “ right. The grace of God quickens and ani-
 “ mates all the degenerate children of Adam.
 “ The mercy of the Saviour is co-extensive with
 “ the ruin into which sin has plunged mankind.
 “ And “ in every nation, he that feareth God and
 “ worketh righteousness, is accepted of him.”
 “ But where the Gospel is proclaimed, commu-
 “ nion with the church by the participation of its
 “ ordinances, at the hands of the duly authorized
 “ priesthood, is the indispensable condition of sal-
 “ vation. Separation from the prescribed govern-
 “ ment and regular priesthood of the church, when
 “ it proceeds from *involuntary and unavoidable igno-*
 “ *rance or error*, we have reason to trust, will not
 “ intercept from the humble, the penitent, and obe-
 “ dient, the blessings of God’s favour. But when
 “ we humbly submit to that priesthood which
 “ Christ and his apostles constituted; when, in
 “ the lively exercise of penitence and faith, we
 “ partake of the ordinances administered by them,
 “ we maintain our communion with that church
 “ which the Redeemer purifies by his blood, which
 “ he quickens by his Spirit, and whose faithful
 “ members he will finally crown with the most
 “ exalted glories of his heavenly kingdom. The
 “ important truth which the universal church has
 “ uniformly maintained, that, to experience the
 “ full and exalted efficacy of the sacraments, we
 “ must receive them from a valid authority, is not
 “ inconsistent with that charity which extends
 “ mercy to all who labour under *involuntary* error.
 “ But great is the guilt, and imminent the dan-
 “ ger, of those who, professing the means of ar-

“ riving at the knowledge of the truth, *negligently*
“ or *wilfully* continue in a state of separation from
“ the authorized ministry of the church, and par-
“ ticipate of ordinances administered by an irre-
“ gular and invalid authority. Wilfully rending
“ the peace and unity of the church, by separat-
“ ing from the ministrations of its authorized
“ priesthood; obstinately contemning the means
“ which God in his sovereign pleasure, hath pre-
“ scribed for their salvation, they are guilty of
“ rebellion against their Almighty Law-giver,
“ and Judge; they expose themselves to the aw-
“ ful displeasure of that Almighty Jehovah, who
“ will not permit his institutions to be condemn-
“ ed, or his authority violated, with impunity.”
This from the “Meditation” for “Saturday even-
ing,” p. 202—204.

As we have quoted the passage, rather in order to connect the circumstances which gave rise to the “collection” immediately under review, than to subject it to rigid criticism; we forbear commenting on several assertions, in maintaining which the reverend writer, if a little pressed, might perhaps find that he has no ingenuity to spare. We now consider it in reference to the subject of the “Essays.”

Extravagant as such pretensions must seem to those whose convictions are of a different sort, and offensive as they were to individuals whose predilections are certainly not anti-episcopal, no notice, so far as we know, was taken of Mr. Hobart’s productions, nor any thing published on the other side till the summer of 1805. Then, a writer, generally supposed to be the Rev. Dr. LINN, introduced into “the Albany Centinel,” under the head of “Miscellanies, No. ix.” some

free strictures on the Episcopal claims. He immediately met with an antagonist of no mean powers, under the signature of a *Layman of the Episcopal Church*, who is understood to be THOMAS Y. HOW. Esq. To the aid of the latter came the Rev. FREDERICK BEASLEY, Rector of St. Peter's Church, Albany, with the venerable name of *Cyprian Clemens*, or Dr. L. himself, shortly appeared in favour of the miscellanist; as the battle waxed sore, the band of the hierarchy was joined by two right reverend prelates, the one from this state, as *Cornelius*; the other from Pennsylvania, as an *Episcopalian*; together with Mr. (now Dr.) HOBART himself, in the twofold form of *Detector and Vindex*; while the *Miscellanist* re-appeared in the characters of *Umpire* and an *Inquirer*. By the forces thus marshalled, five against one, the warfare was protracted till the public grew weary, and the printer interposed to effect an armistice. However, that the record and the fruits of so memorable a campaign might not be lost, the Rev. Mr. HOBART did not think it a misapplication of his time nor a disservice to his church, to gather the pieces of both parties, and republish them in a separate volume with a preface, annotations, and comments of his own. We, accordingly, take up the "collection" as it came from his hands.

We have heard a suggestion of unfairness in this transaction. We do not see how the charge can be supported, unless the writers on the Episcopal side have been permitted to alter and amend their essays without extending the same privilege to their opponents. When an author has committed labours to the press, they become the property of the public, and are open to animad-

version. Mr. H. had, therefore, an undoubted right to reprint a set of essays which had been thrown upon the world without any pecuniary restriction, and to accompany them with such criticisms as he deemed just. If, indeed, an opportunity had been given to one set of writers and not to the other, of revising, and improving their pieces, the treatment would have been unfair in the highest degree: because it would exhibit a fraudulent view of the controversy; one party being represented to more, and the other, of course, to less advantage, than was really the fact. The modification of a single paragraph may cover with ridicule the most forcible argument which was directed against it *before* the modification, and would insult the reader by imposing upon him something which was not the subject of remark. Of so degrading an artifice no reputable man ought to be lightly suspected; nor should the suspicion, when started, be lightly credited. As we have no such suspicion, and as this alone could justify a charge of unfairness, we do not see that Mr. H. is it all reprehensible for his mode of republishing the essays before us.

Mr. H. observes in his preface, that “the friends of the church and of Episcopacy, however reluctant to discuss an important religious topic in a public paper, were compelled to resort to the same mode, for defence, which the author of *Miscellanies* had chosen for his attack.” We lament, as sincerely as themselves, that a *Newspaper* was selected for such a discussion. We lamented it from the first. We never flattered ourselves that it would operate with a favourable influence either on the cause of truth, or on the social feelings of the community.

M

But when Mr. H. and the *Layman*, and *Cyprian*, all complain of being assaulted in the peaceful exercise of a common right, and thus endeavour to throw the odium of aggression upon the author of "Miscellanies," it is rather over-acting. To exclude all non-episcopalians from "the church" which the Redeemer purifies by his blood, and "quicken by his Spirit,"—to pronounce all their ministrations "irregular and invalid,"—to charge them with "great guilt," and threaten them with "imminent danger," for "negligently or wilfully continuing in a state of separation" from the episcopal church—to represent them as "wilfully rending the peace and unity of the church; as obstinately contemning the means which God hath appointed for their salvation,"—as "guilty of rebellion against their Almighty Law-giver, and Judge"—to publish all this to the world; and then most gravely to tell these same non-episcopalians, that there is no attack upon them; but only a little wholesome admonition for the edification of devout episcopalians on the evening before the Holy Communion! and, moreover, to put on a lofty air, and break out into angry rebuke, toward those who are not satisfied with their explanation, is really an improvement in polemical finesse. But hold! let us look again at these pretty figures of rhetoric, by which thunderbolts, hurled at the heads of opponents, are converted into the gentle dews of instruction and consolation to friends—Schismatics, usurpers, renders of the church's unity, rebels against their Almighty Law-giver!—Verily, if this is no *attack* upon non-episcopalians, it is so like one, that we need a shrewd interpreter at our elbow, to prevent our mistaking it. "I never," said Jack, of Lord Pe-

ter's brown bread, " saw a piece of mutton in my
" life, so nearly resembling a slice from a twelve-
" penny loaf!!"

If Mr. H, had intended an attack upon the anti-episcopal denominations, in what manner *could* he have made it? Not by assailing them individually in the street: not by entering their houses and reading them a lecture on schism: not even by preaching against them in his own place of worship: for this would be " instructing his own people;" and if any others should happen to stroll in, he could not help that, more than he could hinder their buying and reading his books; which, according to his own account, he neither desired nor expected. It is the dictate of common sense, that if an author print and publish severe reflections upon any body of men, he not only attacks them, but does it in the most open manner possible. If one of our citizens should write and advertise in the *Gazettes*, a pamphlet, calling all the members of the community, but those of his own sect, traitors and rebels to the government, would Mr. H. or any body else, comprehended in the charge, be satisfied with such an apology as this: " You have no right, sir, to be offended with any part of my pamphlet. It is true, I have called you a rebel and a traitor, but you should not construe these epithets into an attack upon you; for the least candour will enable you to perceive that I published my pamphlet for the exclusive use of my own connexions?" Would this, we ask, convince Mr. H. or any one else, and send him home perfectly satisfied to be denounced, as a rebel and a traitor, so often as a zealous partizan might judge it conducive to the edification of his own particular friends? We believe not.

Neither will the non-episcopalians be satisfied with Mr. H's. apology for himself. They will probably view it as a stratagem, and not a very deep one, to avoid the unpopularity of appearing as the aggressor. Some of them, too, may consider Mr. H's. books as the continuance of a system of attack which commenced several years ago, when a certain preacher declared to the faces of some of the most venerable ministers in this city, that all clergymen not episcopally ordained, are impostors; their commissions, forgeries; and their sacraments, blasphemy*.

These aspersions raised a great clamour at the time; and the repetition of them by Mr. H. and others, though in more decent language, has been loudly censured, as a violation of all the rules of prudence and charity. Of their *prudence* we say nothing. And the offence against charity is not the point of difficulty with us. Nor do we think that

* The preacher was Mr. WRIGHT; the place, St. Paul's church; the occasion, a deacon's ordination; and the text, of which, to use his own words, he "took leave," in order to give the poor non-episcopalians a *hit*, that injunction of our Lord, "*Be ye wise as serpents, and harmless as doves.*" That the orator was right in taking this "leave," will hardly be questioned, as he immediately broke through the second precept of his text; and the consequences proved that he had but little skill in the first. The effusion had more of every thing in the serpent, than his wisdom; and more of every thing in the dove, than her innocence.

A circumstance which rendered the attack an outrage, was the care of the episcopal clergy to circulate notice of the ordination, and their solicitude for the attendance of their non-episcopal brethren! One of the latter, who was present, remarked, at the close of the service, with the pith and point of indignant feeling, that "Mr. W. possessed a large stock of confidence, to tell his bishop to his face, that he was an unregenerated man, and no member of the Christian church!" It being well known, that the Right Reverend Father in God, SAMUEL, bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the state of New-York, had been baptized by the Rev. Mr. DUBOIS, one of the ministers of the Reformed Dutch Church. Therefore,—&c. Alas! Alas!

the author of "Miscellanies," in declaiming against episcopal "bigotry and superstition," has taken the question by the proper handle. These are, at best, ungracious compliments, which, though they may vent the ire of the writer, contribute little to the emolument of the reader; and are generally repaid with good will, and with large interest. Truth can admit of no compromise with error, nor does charity require it. They are the truly charitable who point out the way of life, and warn their fellow men of dangerous mistake. Therefore, we shall neither dispute the right of an Episcopalian to publish his peculiar sentiments, nor when they happen to bear hard upon others, shall we cry out against their uncharitableness. Our concern is with their truth or falsehood. And as we are far from impeaching the sincerity of Mr. H. and his coadjutors, whatever we may think of their discretion; so our criticisms are intended to apply to them solely as *authors*. For their personal characters, we entertain unfeigned respect. Nor can we be justly charged with violating that respect, though we examine their claim with as little ceremony as they have brought it forward. If the error be ours, let them overwhelm our darkness with the effulgence of their light—if the error be theirs, God forbid that any human regards should prevail with us to pass it gently by. With the imperial Stoick, we "aim at *truth*, by which no man was ever injured*."

They tell us then, that their "priesthood" is the only "authorized ministry"—that the church in which it officiates, is the only one in cove-

* Ζητῶ τὴν ἀλήθειαν ὑφ' ἧς οὐδὲς πώποτε ἰβλάθη.—Mar. Anton. Lib. I. c. 21. p. 50. ed. Gatakeri.

nant with God—that where the gospel is proclaimed, communion with this church, by the participation of its ordinances at the hands of the duly authorized priesthood, is the indispensable condition of salvation—that whatever mercy may be extended to those who labour under *involuntary* error, such as *negligently* or *wilfully* continue in a state of separation from the authorized ministry of the church, and participate of ordinances administered by an irregular and invalid authority, are guilty not only of schism, but of contempt of God's institutions; of rebellion against his government, and of exposing themselves to his awful displeasure. In fewer words, their doctrine is, that non-episcopalians are no part of the Christian church; but are “children of wrath,” and without a single hope founded on covenanted mercy. No “repentance toward God;” no “faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ;” no conformity to his image; no zeal for his glory, can be of any avail. The simple fact of their separation from the “authorized,” that is to say, from the episcopal “priesthood,” mars their religion, and renders it stark naught!

This sweeping sentence of proscription is softened by representing it as “not inconsistent with that charity which extends mercy to all who labour under *involuntary* error.” But the relief is not worth accepting. For in the *first* place, so much is necessary to constitute “*involuntary*,” or as it is elsewhere called, “*unavoidable*,” error, that the instances in which the plea could be substantiated would be rare indeed. Access to means of instruction precludes it effectually. And as there are few districts where this question can be agitated, without episcopalians, or their

priests, or their writings, the error must almost always be wilful; in which case the retreat is cut off—and *secondly*, we have no ground to expect even this very precarious mercy, but the *charity* of Mr. H. and his brethren! Warrant from the word of God they have produced none, and have none to produce. If communion with the authorized, or Episcopal priesthood, be to those among whom the Gospel is proclaimed, an indispensable condition of salvation, what possible escape can be left for those who reject it? The very idea of such an escape, however to be effected, is repugnant to that of an *indispensable* condition. No: if the condition be *indispensable*, they who reject it must perish. And if they who reject it may still be saved, it is not *indispensable*: otherwise, the definition might run thus, *an indispensable condition is that which may be dispensed with!* The alternative then is, EPISCOPACY or PERDITION!! Prove this, and there is but one way for us: rush into the arms of the Episcopal Church, and the sooner the better! Prove this, and for our part, little as we are inclined to such a transition at present, we will take refuge immediately in her communion! He is a fool who would put his soul in jeopardy for a single moment, by rejecting an “indispensable condition of salvation;” and risk the loss of Heaven upon the credit of the *charity* of Mr. H. and Bishop HORSLEY!! We are sure that the drift, and have little doubt that the design, of a number of Episcopal publications is to force plain people into such a conclusion.

But before the authors can be justified in uttering a syllable which only looks toward such a conclusion, they ought to be perfectly certain of

their premises. To unchurch, with a dash of the pen, all the non-episcopal denominations under Heaven; and cast their members, indiscriminately, into a condition worse than that of the very Heathen, is, to say the least of it, a most dreadful excommunication; and if not clearly enjoined by the authority of God, as criminal as it is dreadful. That all those glorious churches which have flourished in Geneva, Holland, France, Scotland, England, Ireland, &c. since the reformation; and all which have spread, and are spreading through this vast continent—that those heroes of the truth, who, though they bowed not to the mitre, rescued millions from the man of sin, lighted up the lamp of genuine religion, and left it, burning with a pure and steady flame, to the generation following—that all those faithful ministers, and all those private Christians, who, though not of the hierarchy, adorned the doctrine of God their Saviour, living in faith, dying in faith; scores, hundreds, thousands of them going away to their father's house under the strong consolations of the Holy Ghost, with anticipated heaven in their hearts, and its Hallelujahs on their lips—that all, all were without the pale of the visible church; were destitute of covenanted grace; and left the world without any chance for eternal life, but that unpledged, unpromised mercy which their accusers *charitably* hope may be extended to such as labour under involuntary or unavoidable error; and this merely because they renounced Episcopacy—are positions of such deep-toned horror as may well make our hair stand up, “like quills upon the fretful porcupine;” and freeze the warm blood at its fountain. We say this sentence has been pronounced

upon millions of the dead and of the living, merely because they were not, or are not, Episcopal. For Mr. H. and his friends have declared in substance, what their famous DODWELL has declared in form, that, “ *the alone want of communion with the bishop, makes persons aliens from God and Christ, and strangers from the covenants of promise, and the commonwealth of Israel!*”*

We shall hardly be accused of transgressing the bounds of moderation, when we demand for such assertions, proof which demolishes cavil, and shuts the mouth of reply. And if their authors cannot produce it; if they be not ready with demonstration such as shall make “ assurance double sure,” they must abide the consequences of their temerity.

What the nature of their proof is, and how it will bear them out, we shall enable the reader to judge before we finish this review. We close at present, with two observations.

1. The writers with whom we have to do, lay upon the form of church government a stress which is not laid upon it in the word of God. We are far from insinuating that the question is of small moment; we are persuaded, on the contrary, that it is of great moment; and that Christians are chargeable with much sin for the indifference which prevails among them concerning it. We can never grant that the appointments of our Lord Jesus Christ may be innocently neglected; nor that any one is excuseable for not endeavouring to satisfy himself what these ap-

* That Mr. H. treads closely after Dodwell, see “ *Companion for the Festivals and Fasts,*” p. 59.

N

pointments are. But we are very sure that particular views of external church-order, are not the hinging point of salvation. Whether a man shall go to heaven or to hell, will be decided by another inquiry than whether he was an Episcopalian, a Presbyterian, or an Independent. The scriptures have fixed that inquiry to this point, whether he was a believer in the Lord Jesus Christ or not? *He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved: and he that believeth not, shall be damned.* Again. *Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved.* The reverse is, *he that believeth not is condemned already, because he hath not believed on the name of the only begotten son of God.* According to these passages, faith in the Lord Jesus as he is exhibited in the Gospel, is “the indispensable condition of salvation”—According to Mr. H. and his compeers, participation of Christian ordinances at the hands of the Episcopal priesthood, is the indispensable condition of salvation. We are not ignorant that in other sections of his book, Mr. H. dwells with interest and force, on the necessity of a living and productive faith. We are glad to see so many things in a strain much more evangelical than pervades most of the ministrations in his church. But this inspires us with the deeper regret on account of the “dead flies” among the precious “ointment.” Nor can we suppress our conviction that in representing an adherence to Episcopacy as “the indispensable condition of salvation,” himself, and DAUBENY, and a legion more, have done much toward misleading men’s minds as to the foundation of eternal hope. That which wounds the bosom of tender piety, and of which we utterly deny the correctness, is

their placing the external order of the church upon a level with the merits of our Lord Jesus, in the article of acceptance before God. We are positively told that soundness in the former is “the indispensable condition of salvation;” and faith in the latter cannot possibly be any more. Nay, with respect to non episcopalians, Episcopacy is of *primary*, and faith in the Redeemer of *secondary*, importance: for we are told again, that “whoever is in *communion* with the *bishop*, “the supreme Governor of the church upon earth, is in *communion* with *Christ* the head of it; and whoever is not in communion with the bishop, is thereby cut off from communion with Christ:” and this is said to be a “general conclusion” “established” by “the *uniform* testimony of ALL the apostolic and primitive writers*.” After perusing the paragraph, we were held in suspense between the gaze of astonishment and the swell of indignation. *Why*, he who is acquainted with facts well knows; these gentlemen *ought* to know; and, in due season, others whom it concerns *shall* know. The meaning is not obscure. There is no access to communion with Christ, but through communion with the bishop. Yet, Mr. H. himself being judge, true faith vitally unites its possessor to the Redeemer†; and in this “vital union” originates all communion with him. If, therefore, faith in Christ produces communion with him, and this communion is inaccessible but through the medium of the bishop, it follows that faith in Christ is impossible where there is no communion with the bishop: and that all non-episcopalians are, of necessity,

* *Companion for the Festivals and Fasts*, p. 59. from Daubeny. Quere. How many bow-shots are such writers off from the territory of “our sovereign Lord the Pope?”

† *Companion for the Altar; meditation for Thursday.*



infidels. And thus our position is proved, that Episcopacy is held up as of primary, and faith in Christ as of secondary, importance. For as both are "indispensable conditions of salvation," that one upon which the existence of the other depends, must be the more important of the two. And this is not an example of that sort of priority which obtains in the relation of *means* to *ends*; the use of the former preceding the attainment of the latter; so that the end, which is the greater, presupposes and follows the means which are the less. The case before us, we say, is not of this sort: because we have access to the testimony of God, which must be believed in order to salvation, without going through the gate of Episcopacy. It may be urged, that faith in Christ includes the principle of obedience to his institutions; and therefore to resist them, is to show the want of that obedience which flows from faith. Doubtless the faith of Christ does include such a principle. But this no more proves particular views of church order, than it proves particular views of any thing else which is regulated by Christ's authority, to be the "indispensable condition of salvation." Habitual disobedience to any of his known commands will exclude from his kingdom. Yet there are sins both of ignorance and infirmity which consist with a gracious state. And why an error about church-government is not to be classed among these, the Bible has assigned no reason. And if the high church-men will push their own doctrine, it will compel them to excommunicate each other in their turn. For it is no secret that there have been material differences among them on their favourite theme: and nothing can exceed their confusion and mu-

tual contradiction, when they attempt to found their hierarchy on the scriptures.

At times, we acknowledge, they concede the possibility of “penitence” and a “true faith” out of their church; for it is upon this concession that they rest their *charity* for the non-episcopalian. But as their concession is in diametrical repugnance to their argument, it only lets us see that they flinch from the consequences of their own doctrine.

Upon the whole, we have the best evidence that they lay an unwarrantable stress upon the form of ecclesiastical order, by erecting communion with their priesthood into an “indispensable condition of salvation.” The alarm which they have sounded on this subject, is *vox et præterea nihil*, mere noise; and need give no disquiet to the most timid conscience.

2. Our next observation is, that as Mr. H. and his fellows have denied all communion with Christ to non-episcopalians, they are bound to show, that there is at least, *more* of the truth and efficacy of the gospel in the Episcopal church than in all other connexions. This is not drawing invidious comparisons between Christian denominations, but, on their own principles, a perfectly fair comparison between the church of Christ and a set of associations which do not belong to it. We shall account it no hard task to prove as much of the church of Christ according to our views; nor ought they. For assuredly, if there is not within his church much more of “power and love, and of a sound mind;” much more of the fear of God; of “receiving Christ “Jesus the Lord” and “walking in him;” of *reverential* attendance upon his worship; of domes-

tic and personal godliness; in one word, much more of the spiritual life, and of that "holiness" "without which no man shall see the Lord;" if much more of these things be not found *within* his church than *without* it, "what doth it profit?" Will Mr. H. meet the ordeal? Will he accompany us from temple to temple, from pulpit to pulpit, from house to house, from closet to closet, and agree, that in proportion as there is little or much of "pure and undefiled religion" in them, their grade in the scale of Christian churches shall be low or high? Is it, then, a fact, that in the church which boasts of the only valid ministrations, and the exclusive prerogative of being in covenant with God, there is more evangelical preaching; more of Christ crucified; more plain, close, decisive dealing with the consciences of men, upon the things which belong to their peace, than in many of the churches which she affects to despise? Is it a fact, that her "authorized priesthood" are more scrupulous about the preservation of pure communion; that they object more strongly to the admission of mere men of the world; and are more active in excluding from their fellowship the openly irreligious, than are others? Is it a fact, that they adopt more prompt and vigorous measures to expel from their pulpits doctrine which flies in the face of their avowed principles, and is acknowledged by themselves to be subversive of the Christian system? Is it a fact, that in this "primitive Apostolic" church, the sheep of Christ and his lambs are more plentifully fed with "the bread of God which came down from heaven?" Or that she has less to attract the thoughtless gay, and more to allure those who become seriously concerned about their eternal

Digitized by

salvation, than is to be found in hundreds of churches which she virtually “delivers unto Satan?” Are these facts? We appeal to them who have eyes to see, and ears to hear; especially to to them who “have tasted that the Lord is gracious.” The interrogatories and the appeal are extremely painful; but we are driven to them by the champions of the hierarchy, who appropriate communion with Christ to their own connexions. We, therefore, put them upon their trial before the bar of scripture, of conscience, and of public criticism. We demand the *evidence* of their exclusive fellowship with the Redeemer; we demand it for our own sakes; we insist upon their showing, according to his word, the superiority of their practical religion both in quantity and quality. If they cannot or will not answer, no rational man will be at a loss for the reason.

An Episcopal church we do know in which there are hundreds of ministers, and thousands of their people who are “valiant for the truth;” who exemplify in their own persons the loveliness of the Christian character, and who, with respect to themselves, will never shrink from the strictest investigation. Would to God, we could say as much for all non-episcopalians! But these members of that church who give, in “the fruits of righteousness,” unequivocal proof that the “Spirit of Christ is in them,” are not the persons who advance or defend such claims as are set up by Messrs. DAUBENY and HOBART. On the contrary, they most cordially welcome to their bosoms, as heirs with themselves of the grace of life, all those “who love the Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity:” and they are hated, reviled, persecuted, by those very same high church-

men who, like Mr. H. and his friends, are for confining the covenant of salvation to their own precincts.

We have reached only the threshold of the work which we proposed to enter and examine. But if we have detained the reader with preliminary matter, it is because we could not do justice to the subject without it. He is now in possession of facts and reasonings to show that the actual discussions relative to Episcopacy, are not to be classed with those wrangles of party which amuse ignorant zealots, and disgrace sober inquiry. Nothing less is agitated than the question whether, as non-episcopalians, we are to walk in the "faith of the gospel," in "joy of the Holy Ghost," and with a "hope that maketh not ashamed;" or be shut up under condemnation, reprobated by God and man? As we did not begin the controversy; nor engage in it till after long forbearance under multiplied provocation: and not even then, till we felt ourselves called upon, by an imperious sense of duty, to vindicate the perverted truth, and the abused ordinances, of our master in Heaven; so, having begun, we shall not desist until we shall have exposed those arrogant pretensions, and fallacious reasonings, which are calculated to distress and deceive the hearts of the simple.

(To be continued.)

ART. II. *The Ecclesiastical Catechism; being a series of questions relative to the Christian Church, stated and answered, with the scripture proofs.*
By ALEXANDER M^c LEOD, A. M. pastor of the Reformed Presbyterian congregation in the City of New-York. New-York. Hopkins & Seymour. 1807. p. p. vi. and 129. 12mo. bds.

MANUALS of elementary instruction in the form of question and answer have obtained, from their long and approved utility, a kind of prescriptive right to our regard. But while the press has teemed with catechisms on religious doctrine, information concerning the constitution and order of Christ's kingdom upon earth, has been left, for the most part, to those volumes of ponderous literature which are accessible to few; and utterly useless to the generality of readers. The effects of this negligence are but too apparent. The bulk of even serious professors of religion are deplorably ignorant of the foundation and reasons of that very church order to which they adhere. Their ministers have seldom been at the pains to teach them. Satisfied with mere doctrine, they have insensibly learned to be dissatisfied with every thing else. If they have not settled down into absolute indifference towards the law of God's house, they have taken it up too much on the authority of tradition. As they do not understand its principles, when any thing is done which, though strictly proper, does not coincide with their convenience or their habits, they are both

O

startled and displeased. And when a son of mischief could make no impression upon them by preaching "another gospel," he is almost sure to succeed with a number by attacking them on their defenceless side, their church government. As the subject is new to them, "he who is first in his own cause seemeth right;" and before "his neighbour can come after him and search him," they are carried away; and then, the lure of novelty, the shame of fickleness, and not unfrequently, some less innocent passions, prevent their return.

The evils which, from this source, have recently flowed in upon many evangelical churches in Britain, are at once the scourge of past supineness, and an incitement to future vigilance. Expecting similar effects from similar causes, we have ground to fear, that, without decided effort, the American churches will soon be their "companions in tribulation." We are, therefore, glad to see an attempt to draw the public attention to this matter; and to bring a scriptural view of the Christian church within the reach of juvenile understanding, and the poor man's purse.

Mr. M'LEOD arranges his questions and answers under the following heads—*The Christian church—church-fellowship—church-government—church-officers—church-courts—religious worship—church-discipline.* To the whole are added explanatory and critical notes.

It is obvious from the number of subjects compared with the size of the book, that nothing more is intended by this "catechism" than an outline of truth and argument. Many of the topics admit, and in a larger publication would require, an expansion and illustration which are in-

compatible with the limits of this. Dense and valuable matter, however, is to be found under every one of enumerated heads. We wish that we could commend the *form* of Mr. M's answers as freely as we can their substance. We think that they labour under a considerable defect. They are almost all indirect; by which we mean, that the question is immediately followed by remarks and reasonings *preliminary* to the answer, and that which is properly the answer itself, is reserved for the last. We cannot consider this as a happy mode of construction. Perspicuity and simplicity being essential to an elementary work, this species of inversion ought to have been sparingly introduced, as it is ordinarily unfriendly to both. We are not unaware that Mr. M. has pursued *nature's* method of arriving at a general conclusion through an induction of particulars. But he should remember that *science*, which instruction in *principles* must always be, is the method of nature *reversed*. Ignorance or negligence of this truth upon which every good system of education is founded, has pestered the community with a set of conceited literary quacks who have found out and are plying nature's method of teaching, and gather a crowd as ignorant or negligent as themselves to admire their discovery. Let them boast and admire their hour. If good sense has not fled away altogether, they will soon be left to console each other at leisure*. These remarks, however, are not for Mr. M. We know too well the rank

* A most signal instance of this vapouring folly is to be seen in a book of N. G. DUFIEP, entitled, *Nature displayed in her mode of teaching language to man*. That people who are unacquainted with the science of language should be duped, is nothing strange; but that the deception should be upheld by names which ought to be sacred to the patronage of *sound literature*, is both surprising and humiliating.

which he holds, and ought to hold, in the scale of both sense and talent, to apply them to him. But we are convinced that the effect would have been better, had his questions been so framed as to allow of a short, categorical answer; and the reasons been assigned afterwards. They might have been annexed, with much advantage, to subordinate questions.

There are also instances in which Mr. M. has rather furnished *materials* for an answer to his question, than an answer itself. ex : gr. in ques. 129.

“How shall singing psalms be attended to as a part of secret worship?”

“The book of psalms being a picture of the human heart in the exercises of true religion, drawn with infallible accuracy, must be interesting to every Christian: the person who enjoys in his retirement for secret devotion, an opportunity of reading or singing a psalm, should piously embrace it, making melody in his heart to the Lord.”

Here, it is evident, the author shows rather *why* psalms should be sung in secret, than *how* they shall be sung: although, with some pains, a good direction for the latter might be extracted. The only thing which resembles an answer to the question, is the quotation in the last clause, “making melody in his heart to the Lord.” But this leaves the reader nearly where it found him, as it is not more difficult to answer the question than to explain the text. There is a tendency to this sort of obscurity in Mr. M's style, the correction of which is of importance both to his reputation and his usefulness.

The scriptures do not seem to have been all selected with equal care. Were we opposed to praying societies, we should hardly be convinced by Mr. M's *proofs* of their being a “divine or

dinance." Qu. 137. p. 59. 60. The passages cited may receive an easy and natural interpretation without referring them to "praying societies" at all.

Qu. 79 affords another example. The "official duty of a deacon" is said, and truly said, "entirely to respect temporal affairs." The proof is from Rom. xii. 8. "He that giveth, let him do it with simplicity." Now there is strong doubt, to say the least, whether the text has any respect to the deacon's office. The proof under Qu. 75, from Acts vi. 2. 3. is much more to the purpose.

Mr. M's style, though neither turgid nor sterile, has frequently a stiffness, an abruptness, and an awkwardness of collocation, which will wear away by the liberal use of his pen.

These observations do not detract from the general merit of his work. The following extracts will serve both as a specimen of his manner, and to correct mistakes on two interesting subjects.

"56. Wherein did the office of an apostle differ from that of an ordinary Christian minister?"

"The Apostles often take the name, and act in the character, of ordinary ministers^a; but the apostolic office was temporary and extraordinary. The apostle must have personally seen the Lord^b; must have obtained, immediately from Christ, his commission^c; must have the power of communicating miraculous powers to others^d; and possess authority, not limited in its exercise to a particular parish or diocese, but extending equally over all the churches^e."

"a 1 Pet. 5. 1. b 1 Cor. 9. 1. c Gal. 1. 2. d Acts 19. 6.
e 1 Cor. 7. 17*."

The ensuing extract is the note to the answer to Q. 22:

"Is saintship the criterion of membership in the Christian church?"

* The proofs are written at length in the Catechism.

“ The officers of the visible church must act according to law. They sit in judgment, not upon the state of a person in the sight of God, but upon his profession and his character, in the sight of men. The pastor should, privately and publicly, deal faithfully and plainly with men's consciences. He should endeavour to discover their religious state, and their progress, in order to divide rightly the word of truth. But when, in common with his elders, he sits in judgment upon the admission of an applicant to church privileges, or upon the exclusion of a member from the fellowship of the visible church, he acts not upon private suspicions, but upon the evidence of *overt acts*. We are not to receive a man to communion, merely *because he is regenerate*, nor are we to reject him, merely *because he is unregenerate*.

“ 1. We are not officers of the invisible church. Saintship is, in it, the criterion of membership.

“ 2. It is *impossible* that regeneration is the criterion of membership in the visible church: no mere man can judge the heart. Upon this principle, we *never* could associate in the church with confidence. We cannot be *certain* of one another's regeneration.

“ 3. It is *presumption* to say that saintship is the criterion of visible membership. It condemns the conduct of Christ, and of the apostles. Christ admitted as a member, and ordained as a minister, Judas, whom he knew to be unregenerate. Simon the sorcerer was a baptized church member, while in the gall of bitterness and bond of iniquity. Here is our example, that private suspicions, yea, certain knowledge, unless founded upon some *overt acts* capable of proof, is not the rule of judgment.

“ 4. By a divine constitution, the church of the Jews included some unregenerate men. The holiness of God is the same at all times. “ Holiness becometh his house for “ ever.

“ 5. The Christian visible church, according to Christ's account of it, embraces some unregenerate men.

“ Is it a vine? It has barren branches. Is it a field of growing corn? The tares must grow with the wheat until the harvest. These tares are the children of the wicked one. This is not to be denied. It is the devil that brings hypocrites and self-deceivers to make application for church

membership. But the vigilance of Christ's servants cannot keep them always without. We warn all of danger. We deal plainly with their consciences. If they deceive us by a false profession, their blood be upon their own heads. But no general law, by which the tares should be rooted up, could preserve the wheat unharmed.

"6. The principle, that regeneration is the criterion of membership, is pregnant with mischief. 1. It encourages ignorance in ministers. Why should they labour to understand the constitution, laws, and history, of the visible church, seeing they have only to judge whether such a man have grace or not, in forming a church? 2. It is an engine of tyranny. There is no rule to be prescribed for him who erects his metaphysical apparatus to judge of my heart. 3. It encourages spiritual pride. "Stand by," says this discernor of spirits, "I am holier than thou." 4. It is destructive to piety. The church, upon my admission, has pronounced me regenerate. I have no need of self-examination. My joy, instead of a thirst for holiness, will hereafter be fed by repetitions of experience. 5. It encourages licentiousness. If a saint is not to be excommunicated, he may indulge in scandals, even in murder and adultery, with impunity. 6. It is a certain method of banishing saints from the church, and of receiving hypocrites. The sincere Christian is more inclined to *do* what he *ought*, than to *proclaim* what he *feels*. The libertine, who lived without God, having, some how, believed the doctrines of grace, and immediately conceived himself a remarkable monument of divine grace, while he is in heart a libertine still, is the most suitable member for such a communion. Under pretence of being strict, such terms of communion are in fact the most latitudinarian.

"Let none be induced by these remarks, to consider as a church member any person, merely because he is respectable in the world, is partial to a certain system, or holds a pew in a place of worship. The qualifications for church membership are expressed in answer to Question 26."

Upon the whole, we can cheerfully recommend Mr. M's work to the serious reader; and sincerely wish that its acceptance with the public may encourage and enable him to emit, in a short time, a new and improved edition.

ART. III. *An Address delivered to the candidates for the Baccalaureate in Union College, at the anniversary commencement, July 30th, 1806* By ELIPHALET NOTT, D. D. *President of Union College. Published by request. Schenectady. Stevenson. 8vo. pp. 18.*

THINGS of small moment in themselves often acquire importance from the names and circumstances with which they are connected. When men of popular character and influential rank publish, even a small pamphlet, they excite a peculiar interest, and frequently make a powerful impression. And when a man, like Dr. NOTT, standing, with reputation, at the head of a respectable seminary, communicates to the world his parting instructions to his pupils as they successively retire from his inspection, the love of letters, of country, and of religion, combines with motives of curiosity to multiply his readers. For our part, we took up Dr. N's "address," with no low expectation. We had anticipated a clear, decided, and affectionate testimony to that gospel on the faith of which the happiness of these youths is suspended, and for urging which upon their consciences a more auspicious season could hardly have been selected. We had anticipated dense and luminous moral maxims which might serve them as a manual of practical wisdom. We had anticipated, finally, a pure, a simple, and a manly eloquence, which they might propose as a model for their own style. Thus prepared, we sat down to peruse the "address:" but as we

proceeded, our hope drooped ; and we rose up disappointed and grieved.

In the style of Dr. N. we perceive the flashes of a vivid imagination, but an imagination unequal, erratic, and uncontrolled by the laws of correct taste. For that precision, that strength, that chastened and firm and commanding dignity, which befitted the occasion, we looked with anxiety ; but we looked in vain. In addressing a promiscuous audience, the most disciplined mind may and should yield to its unsought impulse, and seize the rapid image, assured that trifling deviations from accuracy will be more than compensated by effect. But into addresses which blend together the governour, the preceptor, the friend, and the parent, this liberty is not admissible. To the ardent and even impassioned, we will concede a place, as well as to the cool and didactick. But when we are hurried from object to object, and from scene to scene, when our guide starts from the “ festive board ;” has us up to “ the stars which decorate the firmament of God ;” then down to “ the worthless pebble that sparkles amidst the dust and rubbish on his footstool”—then away, through “ beauty, grandeur, novelty ; all the fine arts—music, painting, sculpture, architecture, gardening,” to “ the interminable line of heavenly excellence ;” and back again to the first perceptions of a child—the moral sense—the hypocrisy of infidels—to Cain, and Herod, and Belshazzar, and Galerius, and Caligula ; and conscience “ shaking her terrific sceptre, and uttering her monitory voice ;” while at every step of this prodigious journey forms and figures of various shape and hue, “ dance” before our eyes “ in all the mazes of metaphorical confusion,”

P

we are obliged to cry him mercy. Our heads cannot bear such a dizzy flight.

If these things were even proper in themselves, they crowd too thick upon each other. They produce a glare, not a steady light. But they are quite unseasonable; *non NUNC his erat locus*. They would have been much more tolerable in an oration by one of the young gentlemen, than in the parting counsel of their president. We could scarcely read a page without recalling the remark of one of the best critics of antiquity concerning incongruous writers:

Delphinum sylvis appingit, fluctibus aprum.

Nor is the Dr's. phraseology irreprehensible—"Approbates" is an Anglo-Americanism which a classical pen should avoid. He speaks of

"A field whose distant boundary departs from the beholder: whose nearest border, after the advances of six thousand years, has been but partially explored."

The "boundary" of a *field* "departing," is an odd personification. But, passing this, the idea of the boundary "departing from the beholder," supposes that the beholder was *at* it, or at least, that it was present to his sight; for nothing can depart from another without their being previously together. And how an eye can take in a view of the "*distant* boundary," which it must if we talk of a "beholder;" when it has been able but "partially to explore the *nearest* "border, after the advances of *six thousand* "years," we profess ourselves unable to conceive. It must be an eye of "clearest ken," indeed. Just such a one as belongs to the "intellectual "observer," before whom "the *entire universe* "is spread out." With "observers" of so large

a vision we have not the honour of being acquainted. We are also at a loss to comprehend how "conscience" is a "symbol" of the "Divinity." Nor are we at all assisted by the huge capitals in which the first and last of these terms are printed. We swell not the list of improprieties: but we are rather surprised at their number, considering the liberties which some saucy wits took with the Rev. President on a former occasion.

We are not less disappointed with regard to the *moral maxims* of this address, than we are by its manner. Useful hints it certainly throws out. But this is meagre praise. It would be absolutely worthless without them. The youth for whose benefit they are designed were entitled to more. The general course of conduct to be pursued in actual life should have been traced out. Precepts of prudence should have been added; and directions for the cultivation of studious habit, and the attainment of literary excellence, should not have been forgotten. Of all this Dr. N. seems to have been sensible; as he apologizes for the omission, on account of having "detained them so long on the means of happiness;" and he dismisses them with "an incidental thought or two suggested by the times in which we live." They ought not to have been thus dismissed. They ought not to have been "detained so long on the means of happiness," in the way in which Dr. N. has treated that subject. Glowing declamation on the value of bodily pleasures, which our young men are not likely to underrate; on the superiority of "mental enjoyment;" or even on the "moral sense," do little, very little, toward the formation of just character. They fill the hearer with admiration of the speaker; but they

leave no definite impression on the mind ; and after furnishing topics for some light conversation, they vanish " into thin air." But we have more serious objections. In referring them to the pleasures of our sensitive, intellectual, and moral nature, for the " means of happiness," Dr. N. has exposed his pupils to imminent danger of mistake and corruption. He has drawn his proofs and persuasions from a metaphysical speculation on the human faculties. Such speculations judiciously managed, are of use in illustrating and enforcing moral truth; but every step beyond this, is a step on suspicious ground. Contemplating man as a depraved being, we are bold to affirm that such a view as Dr. N. has taken of the " means of happiness," never did and never will bring a strong perception of moral obligation upon the conscience. It is a melancholy fact, that from the moment the authority of God, speaking in his word, as the sole rule and reason of moral conduct, gave place to abstract theories about the senses, the intellectual and the active powers of man, the schools of moral philosophy have been mere hot-beds of infidelity. They have done more toward destroying the religion of our Lord Jesus Christ, than all the writings and blasphemies of avowed foes, from old CELSUS down to THOMAS PAINE. We tremble to see that Dr. N. has undesignedly led his pupils along the confines of the infected region : and we cannot dissemble our fears that his philippic against infidelity will be ineffectual to counteract his own doctrine on the " means of happiness." We feel the more acutely on this subject, as every thing which Dr. N. has said might have been said without difficulty, by a sober deist. The very infi-

delity against which he has pointed his censure, includes not the unbeliever in divine revelation. It is that "scepticism which never gave to a single individual a settled, firm, and abiding belief, that there is no God, no futurity, or that man is not accountable *;" It is only blank *atheism* that Dr. N. rebukes.

The looseness of Dr. N's. language resembles that of his ideas. He tells these young men of their "innocence," of the "delicate, the pure, the sublime, he had almost said" (they are his own words) the "*holy* pleasures," of intellect. It is well he did *not* say it. He tells them of a "depravity of taste" respecting these intellectual pleasures, "which merits eternal reprobation"—He tells them, that,

"When a child first begins to look abroad into the works of the creator, he *naturally* refers the objects which surround him to an adequate first cause, and asks, "Where is God their maker?" If sudden danger threatens him, his eye is directed to the *heavens* for relief. If unexpected happiness overtakes him, his heart breaks forth in grateful acknowledgements to an unseen benefactor †."

All this is done by the child when he *first* begins to look abroad into the works of the creator! Where are we? Here is fine painting; but it is no likeness of *our* world. The pencil of the Divine Spirit has drawn a very different picture. See characteristic traits in Gen. vi. 5. and Psal. lviii. 3. and a whole length portrait, in Rom. i. 20—32. iii. 10—18. These testimonies are equally applicable to the eulogy on the savage, in p. 10. If nothing more is intended than to assert the existence of a religious principle in man, the proof is extremely awkward; and to represent

* P. 10.

† P. 9.

this general principle as a means of happiness, without fixing it under evangelical connexions, is as false in theology, as it is nugatory in experience.

If any thing could atone for the offences committed against "sound doctrine" by such careless declamation, it would be an affectionate testimony to the gospel and the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ. Here was our chief hope, and here has been our chief disappointment. We transcribe Dr. N's. words entire.

"I cannot sum up all that I would wish to say to you better than by placing the entire character of JESUS CHRIST before you as a PERFECT MODEL, in the imitation of which will alike consist your happiness and glory. On every important question, in every trying situation, ask what would have been HIS opinion; what HIS conduct, and let the answer regulate your own"—

And is this ALL that Dr. N. would wish to say to his pupils concerning the Lord Jesus Christ? Is this more than many of the bitterest enemies of his Deity and atonement would say without hesitation? What, not a sentence to impress on the hearts of these youths the conviction that they are sinful, perishing creatures? and need, and must have, an infinitely better righteousness than they can work out for themselves, if they go not down to the pit? Not a sentence about the love of Christ, the virtue of his sacrifice, and the absolute necessity of faith in his blood for eternal life? Not a sentence of reconciliation to God by the death of his son, as a source of happiness? No, reader, not a single sentence! Is it thus that the Apostle Paul would have parted with stripplings just sallying forth into the world? Would a tender Christian parent, whose office and feel-

ings Dr. N. appropriates, have parted with them thus? Ought Dr. N. thus to have parted with them? Ah! *pudet, pudet!*

In these strictures we discharge a duty to our God, to our conscience, to our country, to our youth, to Dr. N. himself. However slightly the errors of others may be noticed, the errors of such a man must not escape the most rigid scrutiny. The activity of Dr. N's mind; the vigour of his application; the eloquence of his manner, the popularity of his name, the influence of his station, all render his sentiments and expressions a matter of public interest. And if our animadversions on his address have been severe, they have proceeded from our devotion to the truth, and our desires that his labours may be eminently serviceable to the cause of religion and letters; may afford himself a pleasing retrospect; and be rewarded with honourable fame.



ART. IV. *Memoirs of the late Rev. William Marshall, pastor of the Associate congregation in Philadelphia.* Philadelphia. M'Culloch. 1806. 12mo. p. p. 50.



SUCH "memoirs" as these, are an indignity offered to the memory of a respectable man. The persons whose interest in the work is least equivocal, and will be fully recognized by every sensible reader, are the cook-maid and the vender of snuff, to whom, for their own proper use and behoof, we adjudge it accordingly.

RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCE,

According to the order intended to be observed in this miscellany, should have immediately followed the reviews. We entreat the reader's indulgence toward the omission of this article in the present number. Matter which was necessary to give him a fair specimen of the work offered to his patronage, has unavoidably, and almost imperceptibly, spread itself over the space which had been allotted to "intelligence." We were the less solicitous to prevent this encroachment, as we found it extremely difficult, at the commencement of our publication, to procure a sufficient quantity of information, valuable in itself, and properly authenticated. On this head we shall freely commit ourselves to the candour of our friends, as we shall fill our pages neither with trifling occurrences, nor with unaccredited rumours.

With respect to the materials to be derived from foreign sources, it is our design not to insert at length, the multifarious letters and communications which crowd the European Magazines; but, in so far as it shall be practicable, to compress their contents into a succinct and perspicuous narrative, referring to the papers themselves only as documents. If we depart from this rule, it will be to insert a piece that might suffer from abridgment, or to record events through which no regular chain of history can be preserved. In pursuance of our plan we shall offer to our readers a separate view of each of the lately attempted missions to the heathens, from its beginning down to the arrival of the most recent accounts.

THE
CHRISTIAN'S MAGAZINE.

Of Sacrifices.

The following Dissertation from Dr. DELANEY'S *Revelation examined with Candour*, is so replete with good sense; so adapted to existing circumstances; and probably so new to most of our readers, that we make no apology for inserting it in preference to an original essay on the same subject.

THE next interposition to that which took place immediately after the fall, of the Divine Being, which we meet with in the Scriptures, is in the cloathing of *Adam* and *Eve*: and soon after follows an account of his acceptance of *Abel's* offering, and his non-acceptance of *Cain's*; from whence men have been generally led to believe, that sacrifices were of divine institution. Let us then examine what evidence can be collected either from scripture or reason on this head, and then see whether they both lead to the same conclusion.

In *Hebrews* xi. 4. the author of that Epistle tells us, that by faith *Abel* offered unto God a more ex-

VOL. I.—N^o. II.

cellent sacrifice than Cain, by which he obtained witness that he was righteous, God testifying of his gifts ; and by it, he being dead, yet speaketh.

Now the sacrifices here referred to, are evidently these of which *Moses* gives us some short account in the fourth chapter of *Genesis*, where he tells us, that *in process of time Cain brought of the fruit of the ground an offering unto the Lord. And Abel, he also brought of the firstlings of his flock, and of the fat thereof. And the Lord had respect unto Abel and to his offering : but unto Cain and his offering, he had not respect.* He then proceeds to tell us, that, upon this preference, *Cain was very wroth, and his countenance fell. And the Lord said unto Cain, Why art thou wroth ? And why is thy countenance fallen ? If thou doest well, shalt thou not be accepted ? And if thou doest not well, sin lieth at the door.*

In these words it is plainly implied, that *Abel* acted well, *i. e.* righteously, in the business of his sacrifice ; and that *Cain* acted not well, *i. e.* unrighteously, in the business of his sacrifice ; and that in consequence of this defect, sin lay at his door.

Now this righteousness in *Abel*, by which he obtained the preference to his brother, the apostle ascribes to his faith.

By faith Abel offered unto God a more excellent sacrifice than Cain, by which he obtained witness that he was righteous, God testifying of his gifts.

Here we see, that, according to the scripture account, the first act of worship which God accepted with open marks of approbation, from the foundation of the world, was a sacrifice ; in which the life of one of his creatures was devoutly offered up to him : and that what made it acceptable

was the faith of the offerer ; by which he obtained an attestation from God himself that he was righteous.

In this account of the preference of *Abel* to *Cain*, are contained two points of doctrine which are remarkably the objects of ridicule with the infidel world, above all the other duties of religion that ever were enjoined under the *Jewish* or *Christian* œconomy.

The first is, that sacrifice was from the beginning acceptable to God : and the next, that faith made it so.

For some think nothing more absurd than to imagine that God could ever be gratified or appeased by the destruction of his creatures. And, if this action could not in its own nature be acceptable to God, how could faith make it so ?

Now to clear these objections, which I own are plausible, let us first inquire how far reason can evince that sacrifices were of divine institution ; and secondly, what light the scriptures give us on that head ; and if both these evidently lead to one conclusion, our last inquiry must be, what ends were intended by Almighty God to be served by this institution ?

I. Then, I am to inquire whether reason evinces that sacrifices were of divine institution ? And in order to clear this we must have recourse to one plain principle ; or in other words, to a plain truth which no candid reader will, I believe, contest ; which is this :

That whatever practice obtains universally in the world for any considerable number of years must obtain in it either from some dictate of reason, or some demand of nature, or some principle of interest, or some powerful influence or injunction of some Being of universal authority.

Now, that sacrifices obtained universally, for many ages, over all the regions of the known world, I believe will not be denied by any man who makes the least pretence to the knowledge of antiquity. And, that the practice did not prevail from any dictate of reason, the adversaries of revelation will, I believe, readily own: it being evident, that unprejudiced reason never could antecedently dictate, that destroying the best of our fruits and creatures, could be an office acceptable to God, but quite the contrary. Also that it did not prevail from any demand of nature, is undeniable: for, I believe, no man will say, that we have any natural instinct or appetite to gratify in spilling the blood of an innocent, inoffensive creature upon the earth; or burning his body upon an altar. Nor could there be any temptation from appetite, to do this in those ages when the whole sacrifice was consumed by fire; or when, if it were not, yet men wholly abstained from flesh; as there is all the reason in the world to believe, that, at least, the religious part of them did for the first sixteen hundred years from the creation*. And consequently, this practice did not owe its origin to any principle of interest; and so there could be no priest-craft in the case, during that period.

Also in after-ages, the duty of sacrificing belonged to the father of the family; who was more interested in the well-being of it than any other person whatsoever; and consequently, could have no interest in creating an unnecessary expense. And after this, when fathers grew up into princes, by the increase of their families; the priesthood,

* This point is at least doubtful.—*Ed.*

we know, became an appendage of royalty: and sacrifices were then also at the sacrificer's own expense.

We also know, that libations and offerings of several kinds were the constant practice of private men in their own families; and that priests had no perquisites from them; nor can they, with any colour of reason, be suspected to have had any emolument of any kind from this practice, in any region of the earth, till more than two thousand years from the first institution of this rite. Though, if they had, it is evident, that the advantages derived upon any particular set of men, from any practice, is far from being a proof that such a practice had no original foundation but in the subtilty and interest of that particular set of men. In truth, the supposition is as absurd as any thing can well be imagined; and will affect every profession under heaven, as well as the priesthood; from the prince upon the throne, to the meanest officer and artizan in the commonwealth. Nay, in truth, will affect every profession in the world, much more than the priesthood: because that is the only profession which was originally disinterested in the discharge of duty proper to it.

We own indeed, that orators in *Rome* did plead the causes of their clients, in the flourishing state of the commonwealth, without any such fees as are now paid to pleaders amongst us, on like occasions: but this by no means clears them either of the suspicion or proof of being mercenary in that conduct; because that was the sure and known way to the highest honours, and most profitable employments in the commonwealth. But the father of the family cannot be so much as suspected of having any interest of any kind in less-

ening his own power, by lessening his own property, in the business of sacrifices ; which was indisputably the case. And therefore the priesthood is the only profession in the world, which is clear of all suspicion of interest in the business of its profession, for more than two thousand years from its first institution ; at least, if the priesthood be allowed as old as sacrifices : and if it be not, it is plain that sacrifices are not the invention of priestcraft.

And this observation should, methinks, make any infidel, who had any remains of modesty, blush for such insults upon any order of men, as are demonstrably founded in ignorance and untruth. Since it is demonstrable, that, if sacrifices were the invention of priestcraft, priests practised their craft to their own sole detriment, for more than two thousand years ; which surely was a very strange kind of policy. And, if sacrifices be two thousand years older than priests, certainly it were somewhat hard to place the invention of them to the score of priest-craft.

Since then sacrifices are demonstrably not the invention of priest-craft, nor the dictate of reason, nor the demand of nature ; I should be glad that infidels would so much as attempt to tell us, with any colour of reason and proof, how they prevailed so universally in the world, otherwise than from divine appointment ? How any practice could obtain in the world, to which mankind were neither urged by the interest and subtilty of any particular set of men, nor by any dictate of reason, nor by any instinct or demand of nature, nor by any interest of any kind ; but, quite the contrary, in direct contradiction to every principle of reason, and nature, and interest ; (for the destruction of innocent and useful creatures, is against reason,

against nature, and against interest): I say, how such a practice could prevail, and prevail universally, is impossible to be accounted for, but from some powerful and irresistible influence of example, or injunction of authority. And what example could have such influence, except that of *Adam*, or what authority could have such power, except that of God, is to me, I own, utterly inconceivable.

If you say, superstitions prevail unaccountably in the world: I answer, that all superstition has its origin in true religion; and may, for the most part, be easily traced up to its true fountain. All superstition is abuse; and all abuse supposes a right and proper use. The very idea and definition of superstition, is a superstructure of extravagance, and folly, and falsehood of some kind; and all such superstructures necessarily suppose some foundation of regularity, and reason, and truth. This is the case even of little particular superstitious practices of particular times and places: but where any practice is universal, there it must demonstrably have some universal cause. And that, as I have shown you, can be no other in the case before us, but either God, the founder of the world, or *Adam*, the founder of the human race; from whom it was derived to all his posterity.

If infidels say this practice is from God, they then give up the point in dispute; if they say, from the first father of mankind, (which is the only thing that can be said with any colour of reason) the question will still recur, why *Adam* practised a rite so cruel, and so contrary to reason and nature? Or why he should propagate a practice to his posterity, which he could not but know, would be so detrimental to them, as the regular, annual destruction of the very prime of all the creatures, that

would be most useful to mankind, to the end of the world ?

We see, indeed, that some parents are now weak and wicked enough to encourage their own vices and extravagancies in their issue; (tho' the greater part, even of weak and wicked parents, take the quite contrary course): but then, where they do countenance their own faults and follies in their children, it always is in such instances as carry pleasure, or profit, or advantage of some kind along with them; and the reason of this is not hard to be discerned. Sometimes they think the practice of their children a plea for the same practice in themselves; at other times, they are urged to this conduct from the hopes of conveying the pleasures, or profits, or advantages of those practices to their children, without the evils they themselves suffered from them: they flatter themselves, that their issue, warned by the example of the father's miscarriages, may obtain every thing desirable in their iniquity, with more security: but sacrifice was such a practice, as, unless enjoined by the authority of God, must of necessity be detrimental; without any prospect of pleasure, or profit, or advantage of any kind. And therefore, unless *Adam* was worse than an idiot, it was impossible he could enjoin his posterity such a practice, from any other motive than divine authority: or, if he had, it is unimaginable why they should universally obey him, from any other motive; unless they also were idiots for two thousand years successively; which surely it will ill become the advocates for the strength and sufficiency of human reason, to admit. Nay, this is not all: for it will follow, that the *Egyptians*, and *Greeks*, and *Romans*, were likewise worse than

idiots, in their turn; that the whole heathen world were brutes and monsters for two thousand years more, in the practice of this very rite: nay, they actually are so to this day. In a word, either this rite had some foundation in true religion, which swayed the whole world to the practice of it for four thousand years, and yet sways the heathen part of it to this day; or else this boasted principle of reason, which could suffer men to go on in a train of such absurdity and barbarity, for four thousand, nay, for six thousand years together, is a very bad and insufficient guide. One of these positions is indisputably true; if the latter is admitted, then revelation was absolutely necessary, to reform and to instruct the world, at the time that *Jesus Christ* came into it: if the former, then sacrifices were of divine institution; which was the thing to be proved. Let the adversaries of revelation take which side of this dilemma they like best.

(To be continued.)

FOR THE CHRISTIAN'S MAGAZINE.

*On the formation of a good Conscience.**(Continued from page 46.)*

IN treating of the formation of a good conscience, I shall abstain from weaving any webs of speculation about that internal light which it has been supposed to possess, independently of instruction. That subject is, perhaps, not yet fully investigated. The fact itself remains to be proved. The delivery of an oral law, and subsequently of a written law to man; the preaching of the gospel; parental education; youthful studies; the duties of admonition and reproof; and, in fine, the whole system of civil and ecclesiastical government; are founded on the principle that conscience admits of cultivation, and requires it. Will it be any error to suppose that what the eye is to natural man, that is conscience to moral man? Both direct his steps; and both require an external sun to illuminate them.

The great error of mankind is, that they form their conscience on the model of a corrupted world. They take the rule of their action from the opinion of the age, or of the country in which they live; or of that class or profession of men to which they belong. If they can accommodate their conduct to this rule, their conscience feels quite at ease. They are as good as others. And it is a correct rule "*quicquid peccatur multitudine inultum.*" Who blushes for his conformity with universal manners?

Conscience formed on such a model admits of an infinite variety. Hence she is pronouncing different sentences in different parts of the world. She is one thing to a Jew, another to a Roman, another to a Greek; and quite a different thing to a Christian. She is as various as the climates; as mutable as systems of government, and forms of superstition. She has recognized adultery and murder, as the most sacred of duties in certain circumstances; and the perpetration of these atrocious sins has been resorted to as the balm of wounded minds. The varieties of conscience do not stop here. There is not a department into which the great empire of man is divided, but what has its own peculiar moral law to which the public conscience is conformed. What is admissible in the city, would be sin in the country; while indulgence permitted in the country, would ruin character in the city. The farmer, the merchant, the lawyer, the soldier, has each his conscience founded on the moral law adopted by his corps. Nay, riches and poverty draw their lines of demarcation in the moral judgments of men. If we take a survey of these different sections of society, as so many incorporations, under their several specific laws, we will find reason for unceasing admiration at the wisdom of the divine law. That law is so admirably adapted to human nature in all possible stations, that no association whatever can exist without adopting some of its principles. Justice must distribute around a band of robbers, the plunder which injustice has collected; and mutual faith must unite them for mutual defence. Hence in all those bodies corporate, of which I am speaking, a few of the divine laws form the basis of their morality. But

what divine laws? Those precisely, without which their association could not be supported. Thus the word of honour among soldiers, and the debt of honour among gamblers, is sacred. Further instances are unnecessary. But as uniformly do they cast away every divine law not subservient to their views in associating. Thus chastity is not a military virtue, nor is punctuality in paying tradesmen necessary to support the reputation of a gentleman.

Though enough, if not more than enough, has been said on this subject, I cannot take leave of it without directing the reader to the Christian Church itself, for the most striking illustration of the principle I have been stating. With the same bible in their hands, and worshipping the same God, are there any two Christian denominations which can be said to have the same rule of conscience? I shall say no more on this point; but beg leave to recommend it to the reader as one which will furnish him with amusing and edifying reflections. A single remark only: that sometimes the point which a Church selects as her palladium; which she labours to demonstrate, and industriously impresses on conscience; is found to have not the least effect out of her own bounds; not so much as to be understood, nor to be capable of being understood by others; a local vapour generated on the spot, not the general atmosphere in which Christians breathe.

The representation given prepares the way for the following conclusions: That a conscience formed on any worldly model must be imperfect, as all such models exhibit only a part of the divine law: that it must be faulty, as all of them indulge some sins; that it must be superstitious, as

a value will be laid on some peculiarity destitute of moral goodness. And, what is the greatest evil of all; that in this case, conscience receives its law, not as the law of God, but as the law of man, and bows down and adores public opinion. Dr. Blair, in his sermon on the power of conscience, has this exquisite remark. "When one has acted unsuitably to his interest, or has trespassed against the rules of prudence or decorum, he reflects upon his conduct with pain, and acknowledges that he deserves blame. But the difference between the sense of misconduct, and the sense of guilt, consists in this, that the latter penetrates much deeper into the heart. It makes the criminal feel that he is not only blameable, but justly punishable, for the part which he has acted," &c.

This is unquestionably correct. Our disapprobation of the conduct which has forfeited the esteem of society, must be less powerful and pungent than our disapprobation of the conduct which has incurred the displeasure of God.

Yet, this wordly conscience, if I may use the phrase; this conscience of which society is the legislator, and public sentiment the law, is all that many have to rule their conduct. It constitutes what is usually stiled Honour. So powerful is this honour with thousands, that it can enjoin what God has forbidden, and forbid what God has enjoined; and enforce submission. After all the pompous declamations which every man so eloquently lavishes on the sweet approbation of his own mind; I am afraid that conscience is seldom pierced with remorse for an action which the world has applauded.

The formation of a good conscience depends on this single principle, that God alone is Lord of

the conscience, and his law its only rule. It belongs to his supremacy to command what he will. The man who, in the presence of this dread Sovereign, shall consider his dominion, his holiness, his justice, his power to destroy and to save, cannot avoid exclaiming, "with me, it is a small matter to be judged of man's judgment, yea, I judge not mine ownself; there is one who judgeth me, even the Lord." Conscience should refuse her homage to any other than God. And it merits consideration, whether the man, who submits his conscience to the unauthorized decisions of men, is not really, however unintentionally, guilty of idolatry. But however that point of casuistry may be decided, it is certain that the actions originating from a conscience thus subjected to human authority, do not rise to the dignity of religious conduct; for God hath said, "in vain do they worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men." Such subjection is a criminal surrender of human liberty, a violation of the apostolic precept, "stand fast in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made you free."

The principle which has been laid down admits of no direct contradiction. That God made us, that he has given us a law, that he will judge us by that law, are facts. And the man, who cannot from these facts deduce the inference, that the law of God is the only rule of conscience, has little cause to boast of the attribute of reason. It cannot be disguised, however, that there are circumstances which seem to give to human laws, and even to customs, the prerogative of regulating conscience. This remark may be illustrated by a reference to the duties accruing under the 5th and 8th commandments. To little purpose are

we commanded to honour our parents, and obey our magistrates, if the former issue no commands, and the latter enact no laws. The existence of such commands and laws are contemplated in the divine commandment, and each of them becomes a rule to conscience in virtue of the law of God, which constitutes it such. Hence though laws differ in every state, and regulations in every family, yet each is sacred in its own sphere. In like manner, the 8th commandment enjoins an observance of those laws by which property is obtained and alienated. This is a delicate subject, and still more so in practice than in speculation. If it should happen that a human law opposes a divine law, we reject it at once; [as one precept of the divine law cannot enjoin the violation of another; if, though not contrary to the law of God, a human law be less advantageous than another which can be adopted, conscience submits to it while in existence, while prudence takes all lawful means to exchange it for a better; and if a law be both consonant to the divine law and advantageous to mankind, conscience and prudence unite to submit to its authority, and perpetuate its duration.

Upon the whole, the circumstances mentioned are so far from overturning the general doctrine, that they establish it; as they show that it is the commandment of God alone, which imparts to every ordinance of man, (not contrary to some divine law) the prerogative of regulating conscience, which otherwise it would not have possessed.

The doctrine then which we would establish is, that the man who would form an intelligent conscience, is bound to "search the scriptures;" to

use the "word which is a light to the feet and a lamp to the path;" to study the "perfect law;" and to submit only to the "perfect law of liberty." The duty recommended is difficult. It exacts much reading and reflection; a diligent attendance on the preaching of the gospel; a communication of opinions with intelligent Christians; and all the other means of improving the human mind, which are within our reach.

There is one source of conscientious information, which it might be improper to pass over in this place. It is the religious conduct of the saints. "Take, my brethren, the prophets who have spoken in the name of the Lord for an example of suffering affliction, and of patience." There are experiments in religion, as well as in philosophy, which exhibit doctrines as clearly as demonstration, with the additional advantage of engraving them indelibly on the memory, and of rendering them more operative by associating them with our sensible ideas, and our feelings. Righteousness beams in the divine law. In the life and actions of a good man, it shines with a more mild and charming lustre. In the former it is the dazzling light of truth; in the latter it is the same light displaying the tints and diffusing the perfumes of every beautiful flower, and ripening into perfection every good fruit. Here the law of righteousness puts off its terrors, and appears in a train composed of all the ornaments and felicities of the human condition. Peace and tranquillity, joy and assurance, contentment, patience, and the animating hope of glory, dwell with righteousness in the bosom of a saint. In his right hand are the scales of justice, and in the left is bread for the hungry. He has an ear open

to complaints and sighs; an eye that can catch the profile and whole contour of misery; a heart equally prepared to melt with the unfortunate, and to bound with the happy. He walks abroad the living image of his heavenly father, diffusing righteousness and felicity around him. The man who would do justice to his own conscience, must mark and analyse every trait of righteousness in the character of such a person.

I was aware of that objection—"It is not all gold that glitters." Miserably have the world been imposed upon by grimace, superstition, and enthusiasm; and fatally have they copied the destructive example. But the fact, instead of a refutation, is a confirmation of the doctrine stated; as it proves that it is a part of our nature to adopt our maxims of conduct from the lives of those whom we suppose to be the servants of God: maxims which our own ingenuity might never have deduced from the theoretical study of the divine law.

(To be concluded in our next.)

FOR THE CHRISTIAN'S MAGAZINE.

On the first organization of the Church.

IN our preceding number we have proved the existence of a *Visible Church Catholic*; and that this is the thing intended by such scriptural phrases as "the Church of God," "the house of God," "the kingdom of heaven." But it does not more certainly exist, than it exists in virtue of a divine interposition. None but the living God could set up, protect, and govern, his own kingdom. The question is, when, and where, and how, so singular a society was instituted? The question is of moment, as being connected with interesting views of the external economy of salvation. Let us attempt to answer it.

We know by experience that the church of God was in the world before us. So did our fathers. So did the previous generation: and in this manner the historical fact may be deduced from the days of the apostles. The "Church," therefore, has not been created since their days. Was it created then? No: the apostles found it, as we found it, older than themselves. Their writings are full of its privileges, its ordinances, and other peculiarities; but contain not a single hint of its *originating* with them. They uniformly *suppose* its prior establishment, and speak of it as having been long and familiarly understood. Guided by the clew which they have put into our hands, we go back to the books of the prophets,

and meet the same supposition there. We proceed, with similar success, through the Levitical law, and the Sinai-covenant; we pass the age of Moses, and arrive at the *Father of the faithful*. Here the clew runs out. No ingenuity can follow it further. People of God there were; promises of God there were; gracious revelations, and acceptable worship of God, there were: but a *Church of God*, organized upon the principle of *visible unity*, and standing in such relation to him as it did in after ages; such a Church, before the vocation of Abram, there was not, nor any thing which bore the semblance of it. For its original organization; for the germ of that great system into which it has already grown, and shall yet grow, we must look among the transactions of that memorable period which elapsed between the call of Abram in Ur of the Chaldees, and the birth of his son Isaac.

On the first of these occasions Jehovah gave him a double promise:

1. A promise of a numerous progeny, and great personal prosperity. *I will make of thee a great nation; and I will bless thee, and make thy name great, and thou shalt be a blessing; and I will bless them that bless thee, and curse him that curseth thee.*—*Gen. xii. 2, 3.*

2. The promise of his being a medium of conveying extensive blessings to the world. *In thee shall all families of the earth be blessed.*—*v. 3.*

All the subsequent communications which God made to him are referrible to one of these two promises. They were both called up at different intervals, explained, expanded, and confirmed, till each of them became the basis of an appropriate covenant. Let us briefly mark their progress.

1. The promise of a numerous progeny is repeated with an engagement to bestow upon them the land of Canaan. ch. xii. 7. This promise was stated and confirmed in the most precise and ample terms, after Abram had separated from Lot, ch. xiii. 14—17.; and finally, as he was advancing in years, and the probability of its accomplishment was proportionably diminishing, the Lord “came to him in a vision,” and having cheered him with this gracious assurance, *I am thy shield, and thy exceeding great reward*, ch. xv. 1, renewed the promise concerning his seed, as that which should come forth out of his own bowels, and be multiplied as the stars of heaven. The patriarch on this occasion so glorified the divine veracity by his unshaken, unquestioning faith, that the scripture saith, *it was counted to him for righteousness*. verse 6. The renewed promise concerning his progeny was immediately followed by a confirmation of the grant of Canaan; and a remarkable pledge that the grant should be executed in due season. Having, as he had been commanded, slain several animals, divided their bodies, and placed the sections opposite to each other, his senses were locked up to every other object, and Jehovah disclosed to him a comprehensive view of evils to come upon his family before their possession of the promised land. But their possession at the proper time was guaranteed by solemn compact. “A burning lamp,” the symbol of the divine presence, “passed between those pieces” of the slain animals, in token of ratifying every stipulation belonging to the promise in question. For *in that same day, the Lord made a COVENANT with Abram, saying, “Unto thy seed have I given this land,” &c. v. 8—21.*

Here is an end of all transactions for establishing the first promise. It was sealed in the *covenant*, and never again occurs by itself. The end of this covenant, too well defined to be mistaken, was to secure to Abram a numerous posterity, and their inheritance in the land of Canaan. Further it went not. It does not so much as mention the promise relating to the families of the earth being blessed in him. And from the minuteness with which every thing else is adjusted, it is evident that this last promise, not even hinted at, was not intended to be comprised in the covenant which secured the other. Let us proceed then.

2. Fourteen years after the date of this covenant, Jehovah appeared again to Abram, and made another covenant with him. The transaction is thus recorded in the seventeenth chapter of Genesis: *And when Abram was ninety years old and nine, the LORD appeared to Abram, and said unto him, I am the Almighty God; walk before me, and be thou perfect. And I will make my covenant between me and thee; and will multiply thee exceedingly. And Abram fell on his face: and God talked with him, saying, As for me, behold, my covenant is with thee, and thou shalt be a FATHER OF MANY NATIONS. Neither shall thy name any more be called Abram; but thy name shall be ABRAHAM: for a father of many nations have I made thee. And I will make thee exceeding fruitful, and I will make nations of thee; and kings shall come out of thee. 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 UNTO THEE, AND TO THY SEED AFTER THEE. And I will give unto thee, and to thy seed after thee, the land wherein*

thou art a stranger, all the land of Canaan, for an everlasting possession; and I will be their God. And God said unto Abraham, Thou shalt keep my covenant therefore, thou, and thy seed after thee, in their generations. This is my covenant which ye shall keep between me and you, and thy seed after thee; Every man-child among you shall be CIRCUMCISED. And ye shall circumcise the flesh of your foreskin; and it shall be a token of the covenant betwixt me and you. And he that is eight days old shall be circumcised among you, every man-child in your generations; he that is born in the house, or bought with money of any stranger, which is NOT OF THY SEED. He that is born in thy house and he that is bought with thy money, must needs be circumcised: and my covenant shall be in your flesh for an everlasting covenant. And the uncircumcised man-child, whose flesh of his foreskin is not circumcised, that soul shall be cut off from his people; he hath broken my covenant. ver. 1—14.

Our inquiry is into the nature and design of this covenant. What was it?

Not a covenant, either of works or grace, for eternal life. For Abram had been "justified by faith, without the works of the law," and had been interested in the covenant of God's grace before this. His eternal life had been secured many years.

Nor was it merely a personal or domestic covenant: that is, one which provided for the individual dignity of the patriarch, and the prosperous settlement of his children in the land of Canaan. This, too, had been concluded long before, as has been shown. It recognizes, indeed, all that was included in the personal covenant, which it might otherwise be supposed to super-

sede; but it has features of its own so peculiar and marked, that it cannot be considered in any other light than that of a distinct engagement.

For, besides the solemnity with which it was introduced, and which would hardly have preceded a mere repetition of former grants, it contained new matter; it constituted new relations; and was affirmed in an extraordinary manner.

1st. It contained new *matter*—*I will make thee a father of many nations*: which is much more than can be interpreted of Abram's literal posterity; and must be viewed as expounding the promise and extending the privilege formerly assured to him—*In thee shall all families of the earth be blessed*. It was a great thing to be only an instrument of blessing to all the families of the earth; but a much greater to be that instrument in such a manner as to become what no other man, in the sense of the covenant, ever did, or ever can become, “a *father* of many nations:” and moreover, a personal pledge, also, of his new dignity was conferred upon the patriarch, in that remarkable alteration of his name from Abram to Abraham; the former signifying *high Father*; and the latter, *high Father of a multitude*.

2d. It constituted new relations—*To be a God unto thee, and to thy seed after thee*. This cannot be explained of Abraham's relation to God as the God of his salvation; for in that sense God was his God long before; and whatever is the relation expressed, it grew out of the covenant *now made*: It embraced his *seed* too. Nor, with respect to *their* eternal life, did God now engage to be their God; for all that was adjusted in the covenant of grace; and the privilege could not reach beyond those who were the actual par-

takers of the same precious faith with Abraham. Whereas, in the sense of *this* covenant, God was the God of all Abraham's seed, without exception, under the limitations which restricted the covenant-operation first to Isaac, and afterwards to Jacob, including such as should choose their God, their faith, and their society. For he was to be their God in *their generations*: i. e. as soon as a new individual of this seed was generated, he was within the covenant; and according to the tenour of the covenant, God was his God*.

The foregoing retrospect has decided one point, to wit, that *the covenant with Abraham and his seed, contemplated them not primarily nor immediately, as of the election of grace, but as an aggregate which it severed from the bulk of mankind; and placed in a social character under peculiar relations to the most high God.* To define precisely the nature of this constitution, we must go a step further, and ascertain who are meant by "the seed."

It cannot be the carnal descendants of Abra-

* The expressions "thy God," "my God," "our God," and that, so much and so properly in use among Christians, "our covenant-God," must always be interpreted according to the nature of the covenant to which they refer. Common, but unwarranted practice, has limited them to the covenant of grace; so that a serious man is apt to think he hears heresy, if they be ever applied to any thing else than the saving relation in which a believer stands to God as his reconciled God in Christ Jesus. But this is a mistake; and lies at the foundation of many false and hurtful opinions of the Christian Church and its privileges. The Jews could, *nationally*, call God "their God:" They often did so, and with right, when they were gross hypocrites in the article of their personal religion. The Sinai-covenant constituted them the people of Jehovah, and him their God, as really, but in a widely different sense, as he was the covenant-God of Abraham, or of Paul, for personal salvation. A due exposition of this matter involves the whole doctrine of the visible church catholic, which is grievously misunderstood by most professing Christians of all denominations.

ham exclusively ; although it has a particular respect to them, for,

(1). Three large branches of that seed were actually shut out of the covenant, i. e. the children of Ishmael, of Esau, and of Keturah.

(2). The covenant provided for the admission of others, who never belonged to that seed. *He that is eight days old shall be circumcised among you ; every man-child in your generations : he that is born in the house or bought with money of any stranger, which is NOT OF THY SEED.*

This principle was acted upon under the constitution which was superadded, by the ministry of Moses, 430 years after. The stranger who wished to keep the passover, was required first to circumcise all his males, and then he became as *one born in the land*, i. e. he was to all intents and purposes under the full operation of the covenant established with Abraham and his seed. On the other hand, the Edomite, *who sprang from the loins of Abraham*, was put upon the *same footing* with the Egyptian who descended from Ham: the children of both were received in the fourth generation ; neither of them came in upon the plea of consanguinity with Abraham: nor were they admitted into the commonwealth of Israel under the idea of the children of Israel having Abraham for their literal father, but formally and explicitly upon the ground of their being "*the congregation of the Lord.*" Deut. xxiii. 8*. But, being once incor-

* קהל יהוה "The church of Jehovah:" the very expression which is translated again and again in the New Testament, *εκκλησια θειου*, "the church of God." The fact is, that all our language in sacred things is borrowed from the Old Testament; and cannot be understood without a reference to it; and those who clamorously demand the origin of every thing Christian to be produced from the New Testament, show that they

VOL. I.—N°. II.

T

porated with the natural seed, in that great congregation, they, too, were viewed as of the covenanted seed; and they transmitted their privilege to their children in their generations.

(3). By the covenant made with Abraham he acquired the prerogative of being the "*father of many nations.*" This article is, of itself, a demonstration that the covenant was of a much wider extent than all the literal descendants of Abraham in the line of Jacob put together. They never did make but *one* nation. There is a marked distinction between them and these "many nations;" who are evidently the same with "all the families of the earth," that were to be blessed in Abraham. The apostle Paul interprets the phrase by another; his being "*the heir of the world;*" and peremptorily denies its restriction to the literal seed. *Rom.* iv. 13, 16, 17.

The argument is short. Abraham's seed comprehends all those of whom he is the father: but he is the father of many nations; therefore, these many nations are to be accounted as his seed. Again: the covenant was made with Abraham and with his seed: therefore, the covenant embraces these many nations who are included in his seed.

3. This covenant was affirmed in an extraordinary manner; *viz.* by the rite of *circumcision.* *This, saith God, is my covenant which ye shall keep between me and you, and thy seed after thee, every man-child among you shall be circumcised.* The uses of this rite were two.

First. It certified to the seed of Abraham, by a understand neither the New Testament nor the Old, nor yet that very Christianity about which they prate. Christianity is more, a great deal more, than a few doctrines.

token in the flesh of their males, that the covenant with their great progenitor was in force; that they were under its full operation; and entitled to all the benefits immediately derived from it. But circumcision had a further use; for,

Secondly, The apostle Paul informs us that it was a seal of the **RIGHTEOUSNESS OF THE FAITH** which Abraham had being yet uncircumcised, that he might be the father of all them that believe, though they be not circumcised; that **RIGHTEOUSNESS MIGHT BE IMPUTED** unto them also. *Rom. iv. 11.* In this connexion it certified,

That Abraham was justified by *faith*:

That the doctrine and the privilege of the "righteousness of faith," were to be perpetuated among his seed by the operation of God's covenant with him:

That the justification of a sinner is by faith alone; "righteousness" being "imputed" to "all them that believe," and to them only; who by the very fact of their *believing*, become, in the highest sense, children of Abraham, and are accordingly blessed with him.

While, therefore, the sign of circumcision was in every circumcised person, a seal of God's covenant with Abraham and with his seed, it was to all who walked in the faith of Abraham a seal of their personal interest in that same righteousness by which Abraham was justified.

From these general premises the conclusion is direct and irrefragable, that the covenant with Abraham was designed to assure the accomplishment, of the second great promise made to him while he was yet in Ur of the Chaldees; and that the effect of it was to bring him and his family, with all who should join them in a kindred profes-

sion, *into a church estate*, i. e. was a *covenant ecclesiastical*, by which Jehovah organized the visible church, as one distinct spiritual society; and according to which all his after dealings with her were to be regulated. Hitherto she had been scattered, and existed in detached parts. Now it was the gracious intention of God to reduce her into a compact form that she might be prepared for the good things to come. Since Abraham was designated as the man from whom the MESSIAH was to spring; since he had signally glorified the Lord's veracity, not staggering at his promise through unbelief, he selected this his servant as the favoured man in whose family he would commence the organization of that church in which he designed to perpetuate the righteousness of faith. With this church, as with a *whole*, composed, in the first instance, of Abraham's family, and to be increased afterwards by the addition of all such as should own his faith, was the covenant made. This is that covenant after which we are inquiring.

II. This covenant has never been annulled. The proof of the affirmative lies upon the affirmer. When? Where? and by whom was the act for annulling it promulged? The "vanishing away" of the ceremonial law has nothing to do with the Abrahamic covenant, but to illustrate, confirm, and diffuse its blessings. The former was a temporary constitution superadded for the purpose of giving effect to some provisions of the latter, and expired by its own limitation. The apostle Paul refutes the notion that the introduction of the ceremonial law, could at all prejudice the pre-existing covenant with Abraham; *Gal. iii. 15—17*. And if not its commencement why its termination? And if the abolishing of the ceremonial law

does not infer the cessation of the Abrahamic covenant, there is not a shadow of either proof or presumption that it has ceased. If there is, let it be produced. But not to rest the matter here, we may observe,

1st. That the promise of Abraham's being a father of many nations, who are, therefore, his seed, never was, nor could be fulfilled, before the Christian dispensation. The apostle Paul was certainly of this mind; for he proves the calling of the Gentiles from Abraham's covenant; and if the calling of the Gentiles to be fellow-heirs in the church of God with the literal descendants of the patriarch, was grounded upon his covenant, this, again, shows that they belong to that seed with whom it was made; and, consequently, that it is in full force and virtue at this hour. The apostle presses this point with great ardour; and places it before us in various lights. *If ye be Christ's*, says he, "*then are ye Abraham's seed; and heirs according to the promise.*" What promise? Not simply the promise of eternal life in Christ. There was no necessity of their being Abraham's seed to inherit this promise—but manifestly, the promise of Abraham's covenant to which they were entitled in virtue of their being his seed: i. e. the promise *I will be a God unto thee and to thy seed after thee*. If, then, they who are Christ's are Abraham's seed; and being so are heirs according to the promise; the covenant, containing the promise, is in full virtue, as they belong to the seed with which it was made.

2d. If the Abrahamic covenant is no longer in force, the church of God, as a visible public society, is not, in any sense, connected with him by covenant-relation. This may weigh light with

those who discard the doctrine of a visible Catholic church ; but it draws much deeper than they suspect. The whole administration of the covenant of grace proceeds upon the principle that there *is* such a church. All the ordinances are given to it ; all the promises are made to it. To the elect, as such, they are not, cannot be given. The application of them would be impossible without a special revelation : and the whole administration of the covenant of grace, by visible means, would be at an end. Nor is a single instance to be found, excepting in virtue of immediate revelation, in which the Lord ever gave an ordinance or a promise to particular churches. They always receive their privileges in virtue of their being parts of the church universal. Now this church universal which is the body of Christ, the temple of his Spirit, the depository of his grace, stands in no covenant relation to God, in her public character, if the covenant with Abraham is annulled. For if she does, then another covenant has been made with her. But no such covenant has been made. The new covenant which the Lord promised to make with her at the introduction of the evangelical dispensation, was to supersede, not the Abrahamic, but the Sinai covenant. It is so far from setting aside, that it implies, and establishes the former ; for it is promised to her as that church which was organized and perpetuated under Abraham's covenant. If, therefore, that covenant is removed, and no other has replaced it, the church, in her social capacity, is further off from God than she was under the law ; and all the mercies to which, in that capacity, she once had a claim, are swept away. But this is impossible. In fact, the scriptures uniformly suppose

the existence of such public federal relations: and abound with promises growing out of them. Thus speaks the prophet—"The redeemer shall come to Zion, and unto them that turn from transgression in Jacob, saith the Lord. As for me, this is my *covenant with them*, saith the Lord: my Spirit that is upon thee, and my words which I have put in thy mouth, shall not depart out of thy mouth, nor out of the mouth of thy seed, nor out of the mouth of thy seed's seed, saith the Lord, from henceforth and for ever."—*Is. lix. 21, 22.*

This is a prediction of New Testament times: so the apostle applies it, *Rom. xi. 26.* And he applies it to the recovery of the Jews, which has not yet happened. The covenant, therefore, is in force, and it operates through the medium of Gentile converts; the Lord's Spirit has long ago departed out of the mouth of the Jews. But the promise was made to the church, in her *covenanted character*; her members in constant succession are the "seed" out of whose mouth the divine Spirit shall not depart; and when the Jews are restored, they will be brought into this very covenanted church, and be again recognized as a part of the "seed." But why multiply words? There is no explaining the frequent recurrence of the inspired writers to the covenant of Abraham, nor any propriety in their reasoning, if it is not of perpetual operation.

3d. In discussing the great question concerning the rejection of the Jews, the vocation of the Gentiles, and the future restoration of the former, the apostle reasons upon principles which are most false and impertinent, if the Abrahamic covenant has ceased. *Rom. xi. 17—24.*

He tells the Gentiles that, they were "a wild olive tree;" and that the Jews were the "good olive tree"—This cannot refer to their natural state as sinners before God; for in this respect there was "no difference"—nor to their state as sinners saved by grace: for from this state there is no excision; it can refer to nothing but their visible *church estate*; i. e. to their public relation to God as a covenanted society. What, then, was this "good olive tree," from which the Jewish branches were "broken off;" while the Gentiles were "grafted in?" Evidently, the visible church organized under the covenant made with Abraham. There was no other from which the Jews could be cast off. The ceremonial law was superseded. It was no excision at all to be cut off from a constitution which did not exist; nor could the Gentiles be introduced into it. But what says the apostle? That the "olive tree" was cut down or rooted up? That it had withered trunk and branch? Or was no longer the care of the divine planter? Nothing like it! He asserts the continuance of the olive tree in life and vigour; the excision of some worthless branches; and the insertion of new ones in their stead. "Thou," says he, addressing the Gentile, "partakest of the root and fatness of the olive tree." Translate this into less figurative language, and what is the import? That the church of God, his visible church, taken into peculiar relations to himself by the Abrahamic covenant, subsists without injury through the change of dispensation and of members. Branches indeed may be cut off, but the rooted trunk stands firm, and other branches occupy the places of those which are lopped away. The Jews are cast out of the church, but the church perished not with

them. There was still left the trunk of the olive tree; there was still fatness in its roots: it stands in the same fertile soil, the covenant of God: and the admission of the Gentiles into the room of the excommunicated Jews, makes them a part of that covenanted church; as branches grafted into the olive tree and flourishing in its fatness, are identified with the tree. It is impossible for ideas conceived by the mind of man, or uttered in his language, to assert more peremptorily the continuance of the church under that very covenant which was established with Abraham and his seed. And this doctrine, understood before the apostleship of Paul, was maintained by John the Baptist; "*Think not,*" cried he to the multitudes who crowded around him, "*think not to say within yourselves, We have Abraham to our father: for verily I say unto you, that God is able of these stones to raise up children unto Abraham.*" The hearers of the Baptist, like many modern professors of Christianity, supposed that the duration of the covenant with Abraham, and of the prerogative of the Jews as God's peculiar people, were the same. It is a mistake, replies the second Elijah; you may all be cast off; you may all perish; but the oath to Abraham shall not be violated. God will be at no loss to provide "seed" who shall be as much within his covenant as yourselves, even though he should create them out of the stones of the earth. The threat was vain: it was empty noise; it was turning the thunders of God into a scarecrow for children, if the covenant with Abraham was not to survive the law of peculiarity, and be replenished with other seed than that which sprung from his loins according to the flesh.

VOL. I.—Nº. II. U

FOR THE CHRISTIAN'S MAGAZINE.

IN our last we offered to our readers an interesting view of the Life of Faith, from the pen of Professor *Franken*. He considers this life as it more immediately respects the state of a believer before God, and his corresponding exercises. We now republish a view of the same life of faith, as it more immediately respects his duties, his plans, and his trials in the world. The Christian in America will see, with pleasure, how delightfully the German and the British believer coincide with himself in making God, *their* God, their "refuge and strength." He will feel, and with thankfulness and joy will own, that in this great and essential point, all believers, all the world over, have but "one heart and one soul." He utters no folly, nor sinks into any delusion, when he calls it, with an apostle, *precious faith!*

THE LIFE OF FAITH,

Exemplified and recommended, in a LETTER, found in the study of the Rev. Mr. BLHEAR, late of Doddingham, New-ingham: Being an answer to this question, *how to live in this world, so as to live in Heaven?*

DEAR BROTHER,

YOURS I received, and thought on that question, "how to live in this world, so as to live in heaven?" It is one of the common pleas of my

but either in it or after it, I find I could not be without it, whether it be taken from me, or not given to me; sooner or later God quiets me in himself without it. I cast all my concerns on the Lord, and live securely on the care and wisdom of my heavenly Father. My ways, you know, are, in some sense, hedged up with thorns, and grow darker and darker daily; but yet I distrust not my good God in the least, and live more quietly in the absence of all, by faith, than I should do, I am persuaded, if I possessed them. I think the Lord deals kindly with me, to make me believe for all my mercies before I have them; they will then be Isaacs, sons of "laughter." The less reason hath to work upon, the more freely faith casts itself on the faithfulness of God. I find that while faith is steady, nothing can disquiet me; and when faith totters, nothing can establish me. If I tumble out amongst means and creatures, I am presently lost, and can come to no end; but if I stay myself on God, and leave him to work in his own way and time, I am at rest, and can sit down and sleep in a promise, when a thousand rise up against me: therefore my way is not to cast beforehand, but to work with God by the day. "Sufficient to the day is the evil thereof." I find so much to do continually with my calling and my heart, that I have no time to puzzle myself with peradventures and futurities. As for the state of the times, it is very gloomy and tempestuous. But why do the heathen rage? Faith lies at anchor in the midst of the waves, and believes the accomplishment of the promise through all those overturnings, confusions, and seeming impossibilities.

Upon this God do I live, who is our God for

ever, and will guide us to the death. Methinks I lie becalmed in his bosom, as Luther, in such a case. I am not concerned ; let Christ see to it. I know prophecies are now dark, and the books are sealed, and men have all been deceived, and every cistern fails, yet God doth continue faithful. And faithful is he that hath promised, who will do it. I believe these dark times are the womb of a bright morning.

Many things more I might have said : but enough. Oh ! Brother, keep close to God, and then you need fear nothing. Maintain secret and intimate communion with God, and then a little of the creature will go a great way. Take time for duties in private ; crowd not religion into a corner of the day. There is a Dutch proverb : “ Nothing is got by thieving, nor lost by praying.” Lay up all your good in God, so as to over-balance the sweetness and bitterness of all creatures. Spend no time anxiously in forehand contrivances for this world ; they never succeed ; God will run his dispensations another way. Self contrivances are the effects of unbelief. I can speak from experience. Would men spend those hours they run out in plots and devices, in communion with God, and leave all on him by venturesome believing, they would have more peace and comfort.

I leave you with your God and mine. The Lord Jesus be with your spirit. Pray for your own soul ; pray for Jerusalem ; and pray hard for your poor brother.

A HYMN.

I.

IN all my troubles, sharp and strong,
 My soul to Jesus flies ;
 My anchor hold is firm in him
 When swelling billows rise.

II.

His comforts bear my spirit up ;
 I trust a faithful God :
 The sure foundation of my hope
 Is in a Saviour's blood.

III.

Loud Hallelujahs sing, my soul,
 To the Redeemer's name :
 In joy and sorrow, life and death,
 His love is still the same.

 SELECT SENTENCES.

Experience shows that those who have been reformed from a life of scandalous immorality, or of stupid carelessness about eternity, to a life of strict integrity and devotion, are persons whose constant practice it has been since that happy change, to apply by prayer for divine grace. This may be said to be evident from experience, if mutual faith and trust be allowed, and the testimony of multitudes of the best men in the world, be reckoned an argument of any weight. Never any yet refuted them by contrary experiences: a devout man praying only for happiness, without praying for holiness, is a character yet unheard of.

M'Laurin.

FOR THE CHRISTIAN'S MAGAZINE.

On Acrimony in trifling Disputes.

IT has been often remarked, that disputes upon subjects of trifling importance, are conducted with more asperity, than disputes upon subjects of the highest moment. A circumstance which, no doubt, has contributed to the prevalence of the remark is, that such subjects of dispute often serve as pretexts to conceal a more efficient but less honourable cause of contention. The most daring malignity wishes to hide her grosser features: and by putting on the garb of zeal for truth, hopes to impose upon the serious and unsuspecting.

But independently of this consideration, the remark is just. Nor is the fact unaccountable. Even the best of men, and the most cautious, are apt to be off their guard with respect to occurrences of little interest. A question of magnitude which rouses their feelings, awakens also their powers of self possession. A trifling affair does not carry with it an admonition to rule their own spirit; and they are often surprised into heat and rudeness, merely through want of recollection. This explains an apparent contradiction in the character of many worthy members of civil and religious society. They will bear heavy losses with magnanimity: they will meet the foulest

abuse with calmness: they will receive admonitions on points of duty with meekness and gratitude. But let them lose a shilling; let a wine glass be thrown from the table and broken; let them be contradicted in their judgment of the weather, or of the position of a stick of wood on the fire—and they are in a passion! It is the work of surprise: they had not time to post a sentinel over their temper.

Another reason of intemperate dispute about little things, is the supposed affront offered to a man by controverting his judgment upon such things. He detects, or thinks he detects, an impeachment of his intellect, than which nothing is more galling, or hard to be forgiven. To have his opinion thwarted on a subject which every one may comprehend, is more wounding to his vanity than to be completely silenced upon what is difficult and important. The real injury to truth may be greater in the latter case than in the former. But vanity is not so connected with truth, as that what injures the one, will always proportionably mortify the other. The magnitude of an attempt alleviates the pain, by lessening the dishonour, of failure. But in the case before us, the ingenuity of mortification is without a refuge. To sink under the strength of a giant, is to be defeated. To be foiled by the weakness of a dwarf, is to be disgraced. The staff, the sling, and the pebbles in the hand of David, mocked the prowess of Goliath, and provoked his abuse; when a spear, a sword, and a shield, would have led him on with sobriety to the encounter.

Further to account for the fact we are considering, let it be observed, that the mind, when engaged, must have some object suited to its exertions,

and which may give it room to move. A small subject of controversy, it is, therefore, prone to unite with the person of an antagonist, and thus invective becomes mingled with argument. Something must be said ; and if the subject itself be barren, something else connected with it must be pressed into the debate. Whereas in subjects of more magnitude, the mind has neither necessity, nor inclination, nor opportunity, to wander : it is filled with other than personal considerations. It has room to move freely, and still keep within the limits of sober and rational argumentation. Here warmth may be excited, without any alloy of personal bitterness ; and to condemn such warmth, argues either apathy or cowardice. Truth has never gained any decisive victory without it. Melancthon's mind had strength and penetration ; but blended with such tenderness, forbearance, and even timidity, that the dictates of his judgment were often frustrated by the emotions of his heart. Calvin was his equal in strength, and his superiour in penetration ; but his tenderness and forbearance were under the guidance of a firmness which no violence could shake, and a zeal which no discouragement could extinguish : and whose exertions were most effectual in promoting the cause of truth ? We may seek an answer from the praises of the church of the reformation, and from the reproaches of the church of Rome. But Calvin's zeal was not rage : his vigilance was not captiousness—his reasoning was not rancour—his firmness was not obstinacy—his subjects were not trifles.

What, then, can most effectually prevent those wordy strifes, which disgrace religious controver-

sy? Wisdom to determine the value of a question, and to discriminate between sound and sentiment. The man who allows himself to be drawn into the field by the uncertainty or deceitfulness of a term, shall find, after bearing the heat of the battle, that the object of his zeal was a mere sound, which served only to create the alarm, and was there buried amidst the shouts of the combatants and the noise of their weapons.

As the success of religious truth is prized, trifling subjects of controversy should be avoided. Let the able advocate of sound doctrine fix his eyes upon great principles, explore their extent, and be watchful to chastise every one who dares to invade them; but let him count it equally his duty, to leave trifling things to trifling men; for as folly is inexhaustible, the evil among them is incurable.

SELECT SENTENCES.

The Heathen Philosophers have made many sensible reflections upon the vanity of the world; but they failed on the point of using the world without abusing it. They felt a void within, and they perceived too, that the whole earth could not fill it: and therefore, that they might not hunt a shadow, they tried to contract desire, not to fulfil it; to reduce sensation, not to gratify it; to live without enjoyment, rather than to enjoy. The Christian's wisdom mounts higher, and instead of professing a stoical apathy founded on pride and despair, aims to have the most exquisite sensibility, and to have that gratified with the true enjoyment of the best things.

Searle.

FOR THE CHRISTIAN'S MAGAZINE.

*Considerations on Lots.*N^o. 1.

THE frequency of public lotteries, the enormous system of private frauds which has grown out of them; the extensive ramification of their *principle* through the community; and the facility with which many well disposed persons are seduced into the support of that principle, seem to require an investigation of the true nature and use of the *Lot*. We shall accordingly devote some papers to that subject.

A lot is an action, intended to decide a point without the aid of human skill or power. This definition includes every form of the lot, or every decision which in common language, is said to be *left to chance*. Thus, whether the lot or the chance consist in drawing a ticket at random out of the lottery wheel, after it has been turned round to prevent collusion, or in the position of a die which is thrown after rattling it in the box; or in the particular distribution of cards after a promiscuous shuffle; or in the tossing up of a piece of money; is a matter of no moment. The principle of the action is still the same; the decision to be effected is put avowedly out of the control of human skill and power.

My design is to show, that every such action,

that is, every lot is a direct appeal to the living God, as the governour of the world, and that his holy providence is concerned in the event.

For, if it be not an appeal to God, what is it? Not a reference to the tribunal of men; for it is so constructed as purposely to exclude their jurisdiction. Not a reference to any other creatures superiour to man; for it would suppose them to be omnipresent, which is an attribute of Deity. Not a reference to nothing; for that is a contradiction. Not a reference to chance; for that is atheism. There is, indeed, much talk of chance: and, in its popular use, signifying something which happens in a manner unforeseen by us, the term is harmless enough. But when used philosophically, that is, when applied to the doctrine of cause and effect, it is either absurd or blasphemous. For what is this chance? It either has a real existence or not. If it has no existence, then when you say that a lot is determined by chance, you say that it is determined by nothing: that is, you say here is a sensible effect produced by no cause at all. This is pure nonsense. If your chance is a real being, what sort of being? Either it has life, intelligence, and power, or not. If not, then you say that millions of effects, (for there are millions of lots in the world,) are produced by a cause which has neither power, nor intelligence, nor life: that is, you say, that millions of actions are performed by an agency which is essentially incapable of any action whatever. And this is as pure absurdity as the former. If you say that your chance is a living, intelligent, and active being, I ask who it is? And how you got your knowledge of it? You certainly imagine it to possess omnipresence and omnipotence; for you suppose it capable of pro-

ducing, at the same moment, millions of effects in millions of places; and thus you have found out a being that displays perfections of God, and yet is not God. This conclusion is as blasphemous as the others are insane. There is no retreat. Survey the subject in any possible light, and you are driven to this issue, that the lot is, by the very nature of the case, a direct appeal to the living God, as the governour of the world.

As the appeal is to him, so his providence regulates the event.

To many it seems irrational that the high and lofty One who inhabits eternity, should descend to our little affairs, and take cognizance of things which minister to our amusement, or agitate our passions. They can conceive of a providence which keeps worlds in their sphere, and legislates for the universe. This general government fills them with magnificent ideas, worthy, as they think, of the Supreme: but to such petty concerns as the common incidents of human life, they judge it beneath his majesty and felicity to attend!

This sort of argumentation is not the only instance in which atheism puts on the cloak of reverence for God. I do not assert that all who adopt such notions are atheists; but that the doctrine itself is atheistical, there can be little doubt. It makes a distinction between a *general* and a *particular* providence; admitting the former, and exploding the latter. We are to believe then, that Jehovah rules the *whole* of his universe, but not the *parts*; or that he has fixed certain laws by which its operations go on independently of his interposition. A fine world of creatures truly, that can “live, and move, and have their being,” in a state of complete separation from the influ-

ence of their creator! According to this scheme, he has had no sort of interest in them from the moment he gave them out of his plastic hand, and never shall have any during the whole period of their being. And as for those who dream of his presiding over suns and stars, without noticing the puny inhabitants of our globe; they might with equal reason dream of his creating suns and stars, without his having created men, or beasts, or insects, at all. That which it was not unworthy of him to create, it is not unworthy of him to preserve and govern. It would surely be inverting all propriety to maintain that in proportion as creatures are feeble, they can dispense with his fostering care; and that rational creatures formed for immortality, are exempted from the empire of his law. For however artfully the sophist may play off his quibbles, a sound mind will perceive that, without a particular providence, man cannot be accountable.

This doctrine of a providence extending even to the most trivial occurrences, pervades the system of revelation, and is stated in the scriptures with the utmost precision and perspicuity. *I form the light, and create darkness; I make peace, and create evil. I, JEHOVAH, do all these things. Is. xlv. 7. Thou sendest forth thy Spirit, they (the young animals) are created; and thou renewest the face of the earth. Ps. civ. 30. Are not two sparrows sold for a farthing? and one of them shall not fall on the ground without your father: But the very hairs of your head are all numbered. Mat. x. 29, 30. What can be of less importance than the perishing of a sparrow? What more worthless than a hair of one's head? And yet, the Truth itself being witness, both are objects of the divine*

regard. “ It accords with the most liberal spirit
 “ of philosophy to believe, that not a stone can
 “ fall or plant rise without the immediate agency
 “ of divine power *.” This is good sense, and
 Christianity owns it all. If, then, the providence
 of God directs and disposes all other, the most
 minute events, by what reasoning shall it be
 proved to have no concern with lots? especially as
 he has declared the lot to be under his immediate
 inspection? *The lot is cast into the lap, but the
 whole disposing thereof is of the Lord.* Prov. xvi. 33.
 This will be decisive with him who in simplicity
 and reverence inquires after the truth. But as
 there are captious spirits which seek to hide them-
 selves in the mist of objections; and as arguments
 addressed to the love of dissipation and of gain,
 are apt to make “ the worse appear the better
 reason,” we shall pursue a little further the denial
 of such a providence as embraces the drawing of
 a ticket or the cast of a die.

To deny, then, that the divine providence is
 concerned in decisions obtained by lot, is to deny
 that it has any concern with individuals or their
 actions. For it cannot be shown that the govern-
 ment of God affects *any* individual or *any* action,
 but upon the broad principle of its extending to
every individual and *every* action. If this position
 is incorrect, a line of distinction must be drawn
 between persons and actions that *are*, and that are
not, under his immediate control. If there are in-
 dividuals to whom his providence, which is an-
 other name for the administration of his govern-
 ment, does not reach, then all such individuals
 are exempted from the obligation of his law, and

* MARTINUS. *Essay on the Principle of Population.* Vol. II. p. 67.

are neither accountable nor dependent. For it is absurd to talk of dependence, and law, and responsibility, while you exclude the only agency which, by ascertaining facts, motives, and character, can lay the basis of a perfect judgment.

If, on the other hand, the divine providence embraces all *persons*, but not all *actions*; it follows that the actions thus omitted are not subject to the divine law; and, of course, that men are, at one period of their lives, amenable to God for their conduct, and, at another period, are not amenable. And between these two states of being *with* and *without* law to God, they are perpetually vibrating. But how are they to know when these alternations take place? God has not revealed it, and they cannot discover it for themselves. But no judicious man can be reconciled to so miserable a subterfuge from a pinching argument. It will not bear examination for a single moment. The alternative is, that the providence of God directs every thing or nothing. If the former, then even the casting of a die; if the latter, we are plunged into atheism at once; for a God who does not govern the world is no God at all.

Perhaps it will be urged, that the creator has “fixed certain laws in the physical world; that the doctrine of chances, founded upon these laws, is a subject of calculation; and that their operation is the only thing to be seen in the combination of chances.”

I assent to the proposition, but contend that the objection grounded upon it, is either futile or impious.

Futile—For it amounts to no more than this, that the most high acts by *second* causes. Unless.

indeed, they can act *without* him. The objection, to have any force, must mean that they *can* so act. And then,

It is impious. For it strikes at the *whole government of God*, in so far as it is carried on through the medium of physical laws. To repeat the substance of a remark already made, if his providence has no concern in one, two, or twenty actions or events, occurring according to physical laws, it is equally unconcerned in *all* such events and actions. And thus we arrive at the old inference, that God has nothing to do with us nor our affairs. This mode of reasoning, pushed a little further, will expel every thing but physical laws out of the universe. If I may shut my Maker out of all events happening according to these laws, why not myself, and every other rational agent? And if I set my neighbour's house on fire, or cut his throat, why not refer these things to the class of facts happening according to the laws of muscular motion? You shall not tell me that my rational and moral nature acted through the instrumentality of the fire-brand or the knife; because this is to assert what you have just denied, viz. that intelligent and moral power acts by physical means. On my principles I admit your solution; but then it spoils your philosophy. For I shall as soon believe that an axe can hew wood without the agency of man, as that physical events can be produced, or physical law exist, without the agency of God. And I shall as soon deny the hewing of wood with an axe in my hand to be my own act, as deny the production of an event by physical laws to be an act of the divine providence. In truth, all moral order is maintained, and all moral events come to

VOL. I.—N°. II. Y

pass, by the intervention of physical law. And thus the conclusion forces itself upon us, that the disposing of the lot is as much the act of God, as if he were to perform it by some visible interposition. And therefore a wanton or needless appeal to him by the lot, is a *profanation of his name*.

It will not avail to plead, "the unseemliness of supposing that men of profane minds can, whenever they please, *compel* the Almighty to become umpire between them." The same objection applies to the *oath*. Shall men of profane minds compel the Almighty, at their pleasure, to ascend his throne of judgment, and decide on perjuries and blasphemies? Such language is irreverent, and ought not to be uttered. The plea, however, may be retorted. Shall the laws of God's world be suspended, or his ordinary agency interrupted, because men choose to be wicked? Shall they oblige him to work miracles in order to keep himself out of the way so often as they incline to sport with his providence? Nay, his appointments stand. His laws go on. His agency in them ceases not for a moment. And if men convert them to an unholy use, he will not alter his course to prevent either their crime or their punishment.

To exhibit this matter in another light. If the divine providence is not to be considered in the lot, why is it to be considered in any other action? And if in no other, upon what principle can there be any religious worship? Why should men pray? Is the Most High to leave them in their pastimes and sins, and come at their beck in the hour of trouble? How can there be any future retribution? For this proceeds upon the supposition of God's

perpetual presence and agency ; as there is none in earth or heaven, but himself, who can render to every one according to his works.

The sum is, that against the interposition of God's providence in the decision by lot, there can be advanced no arguments which do not lead directly to atheism. Consequently, all such arguments are false; and a decision by the lot is a decision of God's own providence. And as the lot, in every form and under all circumstances, is an appeal to him, it ought to be employed in a manner suitable to its nature. What the proper use of the lot is, and how it is abused at the expense of much sin, shall be pointed out hereafter.

SELECT SENTENCES.

The wise and prudent conquer difficulties by daring to attempt them. Sloth and folly shiver and shrink at sight of toil and danger, and *make* the impossibility they fear. *Rowe.*

The nature of man is so framed, that not only by often hearing himself called a fool, he believes it; but by often calling himself a fool, he enters into the same opinion. Every person holds an inward and secret conversation with his own breast, and such as it highly concerns him well to regulate, because even in this sense, " Evil communications corrupt good manners."

Pascal.

FOR THE CHRISTIAN'S MAGAZINE.

Dissertation on I. Kings, ii. 9.

THE opinions of men who are just about leaving the world, have always been regarded with deep and deserved attention. Of such, especially, as have been distinguished by the vigour of their minds, the eminence of their station, the splendour of their achievements, the extent of their power, and the rectitude of their characters, every sentence uttered in their last moments is eagerly noted and carefully preserved. A dying father, monarch, hero, and saint, giving to his son and successor, his parting counsel, is the solemn and affecting scene exhibited in this chapter. We approach it with reverence, and hear David addressing to Solomon such instructions as became a statesman, a prince, a man of private virtue, a strong believer in the grace and promise of his God. Yet in the midst of this grave, and tender, and interesting conversation, there occurs an injunction from which we involuntarily recoil—*And behold, thou hast with thee Shimei, the son of Gera, a Benjamite of Bahurim, which cursed me with a grievous curse, in the day when I went down to Mahanaim: but he came down to meet me at Jordan, and I swear to him by the Lord, saying, I will not put thee to death with the sword. Now, therefore, hold him not guiltless, (for thou art a wise man and*

knowest what thou oughtest to do unto him,) but his hoar head bring thou down to the grave with blood. v. 8, 9.

What are we to think of this passage? The infidels, even such of them as do not profess to refute the Bible without reading it, convert it into a heavy accusation against David; and by representing him, from his own mouth, as a malignant tyrant, impeach the credit of the scriptures which call him a "man after God's own heart;" and explicitly approve him, as having done that which was right in the eyes of the Lord, and not turned aside from any thing that he commanded him, all the days of his life, save only in the matter of Uriah the Hittite*. Consequently, the scripture must be considered as sanctioning this very charge respecting Shimei.

"An edifying spectacle truly! An aged monarch, upon his death-bed, sends for the son who is shortly to wear his crown, in order to give him some paternal admonitions. Large professions of piety are on his lips; and you anticipate lessons full of gentleness, forgiveness, and love. But no! Though life is ebbing fast away, and he is just going to his "long account," he cannot permit the malice which for years has rankled in his bosom to die with him. Revenge outlives every other emotion; and beats in the last pulsation of his heart. He calls up an affront which probably had been forgotten long ago by all the world besides, and orders it to be wiped out in the blood of the wretch who had offered it. And as if simple vengeance were not enough, as if it were rendered sweeter

* I. Kings, xv. 5.

“ by perjury, he refers to his own oath under the
 “ sanction of which he had granted Shimei his
 “ life; and thus, with his latest gasp, bequeaths
 “ to Solomon the infamy of commencing a new
 “ reign with an act of perfidy and murder.”

Such is the substance of the infidel's objection. We have no wish to evade it: nor are we conscious of presenting it in a less formidable shape, than any in which the reader may meet with it from an infidel-pen.

Various answers are returned:

That David forgave the *personal* injury done to him by Shimei, but did not surrender the right of the *government* to punish him at any future period, should that measure, just in itself, be thought necessary to the public weal.—

That David's oath to Shimei, did not contain an absolute pardon, but only a temporary respite, of which the duration depended on the pleasure of the sovereign.—

That the obligation of David's oath could not extend beyond the term of his life: as he had only said, *I will not put thee to death with the sword*; but that this could not impair the right of Solomon to bring a traitor to justice; nor the right of David to desire him to do so: and thus as Shimei had forfeited his life to the state, the clemency of David in sparing him so long, demanded his gratitude; and the refusing to continue it any longer, was no fair ground of complaint.

We acknowledge that these answers do not satisfy us.

The first sets up a metaphysical distinction between the *man* and the *prince*, which, under the circumstances of the case, is hardly better than a quibble.

The second is contrary to the spirit of David's declaration. *Shall there any man be put to death this day in Israel? Therefore the king said unto Shimei, Thou shalt not die: and the king SWARE unto him**. If this was not a royal pardon, nothing could be.

The third proceeds upon the supposition of a *mental reservation* in the oath, utterly inconsistent with the frankness of integrity, and with the magnanimity which David displayed in all his other actions at that time: and thus, in effacing one stain from his character, it imprints another.

But while we express our dissatisfaction with these and similar answers, we are far from allowing the validity of the objection which they are intended to remove.

The temper imputed to David is so purely diabolical, that before it could have gained admittance into his breast, he must have stifled every sentiment of honour, every claim of truth, every feeling of humanity, every dictate of conscience, every fear of God. And this could not have been effected without such a long and uninterrupted familiarity with crime as to make it, so to speak, the moral element of his soul. This we know is contrary to the whole tenour of his character, and to the dispositions which uniformly discovered themselves in the most tranquil and the most trying seasons of his life. The objection, therefore, plausible as it seems, and confidently as it has been urged, must be founded on some mistake. We are led to this conclusion, not only from the nature of the case, but also from internal evidence furnished by the history itself.

* 2 Sam. xix. 22, 23..

In the *first* place, David was under no necessity of deferring the punishment of Shimei, and at length devolving that ungracious task upon his successor, as he was in the instance of Joab. This man, whose hands were polluted with two foul murders, had very powerful connexions, being the cousin-german of the monarch himself; had rendered his sovereign signal services on which he, no doubt, presumed; held a high military command, being generalissimo of the Jewish armies; was respected by the troops as a brave and skilful officer; had prodigious influence over the measures of the government; insomuch that David's hands were tied up, and he could not reward the criminal according to his deeds; nor execute the plain commandment of the divine law. But the accession of Solomon broke up many of those interests, and snapped many of those cords, which had embarrassed the proceedings of his father.

The case of Shimei was altogether different. Though turbulent and dangerous, he was never of so much importance as to baffle the attempts of public justice. Had David only dissembled his wrath, and waited for an opportunity to wreak it on the head of Shimei, that opportunity could not have been long wanting. A man capable of such crafty policy would easily have found pretexts for carrying it into execution. "When a ruler hearkens to lies, all his servants are wicked;" and the story of Naboth's vineyard proves that it is no hard matter for a profligate government to destroy even the innocent, who incur their resentment, or stand in the way of their pleasures*. Besides, it

* Ἡ ποτὴρ φύσις πλημμυλεῖν αἰρουμένη, εἰ μὴ μὲν εὐλογου διτθῆναι προσχηματος, ἀπαρκαλυπτῶς γὰρ μὴ ποτῆρευεται. *Fab. Esop. Fab. 6.*

is not in the nature of revenge to defer its purpose, longer than is requisite for complete gratification. Had David, therefore, been influenced by the motives which the objection ascribes to him, he would have disposed of Shimei during his own life. His oath would have formed no obstacle at all; and reasons might easily have been assigned to justify the deed. But the objection represents him as, on the one hand, cherishing a most deadly spite; and on the other, contriving his own shame. By coupling his rancour with the moment of his decease, he exposed himself to the reprobation of all good men; and his vengeance went hungry out of the world, when it might have been glutted by the sacrifice of its victim. This is such thriftless malignity, such unalloyed folly, as cannot be reconciled with the calculating cunning which the objection supposes David to have possessed. Its authors have overshot their mark: and by aiming at too much, have made their blow to rebound upon themselves.

In the *next* place, the course to be taken with Shimei was left to Solomon's discretion. *For thou art a wise man, says his father, and knowest what thou oughtest to do unto him.* Now if he had been absolutely enjoined to put Shimei to death, his wisdom, as in the case of Joab, would have been confined to the *time* and *mode* of doing it. There had been no room for such latitude of discretion, as the words of David imply. And it had been perfectly ridiculous to submit to Solomon's wisdom, what ought to be done with Shimei, if nothing was to be done but putting him to death.

In the *last* place, it is evident that Solomon did

VOL. I.—N^o. II. Z

not understand his father as directing him to destroy Shimei. *Joab* he put to death without delay; and that expressly on account of the murder of Abner and Amasa. *Shimei*, on the contrary, was ordered to build a house in Jerusalem, to dwell there, and not to pass over the brook Kidron, at the peril of his life*. And to the observance of this injunction, he was bound by oath†. It is clear from the sequel, that if he had kept his oath, he would never have been put to death for his treasonable conduct toward David. And as Solomon was certainly a much better judge of his father's intentions, and a much better interpreter of his words, than the enemies of either can pretend to be, his own conduct is a demonstration that he was not enjoined to put Shimei to death; and, consequently, that all the charges of hypocrisy, and revenge, and perfidy, and blood, which they heap so liberally upon the dying patriarch, are most false and calumnious.

But this vindication of David has brought us into an awkward dilemma. The reason of the thing, the spirit of the text, and the subsequent events, point one way; the letter of the text points another. The former overthrows, the latter appears to support, the objection. For David says, in so many words, *BUT his hoar head bring thou down to the grave WITH BLOOD*. How the mere English reader shall extricate himself from this difficulty, we cannot divine. But one skilled in the original, will perceive that it is capable of an easy solution. The Hebrew particle ׀ (*Vau*, here rendered *but*) in connecting two members of a sentence whereof the former has a negative attached to

* 1 Kings, ii. 36—38.

† v. 42, 43.

it, often extends the force of the negation to the latter member also ; producing the same distribution of sense, which is produced by our English particles *neither—nor*. Two or three examples will explain our meaning.

Prov. xxx. 8. Give me NEITHER poverty NOR riches. Translated without regard to the difference between the Hebrew and English idiom, it would read, *give me poverty AND riches*, which is absurd ; and, therefore, the ׀ (*Vau*) is truly rendered so as to throw the force of the negation equally upon both members of the sentence.

2. *Sam. i. 21. Ye mountains of Gilboa, let there be no dew, NEITHER let there be rain upon you, NOR fields of offering.* Without attending to the distributive property of the ׀ (*Vau*) we should read, *Let there not be dew, AND not rain upon you : AND fields of offering.* This again is absurd. The close rendering is, *let there be NEITHER dew, NOR rain upon you, NOR fields of offering.*

1. *Kings, xxii. 31. Fight NEITHER with small NOR great, save only with the king of Israel.* But to read, *fight not with small AND with great*, would be no less absurd than either of the preceding. Examples might be multiplied*, but these are sufficient. And by the very same rule, must the text under review be translated. viz. *Now, therefore, NEITHER hold him guiltless ; NOR his hoar head bring thou down to the grave with blood.* Thus rendered, the passage accords precisely both with David's remarks, and with Solomon's conduct. *Behold thou hast with thee, says David, Shimei the son of Gera, a Benjamite of Bahurim, which cursed me with a grievous curse, in the day when I went*

* Vide NOLDII *Concord. Partic.* p. 287, 288.

to Mahanaim. Therefore, "hold him not guiltless." *But he came down to meet me at Jordan, and I swore to him by the Lord, saying, I will not put thee to death with the sword: therefore, "bring not his hoar head to the grave with blood."* Solomon did neither the one nor the other.

The whole may be paraphrased as follows. "Be upon your guard against Shimei, the Benjamite, who was very abusive and insolent to me, when I was retreating before Absalom. He is a restless, unprincipled man. Never trust him. Never imagine that he will become a good subject. Keep your eye constantly on his motions; and lay him under restraints which shall hinder him from doing mischief. I do not recommend any particular steps to be taken toward him; your own understanding will be the best guide. But there is one thing, Solomon, which you must not do. You must not put him to death for his behaviour to me at Mahanaim: he met me afterwards on my return, at Jordan, made an humble confession of his fault, and threw himself upon my clemency. I then gave him his life, and swore to him that he should not die for that offence. Secure yourself, therefore, against his machinations in the manner you shall judge fit, but, whatever you do with him, keep my oath sacred."

Thus, after a fair scrutiny, the temper and carriage of David are seen to be the exact reverse of what infidels have imputed to him. Where are now the malevolence and ferocity; where the deceit, and perjury, and murder, of the dying saint? They exist no where but in the visions of a disordered brain. They have not a shadow of support but in an inaccurate version of a Hebrew

particle. Yet the authors of such charges hope to pass for liberal thinkers; for profound scholars; for enlightened reasoners! If men were careful to *understand* the Bible before they set up for critics, we should have less of blasphemy without the church, and less of absurdity within it. Till then, Ignorance will substitute the bludgeon of presumption for the key of knowledge: but yet a shield will not be wanting to defend the truth from her maniac blows.

SELECT SENTENCES.

It is vain for men to turn away their thoughts from that eternity which is before them, as if they were able to destroy it by denying it a place in their imaginations. It exists in spite of them. It advanceth unobserved; and death, which is to draw the curtain from it, will quickly usher them into it.

Pascal.

The knowledge of God, without the knowledge of our own misery, is the nurse of pride. The knowledge of our own misery, without the knowledge of Jesus Christ, is the mother of despair. But the true knowledge of Jesus Christ exempts alike from pride and despair; by giving us at once a sight not only of God and of our misery, but also of the mercy of God in the relief of our misery.

Id.

From the Evangelical Magazine.

A REMARKABLE INTERPOSITION OF DIVINE PRO-
VIDENCE.



GENTLEMEN,

WHEN I reflect on the many happy hours in my youth, spent in private conference, and praying societies, I can neither forget the men, nor yet the distinguished mercies of the Lord, who rendered them a blessing to my early instruction, edification, and consolation. And such as are able to realize the ideas of past friendship, and to associate the feelings of gratitude for the past, with the hope of enjoying in a very few days, or years, a still more pure and perfect communion with endeared but departed saints, will not condemn me for bringing to light, and rescuing from oblivion, any singular instance of the Lord's care and kindness towards his hidden ones, in the days of their pilgrimage; and the following, I hope, will prove both entertaining and instructing to the poor of Christ's flock.

It has been often observed, that the Christian's greatest extremity is the time of God's gracious opportunity. Few things are more evident, than that some of the darkest dispensations in the experience of the saints, have been opportunities for the divine care and kindness to be made known and manifested towards them; and those tempo-

ral supplies, that are given in an extraordinary way, such as the ravens feeding Elijah, in a particular manner answer the designs of our Lord; they are the fruit of the wisdom of him who hath said, "*I will never leave thee; I will never forsake thee.*"

THOMAS HOWNHAM, the subject of the following providence, was a very poor man who lived in a lone house or hut upon a moor, called Barmour-moor, about a mile from Lowick, and two miles from Doddington, in the county of Northumberland. He had no means to support a wife and two young children, save the scanty earnings obtained by keeping an ass, on which he used to carry coals from Barmour-coalhill to Doddington and Wooler; or by making brooms of the heath, and selling them around the country. Yet, poor, and despised as he was in consequence of his poverty, in my forty years acquaintance with the professing world, I have scarce met with his equal, as a man that lived near to God, or one who was favoured with more evident answers to prayer. My parents then living at a village called Hanging-Hall, about one mile and a half from his hut, I had frequent interviews with him, in one of which he was very solicitous to know whether my father or mother had sent him any unexpected relief the night before. I answered him in the negative, so far as I knew: at which he seemed to be uneasy. I then pressed to know what relief he had found; and how? After requesting secrecy, unless I should hear of it from any other quarter, (and if so, he begged I would acquaint him); he proceeded to inform me, that being disappointed of receiving money for his coals the day before, he returned home in the evening, and to his pain and

distress found that there was neither bread, nor meal, nor any thing to supply their place, in his house; that his wife wept sore for the poor children, who were both crying for hunger; that they continued crying until they both fell to sleep; that he got them to bed, and their mother with them, who likewise soon went to sleep, being worn out with the sufferings of the children and her own tender feelings.

Being a fine moonlight night, he went out of the house, to a retired spot, at a little distance, to meditate on those remarkable expressions in Hab. iii. 17—19. Here he continued, as he thought, about an hour and a half; found great liberty and enlargement in prayer; and got such a heart-loathing and soul-humbling sight of himself, and such interesting views of the grace of God, and the love of his adorable Saviour, that though he went out on purpose to spread his family and temporal wants before his Lord, yet, having obtained a heart-attracting and soul captivating view of him by faith, he was so enamoured with his beauty, and so anxious to have his heart entirely under his forming hand, that all thought about temporals was taken away.

In a sweet, serene, and composed frame of mind, he returned into his house; when by the light of the moon through the window, he perceived something upon a stool or form, (for chairs they had none) before the bed; and after viewing it with astonishment, and feeling it, he found it to be a joint of meat roasted, and a loaf of bread, about the size of our half-peck loaves. He then went to the door to look if he could see any body; and after using his voice, as well as his eyes, and neither perceiving nor hearing any one, he re-

turned in, awoke his wife, who was still asleep, asked a blessing, and then awoke the children, and gave them a comfortable repast; but could give me no further account. I related this extraordinary affair to my father and mother, who both heard it with astonishment; but ordered me to keep it a secret as requested; and such it would ever have remained, but for the following reason: a short time after this event I left that country; but on a visit, about twelve years after, at a friend's, the conversation one evening took a turn about one Mr. Strangeways, commonly called Stranguage, a farmer, who lived at Lowick-Highsteed, which the people named Pinch-me-near, on account of this miserly wretch that dwelt there. I asked what had become of his property, as I apprehended he had never done one generous action in his life time. An elderly woman in company said, I was mistaken; for she could relate one, which was somewhat curious: she said, that she had lived with him as a servant or housekeeper; that about twelve or thirteen years ago, one Thursday morning, he ordered her to have a whole joint of meat roasted, having given her directions a day or two before to bake two large loaves of white bread. He then went to Wooler market, and took a piece of bread and cheese in his pocket, as usual. He came home in the evening in a very bad humour, and went soon to bed. In about two hours after he called up his man servant, and ordered him to take one of the loaves and the joint of meat, and carry them down the moor to Thomas Hownham's, and leave them there. The man did so, and finding the family asleep, he set them at their bedside, and came away.

VOL. I.—N^o. II.

2 A

The next morning her master called her and the man servant in, and seemed in great agitation of mind. He told them that he intended to have invited a Mr. John Mool, with two or three more neighbouring farmers (who were always teasing him for his nearness), to sup with him the night before; that he would not invite them in the market-place, as he purposed to have taken them by surprise near home, as two or three of them passed his house, but a smart shower of rain coming on, they rode off, and left him before he could get an opportunity: that going soon to bed he did not rest well, fell a-dreaming, and thought he saw Hownham's wife and children starving for hunger; that he awoke and put off the impression; that he dreamed the second time, and endeavoured again to shake it off, but that he was altogether overcome with the nonsense the third time; that he believed the devil was in him, but that since he was so foolish as to send the meat and bread, he could not now help it, and charged her and the man never to speak of it, or he would turn them away directly. She added, that since he was dead long ago, she thought she might relate it, as a proof that he had done one generous action, though he was grieved for it afterwards.

This is the fact; let those that read make their own reflections.

Deptford, Oct. 4, 1793.

J. R.

REVIEW.

ART. V.

A collection of the Essays on the subject of Episcopacy, which originally appeared in the Albany Centinel, and which are ascribed principally to the Rev. Dr. Linn, the Rev. Mr. Beasley, and Thomas Y. How, Esq. With additional notes and remarks. New-York, T. & J. Swords, 1806. 8vo. \$1.

(Continued from page 104.)

MR. H. in his preface to this collection, assures the reader that,

“ The author of *Miscellanies* has, with great industry, collected together all the arguments against Episcopacy.”

P. IV.

We apprehend that Mr. H's zeal, in this paragraph, has outstripped his caution. A man professes to have a very extensive and accurate acquaintance with a subject, when he pledges himself to the public, that “ ALL the arguments ” on either side of a question relating to it, are contained in a work which he has written or edited. And if the work be defective, especially in material points, he subjects himself to comments most mortifying to his own feelings, most painful to his friends, and not desirable even to his opponents. We, therefore, think, and others may think with us

before we shall have done, that Mr. H. ought not to have committed his reputation to the consequences of such an assertion. His reserve ought to have been the greater, as he has taken some pains to invite an examination of his scholarship. *This en passant.* To the book itself.

"The question of Episcopacy," says the Layman in his 9th number, "is a question of fact, to be determined by a sound interpretation of the sacred volume." We join issue with him; and not only consent, but insist, that the question shall be decided by the scripture alone. We detract not from the respect due to the primitive fathers, nor decline to meet their testimony, as we shall show in proper season. But in fixing the sense of the scripture, their authority is of no more weight with us than the authority of other uninspired men; that is, we regard not their opinion any further than as it is supported by the strength of their reasonings. The written word is the perfect and exclusive rule of our faith. It would be so, had not a shred of Christian antiquity survived the ravages of time. And if all the fathers from *Barnabas* to *Bernard*, had agreed in reckoning among the institutions of Christ, any thing which is not to be found in the statute book of his own kingdom, it should be no article of our creed; and should have no more sway in our conscience than an assertion of the *Layman* himself, or of his clerical friends. This being understood, let us see how the lines of evidence run.

The author of "miscellanies" had, in N^o. x. argued the identity of presbyters and bishops from the indiscriminate use which the scripture makes of these official terms. His antagonists flout at this argument, with all imaginable con-

tempt, through every part of the discussion. It is "literally," say they, "good for nothing:" "too feeble to merit a serious reply." It is "wretched sophistry"—"the old and miserable sophistry of names." But wherein does the sophistry consist? Why Paul is called an "elder;" therefore the Presbyterian argument would prove that Paul was no more than a presbyter. Christ himself is called (*διακονος*) *diaconos*, which is translated a "minister," a "deacon;" therefore the Presbyterian argument would prove, that Christ was no higher than a deacon.

"Presbuteros" (*πρεσβυτερος*) "signifies an *elder man*; whence "comes the term *Alderman*. By this new species of logic," (*which, by the way, is at least more than 1400 years old,*) "it might be proved," saith the *Layman*, "that the apostles were, to all intents and purposes, Aldermen, in the "civil acceptance of the term; and that every Alderman is "really and truly an Apostle." p. 52, 53.

If this argument is correct, the Presbyterians show very small, no doubt. And the Layman is not to blame for stigmatizing it as "wretched sophistry." "The miserable sophistry of names." Yet the reader may be induced to pause, when he is told that men of singular acuteness, learning, candour, penetration, and force of mind, have considered this self-same argument, when fairly stated, as altogether unanswerable. There may perhaps, be some policy in trying to run it down with hard words; for the Layman acknowledges, that the "Episcopalians would *give up their cause at once*, if reduced to the necessity of placing it on such a basis," p. 56. Here the secret is disclosed; if the argument from the scriptural use of official titles is valid, down goes the Hierarchy! *Hinc illæ lacrymæ!* No wonder that the attempts are so incessant to scowl, and

scoff, and laugh it out of countenance. It will not, however, be parted with so easily, and in listening to a good word for it, the reader may begin to think it possible for a little sophistry to trill from *other* than Presbyterian pens.

In examining the records of the New Testament, we find that the conversion of a number of individuals to the Christian faith, was followed by their organization into a public society under their proper officers. These officers, *without a single exception*, are distributed into the two general classes of *presbyters* or *bishops*, and *deacons*: the former presiding over the spiritual, and the latter over the temporal, interests of their respective charges. This distinction is marked in the strongest manner and is never confounded. Thus *to the saints in Christ Jesus, which are at Philippi, with the BISHOPS and DEACONS—a BISHOP must be blameless—likewise must the DEACONS be grave, &c.*

And that the terms *bishop* and *presbyter* in their application to the first class of officers are perfectly convertible, the one pointing out the very same class of rulers with the other, is as evident as the sun “shining in his strength.” Timothy was instructed by the apostle Paul in the qualities which were to be required in those who *desired the office of a BISHOP**. Paul and Barnabas *ordained PRESBYTERS in every church†* which they had founded. Titus is directed to *ordain in every city, PRESBYTERS who were to be blameless, the husband of one wife.* And the reason of so strict a scrutiny into character is thus rendered, *for a BISHOP must be blameless‡*. If this does not identify the *bishop* with the *presbyter*, in the name of common sense, what can do it?

* 1 Tim. iii. 1.

† Act. xiv. 23.

‡ Tit. i. 5.

Suppose a law, pointing out the qualifications of a sheriff were to say, a *sheriff* must be a man of pure character, of great activity, and resolute spirit; for it is highly necessary that a *governour* be of unspotted reputation, &c. the bench and bar would be rather puzzled for a construction, and would be compelled to conclude, either that something had been left out in transcribing the law; or that *governour* and *sheriff* meant the same sort of officer; or that their honours of the legislature had taken leave of their wits. The case is not a whit stronger than the case of *presbyter* and *bishop* in the Epistle to Titus. Again: Paul, when on his last journey to Jerusalem, sends for the *PRESBYTERS* of Ephesus to meet him at Miletum; and there enjoins these *PRESBYTERS* to feed the church of God over which the Holy Ghost had made them *BISHOPS* *. It appears, then, that the *bishops* to whom Paul refers in his instructions to Timothy, were neither more nor less than plain *presbyters*. To a man who has no turn to serve; no interest in perverting the obvious meaning of words; one would think that a mathematical demonstration could not carry more satisfactory evidence. But conclusive as it would be in every other case, it is in this case, the advocate of the Hierarchy tells us, "good for nothing," because Paul is called an "elder," and Christ a "deacon" as well as a "bishop," and, therefore, if the argument proves any thing, it proves that neither the apostles nor their Lord, were any higher in authority than our elders and deacons.

May we ask whether "bishop," "presbyter," "deacon," signify *any thing at all* as terms of

* Act. xx. 17, 28.

office, or not? If they do not, then the scripture has used a parcel of words and names relative to church government, which are absolutely without meaning. This will not be said. Something, therefore, and something *official* too, they must mean. We ask again, whether or not they designate precisely any particular officers, as *mayor*, *alderman*, *recorder*, do in the commonwealth? Or whether, like the term *magistrate*, they merely express authority in general; so that no judgment can be formed from them as to the grade, or functions of the offices to which they are annexed? If the former, the assailant of the Hierarchy, its own friends being judges, is invincible, and their citadel is laid in the dust. Of course, they prefer the latter; and insist that the official titles occurring in the New Testament, can afford no aid in ascertaining what offices Christ hath instituted in his church. If this is their hope, we much fear that it is a forlorn hope indeed.

If our questions be not troublesome, we would ask, what is the use of *names*? Is it not to distinguish objects from each other? To prevent the confusion which must pervade conversation about *nameless* things? And to facilitate the intercourse of speech, by compressing into a single term, ideas which, without that expedient, would be protracted through descriptions of intolerable length? Now if there are not in the New Testament *appropriate* titles of office which distinguish the several officers from each other, there could have been no such titles in use at the time when that book was written? For it would surpass the credulity of infidels themselves, to imagine that the writers, by purposely omitting the *particular*, and employing only the *general*, terms of office,

would throw both their history and their readers into utter confusion. There can be no possible reason for omitting terms characteristic of the several offices, but the fact that no such terms existed. A marvellous phenomenon this! That an immense society, as the Christian church is, should be organized under its proper officers; should ramify itself through all the nations of the earth; should have every one of its branches regularly officered; and yet be destitute of names by which the officers might be correctly known; so that when an official term was mentioned, no ingenuity could guess whether an officer inspired or uninspired, ordinary or extraordinary, highest or lowest in the church, was intended!!! Did any thing like this ever happen in the affairs of men, from father Adam, down to this present *A. D.* 1807? Is such a fact consistent with the nature and use of human language? Is it consistent with the operations or the being of any society whatever? If the state of the primitive church with respect to terms of office, were such as the Episcopal argument represents it, she would indeed, have been

Mostrum horrendum, informe, ingens, cui LUMEN ademptum;

a perfectly unnatural and monstrous production; dark and confused as "Chaos and old Night."

This demonstration that the representation on the part of the Hierarchy cannot be true, accords precisely with scriptural facts. From these, therefore, we shall prove that it is not true. A controversy of moment was referred by the church at Antioch, to the apostles and elders at Jerusalem. Now, if *apostle* and *elder* are not specific terms of office, where is the propriety of the distinction?

VOL. I.—N^o. II. 2 B

And to whom was the reference made? Would the description have answered as well if the assembly had been composed *entirely* of apostles; *entirely* of elders; or *entirely* of deacons? Paul and Barnabas ordained elders (*presbyters*) in every city. Cannot an Episcopalian tell, even from the *name*, whether they ordained bishops, priests, or deacons? Titus was commissioned by Paul to ordain *elders* in every city: and Timothy received his instructions pointing out the qualifications of men who were to be made *bishops* and *deacons*. Pray, if the *officer* was not precisely designated by the *name*, what sense was there in giving particular instructions relative to each? How were Titus and Timothy to find out what sort of officers the apostle meant? Would any Episcopalian affirm, that under cover of the indefinite terms *elder*, *bishop*, and *deacon*, the good evangelists might have settled down a dozen *diocesans* in every city? or created a score of new *apostles*? Why not? if *apostle*, *bishop*, *presbyter*, *deacon*, are only *general* terms of office, but are not appropriated to any particular orders of officers. Nay, if the Episcopal assertion on this subject is correct, a broad line of absurdity runs through the apostolic writings, and through the whole transactions of the apostolic church.

The simple truth is, that all these terms, *apostle*, *bishop*, and *presbyter*, and *deacon*, were as distinctive, and were annexed to certain offices with as much regularity and exactness, as any official terms can be at this hour. The first was given by our Lord Jesus Christ, to officers commissioned immediately by himself, for the purpose of carrying his name and establishing his church among the nations. The last, viz. *deacon*, was given to

officers ordained by the apostles to look after the poor. The other viz. *elder*, or *presbyter*, had long been in use as a specific term of office. It signified a ruler; but a ruler whose power was well defined, and was perfectly familiar to the Jews. *Presbyters* were to be found in every synagogue; and every man in the nation was acquainted with their functions. If ever there was a term which conveyed precise ideas of a particular office, and, was too notorious to be mistaken, *presbyter* was that term. By transferring it to rulers in the Christian church, the greatest caution was taken both to prevent misconception of their authority, and to facilitate the organization of Christian societies. As there were Jews every where, and converts every where gathered from among them, there were every where a number prepared to fall, without difficulty, into a regular church connexion, and to train the Gentile believers to whom the whole system was perfectly new. But they would have talked of *elders* to the day of their death, without the most distant notion of such a ruler as a *diocesan bishop*. These Christian *presbyters* were also *bishops* (*ἐπισκοποι*). The former word denoting their authority; the latter, the functions growing out of it. They were, according to the form in which the master had distributed their duties, to execute the office of *presbyters*, by taking the *episcopate* or *oversight* of the flock. So charges Paul the *presbyters* of Ephesus: *Feed the flock of God, over which the Holy Ghost hath made you BISHOPS. i. e. overseers, or inspectors.* So charges Peter the *presbyters* of the dispersion: *Feed the flock of God—taking the OVERSIGHT thereof:* the word is *ἐπισκοποῦντες*, which signifies, “*exercising the Episcopal office.*”

If, then, the term *presbyter* or *elder*, had been so long settled; if it denoted an officer as unlike a modern bishop as can well be conceived: and if it was admitted universally into the Christian church, as thus understood (for there is no intimation of its sense having been changed,) then the allegation of the Hierarchy, that it is an indefinite term, signifying merely a ruler, without reference to his station, is altogether false, and the objection founded upon this allegation is altogether frivolous. On the other hand, the argument founded upon it for the identity of the scriptural bishops and presbyters as rulers in the church, to the exclusion of prelates, is solid and strong; the flings of "good for nothing," and "miserable sophistry," to the contrary notwithstanding.

We have derived some amusement from remarking, that while our Episcopal friends pertinaciously deny that an official name in the New Testament is so appropriated to a particular office as to designate the *kind* of officer, they cannot render their own reasoning intelligible without the aid of the very principle which they reject.

"The apostles," says *the Layman*, "are called presbyters. This proves conclusively that no argument can be drawn, by the advocate of parity, from the promiscuous use of the terms presbyter, bishop, in the sacred writings. If it proves that there is now but one order in the ministry, it proves equally that Paul was upon a perfect level with the elders of Ephesus*." Again,

"Christ is called *diaconos*, which is translated deacon, or minister. Therefore Christ was on a level with the deacons of Jerusalem."

Does not every reader perceive, at the first glance, that the whole force of this objection, which

* No. 1. Coll. p. 8.

is to put down the advocates for ministerial parity, depends upon the supposition, that presbyter and deacon *are* titles appropriated to particular grades of office? For if they are not, if they denote only office in general; what will the objection say? To try it fairly—substitute *officers*, in the room of *elders*; and the proposition will stand thus: the apostles are called *elders*; therefore, the apostles are on a level with *officers* in the church. This is not likely to fill the “advocates of parity,” with any great alarm. Again,

“The apostle addresses Timothy and him alone, as the supreme governor of the church, [of Ephesus] calling upon him to see that his presbyters preach no strange doctrine*.”

Here the Layman uses *presbyter* as a precise term, for a particular grade of officers; and so does the apostle in the epistle referred to, or else the Layman’s argument, to quote his own words, “is literally good for nothing.” Nay, he even concedes that the term *presbuteros*, elder, is “ordinarily appropriated in the New Testament, to the second grade of ministers:” although, “it is capable of being applied to all the grades†.” But how we are to discover when it is applied in one way, and when in the other; i. e. when it has a particular, and when a general signification, neither this gentleman nor his reverend associates have been pleased to tell us. If we are to judge from facts, which they recommend as an excellent way of judging, and if we collect the facts from their own conduct in the debate, the rule is this. *Presbyter* is always a DEFINITE term of office when it makes for the prelates, and always an INDEFINITE one, when it

* LAYMAN, No. v. *Collec.* p. 55.

† No. 1. *Collec.* p. 7.

makes AGAINST *them*. For example : When Timothy is to be proved a bishop, in the genuine prelati- cal sense of the word, presbyter infallibly sig- nifies the second grade of ministers. This is so- ber, solid logic, which no man who can put a syl- logism together must venture to dispute. On the other side, when Paul, addressing these same presbyters, seems to identify them with bishops ; then presbyter is nothing more than a general term of office : and the argument drawn from its being convertible with *episcopos*, or bishop, is “ literally good for nothing,” “ the old and mi- serable sophistry of names !”

All this, to be sure, is vastly ingenious, and infinitely removed from sophistry and quibble ! But as imagination is apt now and then to be un- ruly, we fancied that it is not unlike the Socinian method of defending the inspiration of the scrip- tures. Let those great luminaries of wisdom, Dr. Priestley and his compeers, patch up the “ lame accounts ” of Moses ; refute the inconclu- sive reasonings of Paul ; and otherwise alter and amend the Bible, as their philosophy shall dictate ; and, then, the sacred writings will be *inspired* to some purpose ! Let the abettors of prelacy inter- pret terms now one way, and then the contrary way, as it shall suit their convenience, and they will, no doubt, convert the New Testament into a forge for the Hierarchy, and swear in an apos- tle to superintend the manufacture.

But still, how are we to repel the conse- quence with which they press us ? If presbyter and deacon are definite terms of office, and the apos- tles are called presbyters, and their Lord a dea- con, (*διακονος*) we certainly, by our argument, con-

found all distinctions: and put the apostles, and their master too, on a level with the ordinary and even lowest officers in the church.

No such thing. The conclusion is vain, because the premises are false. The objection overlooks a distinction which its authors themselves are compelled to observe every hour of their lives; and that is, the distinction between the absolute and relative use of terms. By the *absolute* use of terms, we mean their being applied to certain subjects in such a manner as to sink their general sense in a particular one. By their *relative* use, we mean their being coupled with other terms which permit them to be understood in their general sense only. To the former class belong all *names* which, however general in their primary ideas, have become appropriated to particular objects. To the latter belong the innumerable applications which may be made of the very same terms, when not thus appropriated. Examples will best illustrate the distinction. *Congress, judge, assembly*, are terms of great latitude, and their applications may be varied without end. When we say a *congress* of bodies, of waters, of people—a *judge* of music, of sculpture, of painting—an *assembly* of citizens, of clergy, of delegates; all the world perceives that these terms are used in their general sense, and can be used in no other. But when we speak of the United States, and say, *the congress, the judges*; or of the state of New-York, and say, *the judges, the assembly*, all the world perceives that the terms are used in a particular sense, and designate precisely certain public officers to whom, and to whom alone, every man, woman, and child, in the country will refer them. Now supposing

that certain individuals should remit a litigated point to one of the *judges*, and we should insist that this may mean the *Lieut. Governour*, because the term *judge* may be applied to him, when he sits in the court of errors : and suppose an opponent to urge that "judge" is an official term appropriated to known officers ; and us to reply, your argument is "literally good for nothing," "the miserable sophistry of names ;" judge is a generic term ; and by this same mode of reasoning you might prove that every justice of the peace is on a level with the chief justice of the United States, or with God himself, because "judge" is a name given to them all !! Would not this pass for most sage ratiocination, and persuade the public, that whoever should not bow to it, must be either a "miserable" sophist, or an incorrigible dunce ? And wherein it would yield the praise of acuteness, closeness, or strength, to the Episcopal objection to the argument drawn by the advocates of parity from the use of *official* terms in the New Testament, we are unable to discern. The mistake in both cases is the same, viz. the confounding the absolute and relative, or as we have explained it, the official and unofficial use of the same term. Make this plain distinction, and the reply of the Hierarchy is ruined. The Lord Jesus is emphatically the *SENT* of God : and therefore he is called, the *apostle* OF OUR PROFESSION*. He is also called the *minister* (*diaconos*) OF THE CIRCUMCISION † : but never, absolutely, "an apostle," "a deacon." Paul and his fellow apostles are often called *diaconoi*, ministers ; in such form as

* Heb. iii. 1.

† Rom. xv. 8.

this, *ministers of GOD—ministers of THE NEW TESTAMENT* * : but never, absolutely, “deacons.” They are also called *elders*, or *presbyters*; and for this very good reason, that possessing ordinary as well as extraordinary powers, they frequently participated in the councils, and exercised only the authority, of presbyters †.

Reverse the order: begin with the lowest and go up to the highest officer in the church, and you will not find an instance in which the official name of the superiour is applied to the inferiour. Deacons are no where called presbyters, nor presbyters, apostles. *Cyprian* does, indeed, assert, that “the apostolic authority was manifestly communicated to Epaphroditus.” Where is the proof?

“St. Paul,” says he, “in his epistle to the Philippians, ii. 25. calls him the apostle to the Philippians.” “But I supposed it necessary to send to you Epaphroditus, my brother and companion in labour and fellow soldier, but your apostle” (in our version, your *messenger*) “accordingly St. Jerome observes, “by degrees, in process of time, others were ordained apostles by those whom our Lord had chosen”—as that passage to the Philippians shows. “I supposed it necessary to send unto you “Epaphroditus, your apostle.” And Theodoret, upon this place, gives this reason why Epaphroditus is called the apostle to the Philippians. “He was intrusted with the Episcopal government, “as being their bishop.” But these are parts of scripture on which the advocates of Episcopacy place the least reliance ‡.”

In this paragraph as in many others, the assertions of *Cyprian*, applauded and adopted by Mr. H. display more haste than inquiry, and more ardour than discretion. To force a testimony in favour of Episcopacy, he has contrived, by a false translation of two words, to put into the mouth of

* 2 Cor. vi. 4.

† This matter shall be more fully explained hereafter.

‡ CYPRIAN, No. iii. *Collec.* p. 72

the apostle Paul a speech, which he never uttered. "St. Paul," says he, calls Epaphroditus, *the apostle to the Philippians.*" Paul does no such thing; he would not have spoken truth if he had. No person, as shall be proved in its place, could be vested with apostolic authority, but by the immediate appointment of Christ himself. Such an appointment Epaphroditus had not; and, therefore, Paul did not, could not, call him "an apostle," in the official sense of that term; much less "the apostle to the Philippians;" because a permanent connexion with any particular church, like that which subsists between a presbyter and his congregation, or between a prelate and his diocese, was essentially incompatible with the apostolic character. We wonder that *Cyprian*, while his hand was in, did not fix down Paul himself as the diocesan of Corinth and its dependencies. For his own words to the Christians of that city are, *If I be not an apostle unto others, yet doubtless I am to you: for the seal of mine apostleship are ye in the Lord**. Here occurs, in a fair and honest translation, the very phrase of "an apostle to a people," which *Cyprian* fabricated by a gross misrendering of a passage in the epistle to the Philippians. And considering the anxiety with which the New Testament has been searched for prelates, there can be no doubt, that if stubborn, most stubborn facts did not stand in the way, Paul would have been made up into a diocesan long ago: and introduced to our acquaintance, with the mitre on his brow, as the bishop of Corinth. But if the declaration, "I am an apostle unto you," is no proof whatever, that Paul filled an

* 1 Cor. ix. 2.

Episcopal see among the Corinthians; how can the expression, “an apostle to you,” even admitting it to be correct, prove that Epaphroditus was bishop of Philippi? But the words, mangled by *Cyprian* into an “apostle to you*,” signify just what our common version represents them to signify, “your messenger.” The Philippians had sent him with a contribution to the relief of the apostle’s wants; as he himself tells us in the fourth chapter. *I have all and abound: I am full; having received of Epaphroditus the things which were sent from you.*—v.18. This is the reason why he is called their messenger. The coupling of the term *apostolos* with “your,” takes it out of the predicament of official names, and requires that it be understood in its general sense, which is, “a messenger.” It has nothing to do with Episcopal relations, or clerical functions of any sort; say Theodoret what he pleases. It was hardly just to found the title of a bishop in the murder of a text. But whatever sentence be pronounced on Theodoret, we entirely acquit *Cyprian* from the charge of sinning against knowledge.

Cyprian seems also to labour under the inconvenience of a bad memory. For after agreeing with his friend the *Layman* to reprobate all reasoning from words to things; he lays the whole stress of an argument for the prelatical dignity of Epaphroditus upon a single word. And so mighty is the force of this word in his eyes, that on the strength thereof, he says that the “Apostolic authority was *manifestly* communicated to Epaphroditus.” When the fact turns out to be, that even the word which is to *manifest* this “communica-

* ὁμων ἀποστολος.

tion," has nothing to do with the subject ! And then, to finish neatly, he informs us in the close of the paragraph, that " these are parts of scripture on which the advocates of Episcopacy place the *least reliance*." They are wise to let the thistle alone after feeling its prickles—But it is rather incongruous to place only " the *least reliance*" upon " parts of scripture" which " *manifestly*" prove the very point they would be at. And not less so, to build their " manifest" proof upon an argument which they themselves have pronounced to be " miserable sophistry," and " literally good for, nothing*!"

Verum operi longo fas est obrepere somnum :

the right to be drowsy, in protracted toil, has become prescriptive. Homer occasionally nodded ; and we shall not refuse to *Cyprian* and his colleagues the indulgence of a nap.

The sum is, that the terms *apostle*, *bishop*, *presbyter*, *deacon*, designate, with precision, officers known and established in the apostolic church—That no two of these terms are used interchangeably, excepting " presbyter" and " bishop." We mean that apostle and bishop ; apostle and presbyter ; apostle and deacon ; bishop and deacon ; presbyter and deacon, are never put promiscuously the one for the other : And the reason is that they *do not signify the same thing*. But that " bishop" and " presbyter" are used interchangeably ; so that you may put the one for the other at pleasure, without destroying or obscuring the

* These gentlemen are hardly civil to their favourite *Theodoret*, from whom, through Whitby and Potter, they borrowed this " manifest" communication of the apostolic authority—to hold him up with one hand as a venerable defender of their cause ; and with the other to lash him as a miserable sophist.

sense of the sacred writers: and the reason is, and must be, that they *do signify the same thing*; that is, they mark one and the same grade of ecclesiastical rulers. This last proposition, *Theodoret*, fierce as he was for prelacy, has himself advanced. He probably did not observe how fatal it is to the hierarchy, as the discussions on that subject were not, in his day, very deep nor general. But so sensible was Dr. Hammond, the most learned, perhaps, of all the episcopal champions, that the argument drawn by presbyterians from the identity of the scriptural bishop and presbyter, is conclusive against prelacy, that he boldly denied the existence of such officers as are now called presbyters, till about or after the death of the apostles*. In supporting this paradoxical opinion, he meta-

* “ Although this title of *Πρεσβυτερος*, *Elders*, have been extended to a second order in the church, and is now only in use for them, under the names of *Presbyters*, yet in the scripture-times it belonged principally, if not alone, to bishops, there being no evidence that any of that second order were then instituted, though soon after, before the writing of *Ignatius’ epistles*, there were such instituted in all the churches.”—HAMMOND, on *Act. xi. 30.* p. 380.

How irreconcilably all this is at war with the assertions and reasonings of other learned advocates of the hierarchy, from whom the unlearned ones necessarily copy, we may amuse ourselves with showing in a more convenient place. One or two remarks we cannot suppress. Dr. Hammond does not tell us how these presbyters came into the church, but is pretty sure that they were introduced *after* “ the scripture times,” that is, after the canon of the scripture was completed, and “ *before* the writing of *Ignatius’ epistles*.” The Dr. then confesses that the order of presbyters as inferiour to the bishop, is not of divine right; there being no evidence that any of that second order were instituted in scripture times: consequently, that as Christ had regulated his church, bishops or presbyters, and deacons, had no intermediate officer between them. This is exactly what the presbyterians maintain, and they are much his debtor. But as he saw that their argument would ruin him, as he was utterly unable to controvert its principle, viz. the identity of the bishop and pres-

morphoses every presbyter of the apostolic church into a diocesan bishop ! The meaning of language shall be inverted : the testimony of the scripture shall be dislocated : the presbyters of the city of Ephesus shall be an assemblage of diocesan bishops collected from all Asia ! Truth, probability, and common sense, shall be set at naught—but the object is worth the price ; the sacrifice is amply compensated, provided presbyters be banished from the new testament, and no ruler be seen there unless in the shape of a diocesan bishop ! Had only the *Layman*, and *Cyprian*, and their friends, been troubled, there had been less cause of surprise. But that an argument “ good for nothing ;” a bit of “ miserable sophistry,” should put Dr. *Hammond*, the ἰκανν, the very Goliath of “ the church,” into such a fright as nearly to turn his brain, is strange indeed !

But should the episcopalian be worsted in the contest about the scriptural *titles*, what will be to us the advantage of victory, or to him the injury of defeat, if he shall, nevertheless, establish his

byter ; and as he was determined not to give up the hierarchy, he had recourse to the extravagant fiction of transforming all the presbyters into Diocesans. But as Diocesans with only deacons, would constitute rather a bald hierarchy, it was requisite, to give eclat to their dignity, to foist in another order for which there is no scriptural warrant. And thus at one stroke he has levelled with the ground the whole fabric which the other episcopal workmen have been rearing. For if Timothy and Titus were not Diocesan bishops, as the latter affirm and the Dr. denies ; and if they were not metropolitans, as the Dr. affirms, the others deny, and no man living can prove ; then one of their famous three orders has vanished away. Of the Dr's. supposition that the presbyters were instituted *before* the writing of Ignatius' epistles, the reason is, that they must be found *prior to that date*, or else poor Ignatius must be hung up for forgery.—A notable manœuvre this, to save the credit of the principal witness for the Hierarchy.

claim by scriptural *facts*? So very little, that the choice between victory and defeat, on the first ground, would not be worth a straw to either. Abstractly considered, there is no inconsistency between our own doctrine of the identity of bishops and presbyters, and the episcopal doctrine of a superiour grade. For certainly it does not follow, from the nature of the thing, that because bishop and presbyter mean the same officer, therefore there is no other officer above him. But *as the facts stand*, the case is widely different; and the value of the argument from the scriptural titles lies here, that this superiour order must be found among the bishops and presbyters, or not at all; because, with the exception of deacons, these were the only ordinary officers in the apostolic church. If, then, “bishop” is the same with “presbyter,” the superiour or prelatical order is absolutely unknown to the official language of the New Testament. Presbyters and deacons we meet with in abundance, but not the shadow of a prelate ever crosses our path. Now, that official titles should be conferred upon every grade of officers in the church except the highest; that this officer should have no place in the official catalogue; that he should wander up and down among the churches without so much as a name; that while his subalterns are mentioned particularly and repeatedly, his own existence and dignity should be a matter of mere inference from his *acts*, so far surpasses all the powers of belief, that the proof of his existence is almost, if not altogether, impossible. This leads to a very short refutation of a plea on which no small “reliance” has been placed by episcopal writers, from *Theodoret* down to the *Layman*; viz. that names of office, like other words, change

their signification; and become, in process of time, signs of ideas quite different from those which they originally expressed.

"In Roman history," says the Layman, "we find the term *Imperator* at one period applied to designate a general of an army; at another, a magistrate clothed with unlimited civil and military authority. Suppose we should be told that every general of an army was Emperor of Rome; and that the Emperor of Rome was merely general of an army, what would be the reply? That the term *Imperator* had changed its signification. And how would this be proved? By the Roman history, which shows us that the Emperors had generals under them, over whom they exercised authority. Apply this reasoning to the case under consideration. The terms bishop, presbyter, are used promiscuously in the New Testament. Therefore, say the advocates of parity, they designated the same office in the ages subsequent to the apostles. Is this a logical conclusion? Surely not. Names change their signification. Ecclesiastical history tells us, and the most learned advocates of parity have admitted the fact, that the order of bishops existed in the church as distinct from, and superior to, the order of presbyters, within forty or fifty years after the last of the apostles. The bishops then had presbyters under them, over whom they exercised authority. The offices were distinct from the beginning, bishops being the successors, not of those who are promiscuously called *bishops, presbyters, elders*, in the New Testament, but of the apostles themselves. Theodoret tells us expressly, "that in the process of time those who succeeded to the apostolic office, left the name of apostle to the apostles, strictly so called, and gave the name of bishop to those who succeeded to the apostolic office." No argument, then, can be founded on the promiscuous use of names*."

We hardly expected to find the Layman advancing and retracting a doctrine in the compass of a single page. Yet, assuredly, if bishops are not the successors of those who are promiscuous-

* LAYMAN, No. I. Collec. p. 8. 9.

ly called bishops and presbyters, then these names do designate a precise order of officers, which was the very thing the Layman had denied in the preceding paragraph. That names change their signification is no new discovery. But can this either help the hierarchy, or hurt the advocates of parity? Things are before names; and the changes in things before changes in names. If, therefore, a change has passed upon the signification of official names in the church, since the days of the apostles, that alone proves to a demonstration, that a change has also passed upon the offices themselves; which consequently are not *as the apostles left them*. This is exactly what the presbyterians maintain; and so the episcopal plea returns with all its force upon its authors, and fastens upon their hierarchy the charge of having departed from, and corrupted, the order which Christ appointed for his church, and which the death of his apostles sealed up for permanency. We are not ignorant that the prelatial writers attribute this change of names to a very different cause. The celebrated Dr. Bentley, who, in critical learning, in spirit, and fire, surpasses the most of them, and falls short of none, thinks it was the *modesty* of the prelates * which induced them to relinquish the name of apostle, and to assume that of bishop. It is hard to estimate the degree of modesty which pervaded an immensely numerous body of prelates † at a period of which we have scarcely any records. The epistles of their tutelar saint, *Ignatius*, do not

* *Phileleutherus Lipsiensis*, p. 186.

† Dr. HAMMOND says there were *twenty-four*, besides the metropolitan, in Judea alone. *Annot.* on Rev. iv. 4.

abound with that lovely virtue; and all the world is witness, that in matters relating to their titles and power, the order has been entirely innocent of such an imputation for fourteen centuries at least. The apostles themselves decorated the prelates, we are told, with their own name and ordinary dignity; they exercised the authority and wore the name, during the life, and in the presence of the apostles; and after their death retained the *dignity*, but renounced the *appellation* out of pure *modesty*! Dr. Hammond has more regard to consistency. He first creates, after the death of the apostles, an inferior order of clergy; and as they could not do well without a name, he very ingeniously splits up the designation of the pre-existing order, giving one half to the prelates, and the other to his new race of officers!

We repeat, that change of *names* pre-supposes change of *things*. This is the natural and necessary course of language. The contrary would reverse the operations of the human mind. *When* the change was introduced, is perfectly immaterial to the argument. When the last of the apostles breathed out his spirit, the authority of the living God, "bound up the testimony, and sealed the law among his disciples." No additions nor diminutions now. And whether the alteration in the government of the church, which produced a corresponding alteration in the names of her officers, took place "forty years," or forty scores of years, or forty hours, after the decease of the apostles, is not, with regard to the rule of conscience, worth the trouble of a question. The advocates of parity do not, as the Layman affirms, infer from the promiscuous use of the terms bishop and presbyter in the New Testament,

“ that they designated the same office in the ages subsequent to the apostles.” It is of no importance to them, what these terms signified in after ages. They prove that these terms signify in the New Testament, one and the same order of rulers ; and therefore insist, that, as the rule of faith and the sense of the scripture are immutable, the same terms must mean, at this hour, the very same thing which they meant as they dropped from the pen of an apostle. This is enough for them, as they entertain no fear of being unable to demonstrate that the scriptural presbyters are not diocesan bishops ; and are the only ordinary rulers which the New Testament, the statute book of Christ’s kingdom, recognizes as of his institution. The *subsequent* change of sense in the scriptural titles as we have more than once observed, proves decisively a change in the original order of the church : for upon no other principle can the other change be explained. The Layman has been peculiarly unhappy, in forcing it upon the notice of his readers. He has only turned “ king’s evidence,” against his party ; and, in attempting to parry a Presbyterian thrust, has unwittingly smitten his own bishop under the fifth rib.

(*To be Continued.*)

ART. VI. *A Letter upon the subject of Episcopacy ; from Samuel Osgood, Esq. To a young gentleman of this City.* NEW-YORK, Collins & Perkins, 1807, 8vo. pp. 44. 31 $\frac{1}{4}$ Cents.

So much obscurity pervades both the matter and style of this pamphlet, that although we have given it a very careful perusal, we are not sure that we perfectly understand it. We shall, however, submit to the reader, a few remarks on what we think we do understand.

It is written avowedly against the episcopal claim ; and lays hold, in the outset, of the episcopal argument, drawn from the testimony of the fathers. This argument, or rather the basis of it, is presented in the following words.

“ To trust, indeed, to the single testimony of any one father of the church, or to embrace his speculative opinions, or interpretations of scripture, would be blindly and indiscreetly to take as our guides, imperfect and fallible men. But, though liable to error in judgment, the primitive fathers must be revered as men of exalted piety and virtue. As witnesses to matters of fact, to the doctrines which were universally received, and to the usages which universally prevailed in the church, their testimony is invaluable, and, in all controverted points, should be decisive*.”

On this passage, Mr. O. after some preliminary remarks, thus comments.

“ The testimony of the fathers, is said to be invaluable

* Mr. O. has only used the ordinary marks of quotation, without referring to his author. The passage is in Dr. HOBART'S *Companion for the Altar*, p. 197.

Review.—Osgood's Letter on Episcopacy. 213

in three respects: *as to matters of fact; as to doctrines; and as to usages; and, in all controverted points, should be decisive.* It may be made manifest that the fathers did not pay this unbounded respect and deference to each other; and if not, no reason can be given why we should respect them more than they severally respected each other. Controverted points as to matters of fact, may be almost innumerable. Was Origen an universalist? Was Eusebius an Arian? These points may be controverted, and it is of no consequence to the church, whether these and a thousand others of no greater moment, as respects us, ever be settled. If there be *an exclusively authorized priesthood*, it must embrace fact, doctrine, and usage. But the *doctrine* is every thing, and the fact and usage are only concomitant circumstances. If the fact and usage be made probable, do they establish the doctrine? *Fact* applies to usage, as well as to *doctrine*. Usage may be conformable to doctrine, and may be a consequence of it. But it would be dangerous and irrational to attempt to establish, with certainty, one of the most important articles of the Christian faith from such usages as were in the church fifteen hundred years ago. The Fathers universally tell us, that such important articles of faith must be clearly derived from the sacred Scriptures alone. This is a matter of fact, of which we have abundant evidence in their writings. They disclaim all infallibility in explaining Scripture; and in controverted points, we can see no reason why their testimony to, or rather opinion of, an infinitely important point should be any more decisive with us, than it was severally with themselves." p. 10.

The episcopalians, we believe, do not say exactly what Mr. O. attributes to them. They do not say, in his construction of their argument, "that the testimony of the fathers to, *or rather opinion of*, an infinitely important point, should be decisive with us." He seems to confound their *testimony to a point* with their *opinion on that point*; and then to make the episcopalian assert that if any point is controverted among us, their opinion should be decisive. If this is his meaning, he evi-

dently contradicts the author whose words he has quoted.

The episcopal argument we take to be this. The fathers testify to the facts and doctrines which were universally received in their own days. That is, they testify of facts to which they were personal witnesses. Their testimony is relied upon no further than as it ascertains the existence of these facts, which you cannot deny without impeaching their veracity. Episcopacy is one of the facts thus attested. And from the *fact of its existence*, the episcopalians *infer* the divine origin of their hierarchy; for they argue, that without such an origin it could not have so existed, as, according to the testimony of the fathers, they say it certainly did. The use, therefore, which they here make of the fathers, is as witnesses to a matter of fact; the doctrine of the divine right of the hierarchy, is their *own conclusion* from the fact. The *opinion* of the fathers has nothing to do with it.

If this representation is just, Mr. O. as he has chosen to assail the episcopalians in their strong hold, ought directly to have controverted either the *fact itself*, or the *inference* deduced from it. It does not appear to us that he has done either the one or the other.

Mr. O. has been much happier in his answer to the following interrogative :

“ Is not the conclusion irresistible and irrefragable, that, if the church universal from the third to the sixteenth century, was governed by bishops as superior to presbyters and deacons; and if no period can be ascertained when this government was introduced into the church, it must be traced to apostolic institution, and of course rests on divine authority.” p. 15.

The conclusion he rejects, as he well may; and remarks, not without pungency,

“ No record, it is said, of this daring usurpation,” (viz. of bishops over presbyters,) “ can be found: and what St. Jerome says with regard to it, is mere conjecture, &c. But a record does exist that the supremacy of bishops was a human invention, and is no conjecture, but a positive assertion of the fact, and cannot be erased by any art that sophistry possesses.—I will produce the record.” p. 16.

This record is the famous testimony of Jerome, and Mr. O. reasons upon this sound principle of evidence, that one affirmative outweighs a thousand negatives. But we fear that his very loose manner of talking about the testimony of the fathers in the preceding pages, will subject him to the danger of retort.

We must observe further, that while Mr. O. aims avowedly at episcopacy, the whole drift of his pamphlet strikes at the existence of a regular successive ministry under every form. To this we cannot subscribe. The episcopalians are right in saying that the doctrine of a *succession* is as necessary to the presbyterians as to themselves. Determined as is our opposition to the prelatists, we shall not leap into the gulf for the pleasure of carrying them along with us. We do not see but that Mr. O's. doctrine sets the door wide open for every rash and presumptuous intruder into the ministry, without any official introduction or control whatever. As we are perfectly convinced that such a prostration of the ministerial office is one of the most subtle stratagems of Satan to destroy the church of God, we shall never cease to resist its approaches in every shape, in every degree, and in every direction. In this view, if Mr. O's. pamphlet was designed as an ally of the presbyterian cause, we disclaim its aid. *Non tali auxilio.* We want no such defence. We will

meet the prelatists upon the common ground of a *succession*, and contest their claim as a matter of *fact*.

“Is not,” says Mr. O. “the controverted point, *precisely a genealogical question?*”

We answer in the negative; and that will be sufficient till we have something like proof for the affirmative. His applying to the succession of the christian ministry, Paul's injunctions to Timothy and Titus, to disregard fables and endless genealogies, and foolish questions, and contentions about the law, cannot be considered but as a wresting of the scripture.

Passing over several long quotations from ancient and modern authors, we shall close with noticing Mr. O's criticism on Titus, i. 6. “That thou shouldest—ordain elders *in every city* as I had appointed thee*,” says our version: “literally,” says Mr. O. “that thou shouldest appoint *through the city* presbyters, as I had commanded thee.” p. 44.

This is an amendment much for the worse. We reject Mr. O's translation, for the following reasons:

1. The word rendered city is without the article, and ought not be translated *the city*.

2. As there is no antecedent but “Crete,” *the city* must refer to that: and then the criticism will imply either that the whole island of Crete was a city, or that there was but one city in the island.

3 The phrase *κατα πολιν*, translated by Mr. O. “through the city,” is precisely the Greek for, “from city to city;” our English bible, therefore, has correctly rendered the sense of the text, and ought not to have been meddled with.

* Καταστησης ΚΑΤΑ ΠΟΛΙΝ πρεσβυτερους, &c.

ART. VII. *A Letter to Samuel Osgood, Esq. occasioned by his Letter upon the subject of Episcopacy; addressed to a young gentleman of this City. By Philalethes.* New-York, Collins & Perkins, 1807, 8vo. pp. 14. 12½ Cents.

THIS short letter is written with much urbanity of manner, and with neat simplicity of style. The author supposes that the strain of Mr. O's. letter, in so far as it militates against the principle of a regular transmission of ministerial authority from Christ and his apostles, down to the present day, and onward to the end of time, is not much more agreeable to intelligent presbyterians, than to their episcopal opponents. We hope he is correct. His observations on this point are worth transcribing.

“ I cannot imagine, that the more considerate of your Presbyterian brethren, however they may commend your good intentions, will be much gratified by the doctrine inculcated in the letter now under consideration, for it certainly tends to the subversion of all ministerial power in the Christian church. It will not be denied, that the church is a visible, regular, and well-ordered society, blessed with good laws, and furnished with duly-appointed officers. Christ himself calls it *my kingdom*. *He* rules in it with supreme authority, and all the *legal* power which is exercised in it must be derived from *Him*. But, if the doctrine of *uninterrupted succession* from him through his apostles, be false and ridiculous, from what source do Christian ministers of the present day derive their authority to preach the Word, and administer the Holy Sacraments? This authority cannot be derived

VOL. I.—N^o. II. 2 E

from the people, for they who have nothing to give, cannot possibly communicate to another what they do not themselves possess. You are a believer in Jesus Christ; you hold fast the profession of your faith without wavering. But, does the profession of a sound faith, attended by a virtuous practice, confer upon you the right of constituting a minister in the Christian church? No; you are entirely destitute of this power, and your neighbours are as destitute as yourself. Although one hundred or one hundred thousand were to combine in an act of ordination to the ministry, their act on this occasion would be a mere nullity: the product of the multiplication of a hundred thousand noughts would still be nothing.

“As to those who come with the pretence of an immediate call from Heaven to speak and to act authoritatively in the church of Christ, I suppose that you and every other sober Christian will not be much inclined to acquiesce in their bold pretensions. If, like St. Paul, they claim to be immediately designated to the work of the ministry by Christ himself, let them give the evidence which St. Paul afforded in confirmation of their high commission; and then, and not till then, we will be disposed to receive them in the character of ambassadors from Christ, and stewards of the mysteries of God.

“What then remains? If the people possess not the power of ordination to the ministry, and if our yielding to the confident pretensions of self-constituted ministers would open a wide door to confusion and every evil work; we must have recourse to the doctrine of *uninterrupted succession*; we must go back through a line of properly authorized ordainers up to Christ himself, the source of all power and authority, who founded his church on a rock, and promised his apostles to be with them always even unto the end of the world.”

In this reasoning we heartily concur; but we wish it to be understood, that by “going back through a line of properly authorized ordainers, up to Christ himself,” we do not mean the tracing out, by historical proof, every link in the chain of succession: for we do not believe that such a proof is either possible in itself, or essential to the argu-

ment. If it were thus essential, the church of God would depend, for her very existence, upon *uninspired documents*: and, then, such books as the history of Eusebius, and the commentaries of Theodoret, would be as necessary to our faith as the bible itself. But we can never admit that the Christian church would have been disorganized, if every leaf of ecclesiastical story, from the close of the sacred canon down to the appearance of the man of sin, had been consigned to the flames a thousand years ago. The validity of the ministerial office arises out of the *fact itself*, that the line of transmission *has not been broken*; but, by no means, upon our ability to produce unexceptionable historical records of its preservation. For the fact itself, we have the highest possible evidence, and that is the testimony of God speaking in his own word. He has promised that there *shall be* a constant succession of authorized ministers; and, therefore, we conclude, with infallible certainty, that there *has been* such a succession. This ground of persuasion is worth a million of uninspired histories. It cuts the matter short, and is as completely within the reach of the unlettered, as of the learned, Christian. Considering the nature of the divine constitutions, we shall as soon believe that the present generation of men have not lineally descended from the generations which went before, as that the church, actually upon earth, has not descended from the church which was on earth before. But the church is a *whole*; her ministry enters into her very being. Had the ministry ever been destroyed, the church would have been destroyed too: and all the created powers in earth and heaven could not have restored her: because no creature, nor combination of

creatures, can set up a kingdom of God. This is as exclusively his work, as the framing of the worlds. Yet if the succession is not unbroken, the ministry has perished; for it is a contradiction to say that the office continues, when the only means which God ever appointed for perpetuating the office, have ceased. The destruction of successive office in the Christian church, is, therefore, impossible. This is enough for us. We shall believe that the succession of the evangelical ministry has been intermitted, when we see convincing proof that the mode of propagating the human species was fairly arrested some centuries ago; and a new race of men and women rained down from the clouds, or extracted from the mire. Till then we shall be much at our ease.

But while, with *Philalethes*, we maintain the general principle of a *succession*, we are far from embracing his application of it, or his reasoning in its support.

“In the prosecution of truth,” says he, “of every sort, reason tells us that we ought to be satisfied with such evidence as the nature of the case will admit of.” p. 5.

Granted.

“You believe,” *proceeds he, addressing Mr. Osgood*, “you believe the book, which by way of eminence we call *the Bible*, to contain the Scriptures originally given by inspiration of God. What proof can you produce in support of this belief? Can you trace these Scriptures from manuscript to manuscript, and (after the invention of the art of printing) from one edition to another, from the original writers down to our own times? It may be difficult, perhaps impossible, to do so; and yet you may very justly say, “This book has been received in every age of the church as the authentic record of the revelation of God’s will to the children of men; and therefore, I should deem myself guilty of the most culpable absurdity and presumption, were I now to reject it as a spurious work.” In the same manner I would argue, in order to establish the

point relative to the Episcopal government of the Christian church."

Philalethes assumes, what will not be conceded to him, that we believe the scriptures to be a revelation of the divine will, because they have been so received in every age of the church; and that this, viz. the testimony of the church in every age, is "the best evidence that the nature of the case will admit of."

From this proposition we enter our strong dissent, as not only inaccurate, but also of most pernicious tendency. It will draw us into the magic circle of Papal Rome, the church testifying to the scripture, and the scripture testifying to the church: that is, the scriptures declare "the church" to be infallible; and we cannot know the scriptures to be the word of God, but by the testimony of the church; and so, old "mother church," very snugly proves her own infallibility by her own testimony! Is it, however, true that the testimony of the church to the scriptures, as being "the authentic record of the revelation of God's will to the children of men," is the "best evidence" of that infinitely important fact, which the "nature of the case admits of?" What! Had all the records of uninspired antiquity been lost, would there have been no way of ascertaining whether the Bible is the word of God? Has *Philalethes* no other evidence? Has God put his seal upon every work of his hand, from the "cedar of Lebanon, to the hyssop that springeth out of the wall;" from the luminaries of heaven, down of the pebble of the brook? And has he put no mark to his authority on his word of life? Can we not find out that the bible is a divine revelation, unless we be

versed in ecclesiastical history? Tell us, then, that we cannot find out there is a God, unless we be astronomers and botanists. Has his own Spirit, the spirit of truth, nothing to do with certifying to the consciences of believers, independently on every sort of historical induction, that their "faith does not stand in the wisdom of man, " but in the power of God?" What is to become, according to this doctrine, of those plain, unlearned Christians, who never read a page of this testimony of the church in all their lives? They certainly can have no other evidence that the bible is "the record of the revelation of God's will," but this, that their teacher or some body else, tells them so. If they have, the argument of *Philalethes*, to use a phrase of his friend, is "good for nothing"—If they have not, God help them; for such a faith will never bring a sinner to his kingdom*.

The other points touched upon by *Philalethes*, are rather propositions to be demonstrated, than demonstrations of his propositions. He asserts roundly, but is not quite so dexterous in proving. The very same topics occur, more at length, in Mr. Hobart's *Collection of Essays*, which we have

* The reader may see a much better account of this matter, in Dr. OWEN's *divine originall, authority, self-evidencing light, and power of the scriptures, with an answer to that inquiry, How we know the scriptures to be the word of God?* And also in Mr. HALYBURTON's admirable *Essay concerning the nature of faith, or the ground upon which faith assents to the scriptures: wherein the opinion of the RATIONALISTS about it, is proposed and examined, especially as it is stated by the learned Mr. Locke, in his book of Human Understanding*. This tract is annexed to Mr. H's celebrated work entitled, *Natural Religion insufficient, and revealed necessary, &c.*

Review.—Philaethes' Letter to Osgood. 229

under review, and shall receive in their turn all the attention which we think they merit.

The letter of Philaethes, viewed as a composition, is entitled to praise ; but viewed as a polemical production, we feel ourselves perfectly at liberty to say of it, as Lord Chancellor Thurlow said, after hearing a young man whose talents had been rather over-rated: " Nothing very terrible."



RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCE.

FOREIGN.

In pursuance of our design to lay before our readers a succinct history of recent missions to the Heathen, we begin with

A short account of the Mission to the South-sea Islands, by the London Missionary Society.

THIS mission was the first which the society undertook. The missionaries embarked soon after its institution, and arrived at the Society Islands about the beginning of March, 1797. Messrs. Broomhall, Bicknell, Clode, Cock, Cover, Eyre, Hassell, Harris, Henry, Hodges, Jefferson, Lewis, Main, Nott, Oakes, J. Puckey, W. Puckey, and Smith, settled at Otaheite*. The following month the remaining missionaries proceeded to the Friendly Islands; when Messrs. Bowell, Buchanan, Cooper, Gaulton, Harper, Kelso, Shelly, Wilkinson, and Veeson, settled at Tongataboo †. On June following, Mr. Crook settled without any companion at the Marquesas ‡.

At *Otaheite* the missionaries met with quite as favourable a reception as they had ventured to anticipate. The conduct and appearance of *Otoo*, the sovereign of the island, were not very promising; but as he was a youth of only seventeen years of age, his dominions were under the regency of his father *Pomere*, who was disposed to encourage their settlement by every inducement

* *Missionary Voyage*, p. 53, 54. † *Do.* p. 90—110. ‡ *Do.* p. 127—147.

which it was in his power to offer. He without any hesitancy ceded to them a part of the district of *Matavai*, where they erected habitations and enclosures, such as their means would admit. He evinced much hospitality in supplying them with provisions; and was satisfied with such compensation as they found it easy to give. *Manne-Manne*, the chief priest, who possessed considerable influence, was desirous to cultivate their friendship; and appeared willing to use his influence in promoting the object of their mission, as far as he was able to understand it. The inhabitants in general, whether excited by the love of novelty, or the spirit of generosity, showed friendly dispositions*.

But the state of society was soon found to be such, that while it excited the compassion of the missionaries, it presented many discouragements. The duties of husbands and wives, of parents and children, are neither understood nor practised. If the rite of marriage is performed at all, its obligations are viewed as of force no longer than the husband chooses to continue his protection and attachment. They view their children as property, which every parent has a right to dispose of according to his own inclination; and the event is, that many of them are murdered as soon as they are born. But the most horrible source of pollution and cruelty which was found among them, is the *Arreeoy* Society. This is an association of individuals descended from the principal families in the Society Islands. They are continually wandering about from one island to another, and support themselves by plundering the inhabitants.

* *Missionary Voyage*, p. 56—81.

Each of the men has two or three women whom he calls his wives; but their rule is to live in a state of promiscuous concubinage, and uniformly to murder every infant which is the fruit of their intercourse.

Parents, when they become old, are treated with every mark of neglect. Their society is avoided as a disgrace; and indeed, to such a height has their contempt of old age arisen, that the term "old man" is proverbially used to express any thing worthless.

To their religious rites they are much attached, and in the performance of them are very devout. They profess an extraordinary veneration for their priests, who are supposed to have power to inflict and remove diseases at pleasure, and to have immediate revelations from their deities. Sacrifices among them are very frequent. But the most horrible part of their religion is their human sacrifices. Such victims are offered at the accession of every new sovereign, by the chiefs of the several districts, in acknowledgment of their subjection; and on many other occasions, which are distinguished by nothing so remarkable as the repetition of this dreadful rite*.

The missionaries early endeavoured to put a stop to these enormities. But their progress, which, without a miracle, could not have been rapid under the most favourable circumstances, was arrested by an unlooked for obstacle. To learn the language of the natives, they found, contrary to the accounts of all travellers, would be a work of difficulty. The vehemence of their pronunciation; the great quantity of vowels which

* *Missionary Voyage*, p. 60—80. 118—176. p. 336—340. p. 383—386.

are embodied in their words; and the great number of names which they give to the same object, made it evident that both time and application were necessary to gain a tolerable ability of conversing on the truths of the gospel*. But the difficulty of having any communication on such subjects, was in some measure removed by the assistance of one *Peter Haggerstein*, a Swede, who had resided for some years among the natives, was well acquainted with their language, could talk English tolerably well, and was prevailed upon to act as interpreter†. By means of *Peter* they intimated their design of settling in the island; remonstrated with an honest and pious warmth against their exorbitant cruelties; and threatened the wrath of God against all who practised them. *Pomere* and *Manne-Manne* seemed to be affected with what was said, and promised to use their influence in repressing the customs which had been so offensive to the missionaries. *Otoo* and the wife of *Pomere*, discovered a stubborn indifferency, and a determination to adhere to their customs. The mass of the natives promised to be influenced by the example of the chiefs‡. And an opportunity was soon offered of addressing the chiefs, not only of *Otaheite*, but of several of the islands in its vicinity; who declared themselves much pleased with the intentions of the missionaries, and complied with their wishes so far as to promise that no more children should be destroyed ||.

But it was soon found that the gospel alone can make men honest. The crimes which they had promised to abandon, were practised with as much

* *Trans. Mis. Soc.* p. 82. p. 97. † *Miss. Voy.* p. 57, 58. ‡ *Do.* p. 152—154. || *Trans. Mis. Soc.* p. 25.

freedom as ever; unless where the missionaries were present, and by the importunity of entreaties more than by the obligations of promise, prevented them from executing their purpose.

But a cause of discouragement, more serious than the faithlessness of the chiefs, was the separation of the missionaries. This took place about a year after their arrival. During this interval they were often harassed by that covetousness which displays itself in savages, when they have access to any of the conveniencies of civilized life. *Pomere* continued to be friendly; but much was to be feared from the despotism and covetousness of *Otoo*. He was stubborn, sullen, and so averse from any thing like instruction, that there was little hope of ever seeing him seriously impressed with the gospel. His despotism often produced uneasiness among his own subjects; and his covetousness often made depredations upon the property of the missionaries, while insult was added to injustice. This dangerous temper had before the expiration of a year began to discover itself. Some of the missionaries were married men, and felt their fears much excited by their affection for their families. Such circumstances persuaded many of them that it would be proper to quit the island whenever they could find an opportunity: and soon after some of the occurrences which led to this determination, an opportunity was presented by a ship going to Port Jackson; when Messrs. Clode, Cock, Cover, Hassell, Henry, Hodges, Main, Oakes, J. Puckey, W. Puckey, and Smith, left their brethren to strive with difficulties which they supposed their united strength could not overcome. But although they left *Otaheite*, they did not abandon the object of their mission.

At Port Jackson the governor of the colony gave them liberty to open a place for public worship, where they continued for some time, and laboured with much zeal*.

Those who remained upon the island embraced every opportunity of giving instruction. Their ability, however, was still very feeble, and the natives appeared not more unable to comprehend their meaning, than careless about listening to them. But before the close of this year they met with a severe trial from the conduct of one of their brethren. In July, Mr. *Lewis* removed to a place about three or four miles distant from the missionary house, and cohabited with a woman of the island, as his wife. He solicited his brethren that one of them might be allowed to marry him to the woman; but they chose to testify their disapprobation of such an union between a christian missionary and an unconverted heathen. Some time was spent in a correspondence on the subject, but as he still avowed his determination to have the woman for his wife, they felt themselves bound to pronounce against him a sentence of ex-communication†. He continued separate from them until his death, which was about ten months after his separation. The cause of his unhappy end could never be ascertained; but there was too much reason to fear that the pain of remorse had tempted him to destroy his own life‡.

At *Tongataboo* and the other Friendly Islands, the missionaries found the state of society raised to a considerable height above the barbarism of the Otaheiteans. Marriage is more general, and its

* *Trans. Miss Soc.* p. 32—42. † *Do.* p. 50—80. ‡ *Do.* p. 144—148.

obligations more observed. The natives are fond of their children, and take pleasure in a large family. The religious rites are not comparable to the human sacrifices of the Otaheiteans. Old age meets with attention and reverence. But in their propensity to theft, they are extremely daring. To one another their liberality is great; but upon foreigners they look with a very suspicious eye, and give nothing without the hope of an ample equivalent*.

Considerations of prudence persuaded the missionaries to separate, and settle in different parts of the island. The Chiefs of the districts where they settled, promised all the protection which their power could command, and were undoubtedly of much advantage, in restraining the covetousness of their subjects.

They soon found that much evil might be apprehended from the wickedness of a few sailors who had resided some time among the natives, and possessed too much influence over their minds. The very fact of their having chosen to undergo the hardships of savage life, for the sake of its liberties, was enough to raise suspicion. But by several accounts from the natives, as well as several actions which the missionaries witnessed, it was put beyond all doubt, that they were very unfriendly to the Mission, and probably were highly instrumental in promoting the troubles, which ended in its total miscarriage. They wickedly attempted to persuade the natives that the prayers of the missionaries were the cause of all the evils which happened in the island; and as superstition can be driven into any absurdity, their attempts

* *Miss. Voy.* p. 91—110. p. 383—386.

succeeded. One of the Chiefs was so alarmed, that he sent for one of the missionaries, seriously advised them to desist from "that pernicious practice of praying," and told them that his subjects were much offended with him for allowing it, and with them for following it. But the pious missionaries chose to obey God rather than man, and continued to ask their protection from his goodness without much molestation*.

But the misconduct of one of their brethren, proved as great a trial of their faith, as the wickedness of the straggling sailors. Immediately after their settlement, Mr. *Veeson* was suspected of improper intimacy with a woman of the Island. When first charged, he denied the fact, but afterwards acknowledged it. His acknowledgment, however, was not accompanied with any evidences of penitent feeling; and his subsequent conduct proved that he was quite hardened against it; for he not only continued his illicit intercourse but entirely neglected the Sabbath, and every part of religious worship. He was accordingly excommunicated; after which he seemed to forget the habits of civilization, and became assimilated in his manners to the natives with whom he associated†. The journals of the missionaries, until the end of 1798, contain nothing of importance, except the account of several plots which were laid for murdering them, and seizing their little property; but which were all providentially defeated. Their situation, however, was continually so alarming, that they found little time for learning the language of the natives. Sometimes their

* *Trans. Miss. Soc.* p. 156. *Miss. Voy.* p. 223—268.

† *Trans. Miss. Soc.* 257—264.

houses were plundered, while silence was enjoined upon the sufferers at the peril of their lives; and at other times they had to preserve their lives by a speedy escape from their pursuers*.

But their journals for the following year, contain events truly lamentable. In the object of their mission, they completely failed. They thought of establishing schools; but in the children they found an utter aversion against both instruction and restraint, without having in their power any means for subduing it. In those who were more advanced in years, this aversion was strengthened by habitual idleness. Many placed implicit confidence in the straggling sailors, who continued to foment suspicion concerning their designs. They had not yet been able to reduce the language into any grammatical form, which might have facilitated their progress.— But while they were viewing these difficulties, and devising means for overcoming them, their plans were all disconcerted by the alarm of war†.

On the 5th of April, *Dugonagaboola*, who was in reality the sovereign of the Island, was murdered by *Loogalalla* and *Nerwer*, his cousins. He had uniformly shown himself friendly to the Missionaries, and had taken Kelso, Shelly, and Wilkinson, under his protection, in *Aheefo*, the district in which he resided. The *Aheefonians* no sooner heard of his death, than they were inflamed with a desire of revenge; while others, in different parts of the Island, appeared to be equally determined in the defence of the conspirators. *Atta*, a Chief of considerable power, sent for Mr. Shelly and desired him and his brethren to join the

* *Trans. Miss. Soc.* p. 266—267. † *Do.* p. 279, 280.

Aheefonians, whom he expected to command, and to go with him in quest of the conspirators. A refusal to comply surprised and irritated him; and he immediately declared that protection could no longer be expected from him, as it would not be in his power to save them from the covetousness and cruelty of the people, if they remained neutral. And they indeed found too much truth in what he had said. The little government which had formerly been maintained, was completely lost, and all was a scene of dismal confusion.

The different parties were for a few weeks busied in preparing themselves for the war. During this time the missionaries were so much disturbed, that some of them were forced to leave their places of residence. On the 10th of May, the *Aheefonians* informed the missionaries who had settled among them, and to whom Messrs. Buchanan and Cooper had now joined themselves, that they would abandon Aheefo to the ravages of the conspirators, and would go to attack a party who had collected at *Tageow*. The missionaries thought it most advisable to join the *Aheefonians*, and the same day saw them gain a victory over their enemies. In the beginning of the engagement, they came in with the imaginary Deities for a share of the most devout acknowledgments; but when it was seen that they took no active part, they became almost as obnoxious as the enemy. They accordingly were obliged to leave their companions, and ventured to return to Aheefo, where they found things in a much better state than they expected. But about noon the next day, they were surprised by a number of the natives flying with the utmost haste, who informed them that the *Aheefonians* had that

day been defeated, and that *Atta*, with others of their friends, had been slain. They saw no hope of safety but by joining in the flight. They soon came to a thick wood where they endeavored to conceal themselves from the pursuers. But scarcely had they begun to console themselves with the hope of safety, when they received the afflicting intelligence that their three brethren, *Bowell*, *Gaulton*, and *Harper*, had been murdered at *Ardeo*, by the *Aheefonians*. The particulars of their death could never be learnt; but when their brethren afterwards visited them to pay the ordinary duties of respect to their bodies, they found them mangled and disfigured in the utmost wildness of cruelty.

They had now to endure all the distresses which could arise from continual fear, the want of a dwelling, the scarcity of provisions, and the sight of human bodies, which, after being brutally mangled, were left to putrefy in the open air. But God appeared as their very present help. *Loogalalla* became master of the Island about the beginning of June, when he sent for them, and promised them every comfort which his friendship and power could furnish; and soon afterwards, when he was going on an expedition to a neighbouring Island, he left it to their choice whether they would accompany him, or remain in *Tongataboo*. They chose the last; and the event was that their history, during the remaining part of this year, presents us with a scene of uninterrupted calamities. From the vanquished natives, they suffered all the abuse that human nature can invent, when degraded not only by barbarity but misery. Every misfortune was laid to their charge. The friendship of those of *Loogalalla's* party who had staid

behind him, lasted no longer than the hope of enjoying some valuable booty kept it alive. The inhabitants of *Maffanga*, where they had lived since *Loogalalla's* departure, seemed determined to procure their death at his return; and from several accounts, they had reason to fear that he was already inclined to sacrifice them to his despotism. A dreadful storm had visited the island, and destroyed all the produce which the ravages of war had left; so that an escape from the cruelties of their enemies, could prolong their lives only to suffer the miseries of famine. So fully were some of them persuaded that their stay upon the Island must be followed with their death, that they entertained serious thoughts of embarking in a small boat, and attempting a voyage to the Coast of New-Holland.

But God, who never forgets his own, provided for their safety. On the following January, a ship, which was on its way to Port Jackson, stopped at the Island. The opportunity of escape was viewed as a providence which plainly invited them from danger. They accordingly left the Island, not more rejoiced at their providential escape, than grieved that they were obliged to abandon an enterprise, which was undertaken with such pious motives, and met with so painful a defeat*.

(*To be continued.*)

* *Trans. Miss. Soc.* p. 288—315.

ABSTRACT of the proceedings of the Directors of the London Missionary Society, from the last annual meeting in May 1805, to Feb. 20, 1806.

PROCEEDINGS RELATING TO OTAHEITE.

IN the beginning of November last, a Letter was received from the missionaries at Otaheite, dated the 12th of December 1804, together with eight Journals of their itinerant labours, in various parts of that island, during two years preceding that date.

The Society having pledged themselves to the missionaries at Otaheite, to send out a medical man to join them there, have, for two or three years past, been training up Mr. Gregory Warner, under able teachers, for that purpose. On the 7th of October last, he was solemnly designated to the work of a missionary, at Spa-Fields Chapel, and has since embarked in the ship Sinclair for Port Jackson. Government has very kindly granted him a free passage; and Governor Bligh having taken his passage in the same ship, Mr. Warner, together with any other missionaries who may seek an asylum at Port Jackson, have been strongly (and it is hoped successfully) recommended to his favour and patronage.

The Directors, in the instructions which they have given to Mr. Warner, have endeavoured to meet and provide for the circumstances he may find himself in on his arrival at Port Jackson, as they respect the state of the missionaries at Otaheite; and have associated the Rev. Mr. Marsden

with Mr. Warner in the deliberation and decision which such circumstances shall call for. And, it being of great importance to adopt a plan of more frequent communications with the missionaries at Otaheite, through the medium of Port Jackson, the Rev. Mr. Marsden has been authorized to appropriate any sum, to the extent of 300 l. to be used, if necessary, as an inducement to persons residing there, to appoint one vessel or more to proceed to that island, for the purposes of trade, and to take with them such missionaries and stores as may be ready, and to bring Letters or parcels from thence for the Society.

Mr. Hassell and Mr. Harris having requested some books for the Schools over which they preside, at New South Wales, the Directors have ordered 20 l. to be expended in the purchase of suitable books, for the said Schools.

SOUTH AFRICAN MISSIONS.

Very ample accounts from the Cape of Good Hope, and from the missionaries at the various settlements in the interior, are detailed in the number of missionary transactions published in Nov. last. Since that time, Letters have been received from Dr. Vanderkemp and Mr. J. Read, dated Cape Town, Oct. 7, 1805, and stating their having arrived there from the missionary settlement at Bethelsdorp. The Doctor's Letter merely respects a bill, which he has drawn on the Treasurer; but that from Mr. Read, details some interesting and pleasing occurrences. It states, that they left Bethelsdorp in May last; and that,

at present, their return thither is forbidden.—That the word of God, at their departure, was in a prosperous state.—That the number of baptized (adult) persons was forty-six; and that there were many others, of whose conversion they had little doubt.

That one of the baptized, named Kruisman, appears to be a person of great zeal, and that his conversation and instructions among the servants of a farmer with whom he lived, have proved a blessing to the soul of one of the servants. Hopes are entertained of Kruisman's being made the instrument of much good among his countrymen. It appears that the Brethren Ulbricht, Tromp, and Smith, had arrived at Bethelsdorp before Dr. Vanderkemp and Mr. Read departed from thence; so that the word of life will still be dispensed there, although the ordinances of Baptism and the Lord's Supper cannot be administered, on account of the resident Brethren not having been ordained. Governor Janssen is stated to afford every protection and encouragement to the settlement at Bethelsdorp. Mr. Read mentions, that the labours of the Brethren, Anderson and Kramer, have been greatly blessed among the Corranas; and that Brother Edwards and Kok have not laboured in vain among the Brickquaas. Anderson and Kramer were daily expected at the Cape, and also the missionaries Vanderlingen, Forster, and Janz: the cause of the return of the three latter is stated to be, a war among the Brickquaas, attended with a great scarcity of provision.

Mr. Read does not explain the reason of his and Dr. Vanderkemp's return to the Cape; but the Directors hope soon to receive a Letter from the Doctor, with full information on this subject. It

appears probable to the Directors, that the uncertain state of political concerns at the Cape, and perhaps an apprehension of an attack from the forces of this country, have occasioned the recall of the missionaries from their respective stations.



INTENDED MISSION TO CHINA.

Mr. Morison, an accepted missionary, having been deemed a suitable person for this station, his studies, under the Rev. Mr. Bogue, at Gosport, were directed to a preparation for so important an undertaking. The Directors, however, having been informed that a native of China, named Yong Saam Tak, had been brought to this country, and that he resided at Clapham, they applied to his Patrons for permission to associate Mr. Morison with him, that Mr. Morison might be instructed in the Chinese language. This application succeeded; and Mr. Morison, in August last, came to London; and has ever since had the benefit of Saam Tak's assistance in learning the Chinese language, and in transcribing a Harmony of the Gospels, and other parts of the New Testament, in that language, from a manuscript copy in the British Museum.

In addition to Mr. Morison's appointment, the Directors design Mr. William Brown (youngest son of the late Rev. Mr. Brown, of Haddington) late a Student at Edinburgh, and now an accepted missionary, for the Chinese mission. Mr. Brown arrived at London in November last;

and the following course of studies has been commenced on by these missionaries :—

Mr. Morison's studies are directed to the Mathematics and Astronomy, under a suitable tutor ; and he also attends the Lectures at the Royal Institution. Mr. Brown attends the Bloomsbury Infirmary, the Lock and St. George's Hospitals, and Mr. Taunton's and Mr. Accum's Chymical Lectures :—also Lectures on the practice of Physic and on Anatomy ; and both these students are instructed by Saam Tak in the Chinese language.

The above course of studies was determined on in consequence of some valuable information which the Directors received from a very intelligent and respectable person, who had resided at Macao, and who appears to be well acquainted with the dispositions and manners of the Chinese. The Directors also received, from the same quarter, an intimation that persons of mature age, of grave deportment, and of deliberate and prudent minds, would be peculiarly suited to this mission ; and this information, together with a suggestion from a friend in the country, induced the Directors to think of Dr. Vanderkemp to superintend this important mission. After serious consideration, a Letter has been written to the Doctor, stating the intention of the Society to send two or more missionaries to the Prince of Wales's Island, with a view to the translation of the Holy Scriptures into the Chinese language, and to a mission to the Empire of China ; and it has been submitted to him, Whether his joining them on this important errand, may not be more conducive to the furtherance of the gospel than his continuance in Africa? He has been requested to give the

Directors his free sentiments on this subject ; and it has been mentioned to him, that if he should be inclined to remove to the Prince of Wales's Island, it is left to his choice, either first to return to England, or to proceed from Africa to that island.

EAST-INDIES.

GENTOO MISSION.

A Letter of a very pleasing and satisfactory nature, has been lately received by the Directors of the Missionary Society, from the Brethren, George Cran and Augustus Desgranges, dated Vizagpatnam, Oct. 16, 1805, together with their Journal, from March the 4th to September the 8th.

Their first residence in India was at Tranquebar, where they had an opportunity to consult with the worthy Brethren of the Danish mission, and to commence the study of the language of the country. In the beginning of March, 1805, Mr. Cran and Mr. Desgranges judged it best to remove to Madras, where they arrived on the 6th of that month, and had a pleasant meeting with the Baptist Missionaries, who have since left that place for Serampore.

At Madras they met with very kind friends, some of whom occupy the most respectable stations, and who were of eminent service to them in forwarding their missionary views. After consulting with gentlemen of the best information,

VOL. I.—N^o. II. 2 H

earnestly seeking direction from above, and maturely weighing all the circumstances of the case, they determined to leave Madras, and to proceed northward to the Gentoos. One inducement to this decision was, that they might not seem to interfere with any missions already established in that neighbourhood. The good providence of God eminently favoured their views, and sanctioned their decision; for they procured such excellent recommendations from persons high in office, that they were very cordially received by the principal Europeans at Vizagpatnam, where they arrived July the 18th. A worthy English gentleman (a magistrate) had been in the habit of performing divine service himself in the Court House, before the gentlemen of the settlement, the soldiers of the garrison, and a number of half-cast people: the missionaries were immediately requested to undertake this office in his stead, which they willingly assented to; and have since been remunerated by a small salary.

The town of Vizagpatnam contains about 20,000 inhabitants, chiefly idolaters; and the neighbourhood is also very populous. Here, then, under the most favourable circumstances imaginable, our dear missionary Brethren have sat down, and will commence their labours, in a country full of inhabitants, and with every recommendation that can be desired, as soon as they have made themselves masters of the Telinga, or Gentoos language, spoken in those parts. While at Madras, they had diligently studied the Tamulian language; which they had soon the mortification to find differed considerably from that spoken among the Gentoos, where they now are. There can be no doubt, however, that their pious industry will

soon surmount every difficulty of this kind, and that they will shortly be able to preach among these poor, superstitious, idolatrous heathens, “the unsearchable riches of Jesus Christ.” Their study of the **Gentoo** language will be happily facilitated by a manuscript dictionary, providentially put into their hands by a gentleman who was about to return to England. In the mean time, they have the privilege of preaching every **Lord's Day** to the white people in the fort, who amount to about sixty persons.

The conclusion of the **Journal** from the missionaries is so animated and encouraging, that we are persuaded it will be highly gratifying to our friends.

“We cannot close this **Journal**, dear **Fathers** and **Brethren**, without laying before you the importance of the situation in which we are placed, earnestly entreating you to send out more missionaries to assist us. In the town where we now reside, there are above 20,000 inhabitants, perishing for lack of knowledge. Within a few miles of us, on all sides, there are numbers of large villages, where thousands of the heathen live in the grossest idolatry, and who claim our pity and compassion. This place is nearly central, which makes it most favourable for branching out into any part of the **Circars**. We have hundreds of miles to the right and left of us, where we may labour with freedom, and where we shall have no **Brethren** to complain that we interfere with their mission. Its being on the coast, and continually cooled by the sea breezes, makes it advantageous for the health of the missionaries on their first entrance into the country. An European going

into the interior of India, immediately after his arrival, is likely to have his constitution impaired for life: by having the missionary station on the coast, they will necessarily be detained there a year or more, while learning the language, which will tend to inure them to the climate, without endangering their health. While they are attaining the language, they may be very useful by preaching in English, teaching schools, and other missionary employments, which will relieve those missionaries who have attained the language, and enable them to itinerate through the whole of the Circars: also Hyderabad, Golconda, and Bangalore, where the Telinga language is spoken. This spot is not less favourable for entering the Cattaek and Mahratta countries. We understand that there is but little difference in the languages. The Mahratta country appears to us an important field for missionary exertions. On this account we rejoice that a mission is about to be established at Surat. Our opposite situation will afford an opportunity of missionaries being sent from both these stations into the Mahratta country. These may meet each other in the centre, and bid "God speed." It is many days journey from hence.

"Glorious things are spoken of the City of God." Zion shall break forth on the right hand and the left! When we read the animating prospects presented to us in the sacred Scriptures, of the whole world becoming subjects of Christ's kingdom, we are sure that we are not straitened in God; and, therefore, think it would be sinful to be straitened in our own souls. We are aware that the conversion of the inhabitants of those ex-

tensive countries which we hope to traverse, will not be the work of a day;—but of years. It was *a work of years* which the missionary society was founded to accomplish; and we doubt not, if present advantages be embraced with sufficient energy, that many of its members will live to see the blessed day, when the Sun of Righteousness shall shine with such resplendent glory on the millions of India, as wholly to dispel the dark clouds of idolatry which at present overshadow them, and diffuse among them an unspeakable measure of the light of the glorious gospel!

But more missionaries are wanted. Our number is small. While we are laying the foundation, we trust that our friends in England will not delay to send out numbers to raise the superstructure of a work, in the accomplishment of which, God, Christ, the Holy Spirit, and all who bear the divine image, are so deeply interested.

Would to God that all the ministers in our native country,—the Students at the different Seminaries, and the Religious Public, could see what we see, and hear what we hear! Every man bowing to a stock of wood, or to a stone, would prove a new argument to “Come over and help us.” The horrid noise of thousands of idolaters at the celebration of their festivals, would sound like thunder in their ears. “Haste! haste to the help of the Lord against the mighty!” And those who could not themselves come, would have the number and ardour of their addresses to the throne of grace increased an hundred fold.

Not doubting that your zeal for the glory of God will actuate you to take our situation into consideration, and to send out more labourers into

this promising field, we, with the greatest pleasure,

Dear Fathers and Brethren,
 Subscribe ourselves
 Your very sincere, very affectionate Brethren
 and Fellow-Labourers in Christ,

GEORGE CRAN,
 AUGUSTUS DESGRANGES.

P. S. Mr. Ringeltaube, who went out with Messrs. Cran and Desgranges, judged it best to continue at Tranquebar; where he has made a considerable progress in the Tamulian language, and will probably labour in the Tamul country.

We are happy to hear that the missionaries have distributed many of the Persian Tracts which were printed in London, and sent out to them.

Some Religious Tracts have also been printed in English at Madras, by an English Clergyman.

SURAT MISSION.

On the 25th of June, 1805, when the Brethren Cran and Desgranges were preparing to leave Madras, they had the great but unexpected pleasure of meeting with Dr. Taylor and Mr. Loveless (appointed to the Surat mission) who arrived safely and in health at Madras; and were introduced to them at the house of a friend, where they were invited to dine. These missionaries were also kindly received. Dr. Taylor intended to proceed to Bengal, to confer with the Baptist missionaries. In the mean time, Mr. Loveless will stay at Madras; and proceed with Dr. Taylor, on his return to Surat.

Miscellaneous Particulars.

Mr. Frey continues to preach a weekly lecture

to the Jews, every Saturday evening, at the Rev. Mr. Ball's Chapel, in Jewry-street, Aldgate.

A committee has been appointed to superintend Mr. Frey's services, to provide him with suitable books and accommodations, and to consider what measures can be adopted more effectually to engage the attention of the Jews to Christianity, and to excite the regard of the public more fully to this important object; and it appearing to be a matter of great consideration, that a series of Essays addressed to the Jews, on subjects at issue between them and Christians, should be prepared and published under the patronage of the Missionary Society, the unanimous and earnest request of the Directors has been communicated to the Rev. Greville Ewing, of Glasgow, that he would undertake this important work; and he has kindly acceded to their wishes.

Several pleasing instances have lately come to the knowledge of the Directors, of Jews, who appear to be under serious impressions; and of the conversion of some of them there is no reason to doubt.

The Rev. Clark Bentom has returned from Quebec; and Mr. Dick has been sent from Scotland to supply his place.

A letter, dated the 20th of December, 1795, has been received from the Rev. Mr. Hillyard, at St. John's, Newfoundland; where he continues for the winter. His labours in the summer, at various places, appear to have been acceptable and useful.

A letter has been received from Mr. Pidgeon, dated Ristigouch, the 14th of October, 1805. Mr. Pidgeon states, that he has been engaged in preaching at that settlement, and at neighbouring places, ever since March last; and that at the

date of his letter, he was about to return to Carlisle for the winter. During that season he intends to board in a French family, to facilitate his acquisition of the French language, in order that he may labour among the numerous Catholics in that part of the world. The Directors hope that Mr. Pidgeon's services have been very beneficial; and are gratified by hearing that the people at Ristigouch raise from 40 to 50*l.* a year for his support. Mr. Pidgeon has requested a supply of school-books for the use of the numerous children at that settlement; and it is intended to comply with so suitable a request.

A suitable number of Religious Tracts, in the Spanish language, have been purchased and sent to Portsmouth, to be distributed among the Spanish prisoners at that place.

The following missionaries have been accepted since the last General Meeting in May last:—

Mr. JOHN WRAY,
T. ADAMS,
WIMMER,
PAZALT,
ZWAAR,
WEISINGER,

} Germans.
from Berlin.

Mr. JOHN DAVIES,
WILLIAM BROWN,
ROBT. GEATER,
J. HANDS,
— ELLIOTT,
— MC KEWAN.

All the above missionaries (except Mr. W. Brown) are at the Seminary, under the Rev. Mr. Bogue, at Gosport.

Thirty-five pounds per annum are allowed for the board and lodging of each student, and two guineas per annum for occasional expenses.

Mr. Zwaar, one of the German missionaries, is very ill; and it having been stated that a warm climate would, (with the divine blessing) be the most probable means of his recovery, the Directors have engaged a passage for him to Madeira; at which place, if he be spared, it is meant that he shall continue for a reasonable time.

DOMESTIC.

On Tuesday, the 7th of April, was held the Annual Meeting of the New-York Missionary Society.

The Directors made the following
REPORT.

IN their last report the Directors communicated to the Society their intention of organizing a Christian church among the Tuscaroras. The oftener they renewed their deliberations on this subject, the more firmly were they convinced of the propriety of carrying their purpose into speedy effect. With this view, and agreeably to Mr. Holmes' original proposals, that when matters were ripe for the measure, a minister of the same sentiments with the board should be sent out to visit the Tuscaroras, to inquire into their state, and to administer sealing ordinances among them, they commissioned their Rev. Brother, Dr. John Mc Knight, to perform these duties, and to take such steps towards the accomplishment of their design, as should appear to him, when on the spot, most prudent and likely to succeed. Anxious to avoid every thing which might prove injurious to a measure so important in itself, so new to the Indians, and so salutary, if seasonable; and especially to preclude all misconception of their plans, and all just uneasiness either to their Tuscarora friends or to the missionary, they furnished Dr. Mc Knight with instructions, embracing, so far as they were able to judge, the requisite caution on these points. Summarily, he was directed to spend as much time with the mission as might

VOL. I.—N^o. II. 2 I

enable him to gain a satisfactory knowledge of its state—to concert with Mr. Holmes and Cusick the best means of securing a ready intercourse with the Indians, and the best method of dealing with them—to examine with peculiar care into the principles, exercises, life, and conversation of such of them as professed Christianity—to admit to the ordinance of baptism, those who should be found fit subjects of that sacrament, and then to baptize their children—and in case of a sufficient number being admissible to baptism, to erect them into a church with the proper officers; and to administer the Lord's supper, if, under all circumstances, it should be found expedient.

As these proceedings would involve questions of some delicacy with respect to Mr. Holmes, whose sentiments, as an antipædobaptist, are materially different from those of the Board of Directors, on the government of the church, and on the subjects and mode of baptism; Dr. Mc Knight was further instructed to put him in complete possession of their plan, and to ascertain the course which Mr. Holmes should think it his own duty to pursue. If he should decline co-operating, Dr. Mc Knight was to fulfil the duties of his embassy, notwithstanding; always informing himself, with the utmost possible exactness, of the temper and feelings of the Indians toward the several steps of the change which was to pass upon their ecclesiastical relations. If Mr. Holmes should be willing and desirous to take the charge of the congregation when formed and organized, to perform pastoral duties, except the sealing ordinances; to consent to the administration of these by other ministers; and to introduce the knowledge of the Gospel to the more distant tribes, as opportunity

should offer, and health permit, Dr. Mc Knight was to assure him that the Directors were ready and desirous to continue him in his present station. If, on the contrary, Mr. Holmes should reject this proposal, the Dr. was authorized to confer with any other fit person, and engage him for the Society at the salary allowed to Mr. Holmes; and whether the latter should make an immediate election or not, to prepare the minds of the Tuscaroras for the dissolution of his connexion with them, and their being supplied with another minister.

Thus instructed, and being commended by the brethren to the grace of God, Dr. Mc Knight left New-York on the 9th day of June last, and arrived at the Tuscarora village on the evening of Saturday the 21st of the same month. His reception by both Mr. Holmes and the Indians, was respectful and friendly. On the first Sabbath after his arrival, Dr. Mc. Knight preached twice by an interpreter, and afterwards explained the general design of his visit. The Indians declared to him their intention of adhering to their covenant with the Society; and, on the Tuesday following, when the talk from the Directors was laid before them in council, expressed their gratitude for the attention of the Directors, and to the good Spirit, for preserving him on his journey, and promised to take the talk into consideration, and to send an answer with him on his return, which they accordingly did.

In the progress of his inquiry into the state of the Indians, which occupied him chiefly the first two weeks of his visit, Dr. Mc Knight discovered that some of them had already been admitted into Christian communion either at Stockbridge or

Oneida. The conversation with applicants for sealing ordinances, though confined to a few leading topics, was necessarily tedious and embarrassing, as it was carried on through the medium of an interpreter. The Indians have not been in the habit of making correct distinctions on some important subjects of Christian doctrine; their minds being not sufficiently expanded and exercised to form clear conceptions on many things, where every thing almost is new and diverse from their established modes of thinking. However, as they were able to give a satisfactory account of their sense of, and sorrow for sin, and of their dependence on the mercy of God through Christ for pardon and acceptance, the Dr. felt himself warranted in admitting to baptism, several whose deportment corresponded with their profession of the Gospel. One very serious difficulty hindered the admission of some, who, otherwise, seemed to be religiously impressed. The Society will recollect that the notions and practices of the Tuscaroras with regard to the great law of marriage, were formerly represented as extremely inaccurate and loose. Although the efforts to lead them into sounder views and purer manners, have not been without effect; yet the evil of a sort of promiscuous concubinage, the parties uniting and separating at will, and contracting and breaking new nuptial connexions with equal wantonness and levity as the first, prevails among them to a great extent. As they were explicitly told that none who did not unite and live in the marriage-covenant agreeably to the Divine law, could be admitted to Christian communion, the number of those who applied was considerably less than it probably would have been without that intima-

tion. In the judgment of Mr. Holmes there were about thirty, or between twenty and thirty, who gave evidence of their having experienced the power of the gospel upon their hearts. This is from one fourth to one third of the congregation, which consists of from sixty to eighty who stately attend public worship, exclusively of whites. Dr. Mc Knight baptized four adults, viz. Sacharissa, the first Sachem, and his wife; Captain William Prentup, the second Sachem, and George, and seven children. The number of adults previously baptized, either at Oneida or Stockbridge, was eight. Sacharissa, Cusick, and Paulus, were chosen ruling elders, and set apart to their office on the Lord's day, July 13th. No deacon was chosen, although it had been recommended; and, from the peculiar situation of the Indians, that office, it was supposed, might be dispensed with for some time. It was also thought advisable, upon the whole, not to dispense the Lord's supper.

But though ultimately successful, Dr. Mc Knight did not execute his commission without much trouble. Mr. Holmes was decidedly opposed to the measure, alleging that the Indians were not ripe for it; that their knowledge was not sufficient; that no man or body of men had a right thus to organize them; but that it ought to originate with themselves, and be done in consequence of a covenant voluntarily entered into among themselves; that any attempts of this kind would be highly injurious to the interests of religion, and tend to ruin the mission; and, therefore, that he should be equally opposed to them, though made by his own denomination, as if made by another. Dr. Mc Knight, however,

who had obtained from Cusick, as well as from his own observation, ample materials for a correct judgment on this matter, and was not ignorant of other reasons of Mr. Holmes's opposition, besides those which he urged, was of a different opinion, and acted accordingly. The Directors are convinced that he was well advised. Mr. Holmes, however, abstained from any public hostility, and the organization of the congregation was effected, in an orderly, peaceful, and solemn manner.

Mr. Holmes did not inform Dr. Mc Knight whether he intended to remain at the Tuscarora village, upon the terms specified by the Directors, or not. But the Dr. ascertained before his return, that nothing was to be apprehended on the part of the Indians in the event of Mr. Holmes quitting the service of the society; they being perfectly willing to receive any pastor whom the society shall send. Upon the whole, Dr. Mc Knight, in the execution of the charge committed to him by the Directors has acted with prudence and fidelity, and merits the gratitude of the society.

Nothing official having been received from Mr. Holmes since Dr. Mc Knight left him, yet the Directors have had access to information from which they apprehend that a dissolution of his connexion with the society, is far from being improbable at no distant period. To be prepared for any exigency which may occur, they have prevailed with the Rev. Jedidiah Chapman of Geneva, to visit the Indians, and to determine whether he will be willing, in case of the contemplated necessity, and if such a proposal should be deemed expedient on the part of the Directors, to take the charge of the congregation at Tuscarora. They know that he has complied with their request, and have been

for some time in hourly expectation of a communication from him, and regret that it has not yet come to hand,

The school is regularly kept up, and the Indian children, notwithstanding the interruptions of their attendance, make respectable progress.

Agreeably to the desire of the Netherland Missionary Society, the board of Directors have transmitted the amount of expenses, contracted in behalf of Messrs. Smidt, Roesteen, and Van Eekhout, and expect a reimbursement.

An application, as ordered by the society, has been made to the Legislature for an act of incorporation. The petition was presented to the Honourable the Assembly, and leave given to bring in a bill conformable to it. Whether it has passed into a law, the Directors have not been advised.

Paul Cuffee is still in the service of the Society, and from the most authentic information, the Directors are convinced that he continues faithfully to fulfil the duties of his mission.

Nothing else of much consequence has occurred since the adjournment of the Society. The Directors are grieved that there should be any symptom of misunderstanding between themselves and the missionary whom, with great cordiality and unfeigned affection, they sent forth among the Indians. But conscious that their own deportment toward him and his connexions, has been frank, honourable, and such as became their character; and remembering that the present inconvenience is only a very small specimen of similar trials which befel the early Christians, but did not hinder the propagation of the gospel, they are not cast down: their hands are not weakened: they fear not for the issue of such collisions.

The Lord God of Gods, he knoweth, and his Israel, they trust, shall know, that in simplicity and godly sincerity, they have endeavoured to conduct all their missionary work. They commit themselves, and their brethren of the Society, and their interests staked among the poor Indians, to that vigilance of their divine keeper which never sleeps, and that abundance of his grace which is never exhausted. Praying and trusting for the blessing of the Lord Jesus Christ, their glorious Redeemer and Master, upon their exertions, they congratulate their Society in his holy name, on the retrospect of past, and the prospect of future events in the history of their mission.

By order of the Directors,
 J. M. MASON, Sec'ry.
 New-York, 6th April, 1807.

*Dr. The New-York Missionary Society in account current with
 Divie Bethune, Treasurer.*

1806, April 5.	To cash paid Col. Post, for Schmidt, . . .	\$36 80
May 20.	— Paul Cuffee's salary,	20 ..
June 6.	— The Rev. Dr. Mc Knight, previous to } his Mission to the Tuscarora village, }	250 ..
28.	— P. Cuffee's salary,	20 ..
July 15.	— The Rev. Dr. J. M. Mason's acct. . . .	70 86
18.	— Collins, Perkins, & Co's do.	16 ..
Aug. 9.	— Dr. Wilson,	192 50
18.	— Cusick's order to A. Porter,	84 76
Sept. 22.	— Dr. Wilson, for Mr. Holmes,	25 ..
Oct. 2.	— P. Cuffee's salary,	20 ..
11.	— N. Cusick's dft.	95 ..
..	— E. Hill's do.	105 ..
Nov. 5.	— Van Eekhout,	83 ..
19.	— Hopkins & Seymour,	21 62
28.	— Forman,	4 ..
Dec. 13.	— De Groodt's salary,	37 50
1807, Jan. 24.	— Dr. Wilson, for Mr. Holmes,	49 75
Feb. 5.	— Fowler, per. Dr. Rodgers,	24 ..
20.	— P. Cuffee's salary,	20 ..
April 2.	— Do. do.	20 ..
6.	— T. & J. Swords, for printing Sermons, .	175 45
	To balance due the society,	1409 18
		<hr/>
		\$ 2780 42

THE
CHRISTIAN'S MAGAZINE.

Of Sacrifices.

(Continued from page 129.)

AND thus, having seen how far reason evinces sacrifices to be of divine institution, I now proceed to inquire what light the scriptures give us upon that head.

And first, I showed you, in the introduction to this dissertation, that God gave *Abel* sure proof of his acceptance of his sacrifice; and also gave testimony of his having done *well*, in that act of adoration. And from hence I clearly infer, that sacrifices were of divine institution. For, it is certain, that the destruction of an innocent creature is not, in itself, an action acceptable to God; and therefore, nothing but duty could make it acceptable: and nothing but the command of God could make it a duty, in the case before us. We know, that no being has any right to the lives of the creatures, but their Creator, or those on whom he confers that right: and it is certain, that God had not yet given man a right to the creatures, even for necessary food: and much less, for unnecessary cruelty. And therefore, nothing but his command, could create a right to take away their lives.

VOL. I.—N^o. III. 2 L

It is also evident, that killing an innocent creature, cannot in its own nature, be properly said to be doing *well*. And therefore, since *Abel* is acknowledged by God to have *done well*, in killing the firstlings of his flock in sacrifice, it is evident he must have done this for some very good and just reason; and what reason could justify him in doing it, but the command of God?

In truth, no action is just or good, otherwise than as it is conformable to the will of God, either revealed, or established in the nature of things: and that this action was conformable to the divine will, could only be known by revelation, *i. e.* by being commanded. And therefore the rectitude of it, in *Abel*, could only arise from obedience. And that obedience could justify it, can be no doubt to any man, who knows *that obedience is more acceptable with God than sacrifice; and to hearken, than the fat of rams.* 1 Sam. xv. 22.

Again; the apostle assures us, that *Abel* offered a more excellent sacrifice than *Cain* by faith: and what this faith is, he explains in some following instances. For example, he tells us, that *Noah* prepared the ark by faith; that *Abraham*, by faith, left his own country, and went not knowing whither; and that *Sarah*, by faith, received strength to conceive seed.

Now we know, that *Noah* built the ark by the express command of God; and with assurance from God that he and his house should be saved from that destruction which was coming upon the rest of the world. We are assured that *Abraham* left his country and kindred by the express command of God, and went into a country which God had assured him he should receive for an heritage. What was then the faith of *Noah*, and the faith of

Abraham, but obedience to the commands of God, and a firm trust and confidence in the assurances he gave them, however seemingly improbable and unlikely to be fulfilled? And what was *Sarah's* faith, but a firm dependence upon God for the performance of a promise naturally impossible to be fulfilled? And can we have any doubt that *Abel's* faith also consisted in obedience, and an assurance of being acceptable by that obedience, though in an act of duty otherwise most unlikely to be pleasing to God? as that of the destruction of his innocent creatures certainly was. An action, than which nothing could be more, in appearance, ill fitted to appease the divine wrath, or obtain the divine favour. And yet a ready obedience to that great Being who commanded it, made the action and the actor righteous. And it is evident, nothing but such a faith as prompted *Abel* to that obedience, ever could make such an action acceptable to God, in any man whatsoever, from the foundation of the world.

But here it may be objected, *that Abel's sacrifice might be accepted, merely because he was a good man; and Cain's rejected, because he was an ill man.*

I answer, that as this is a scriptural fact, we have no way to judge of it but from the lights left us in the scripture. Now, from the accounts left us of sacrifices in the scripture, we find, that offerings of fruits were sacrifices of thanksgiving; and offerings of creatures upon the altar, were sacrifices of atonement for sin; (nor were fruits accepted in atonement, except in cases of extreme poverty, *Lev. vii.*) Now it is evident, that all men have sins to be atoned, as they have divine favours to be acknowledged; and that atonement should naturally precede acknowledgment, as the foundation of all

other religious duties should be laid in repentance ; since no office of devotion, can be acceptable with God, without a precedent resolution of amendment in the offender ; from hence it was, that by the *Mosaic* law, confession was to precede the trespass offering, *Levit. v.* If men expect to be accepted of God, they must *offer the sacrifice of righteousness* ; and there is no righteousness without repentance. Now *Abel*, though a better man, offered such a sacrifice as plainly implied a consciousness of guilt, which called for atonement ; and consequently his was a sacrifice of repentance ; confessing guilt, and imploring pardon ; and as such, was accepted of God. Whereas *Cain*, though a worse man, expected to be accepted, without repentance or atonement. And this seems to me very clearly implied in God's answer to him ; *If thou doest well, shalt thou not be accepted ? And if thou doest not well, sin lieth at the door ; i. e.* If you are righteous and un-sin-ning, you shall be accepted as such, without sacrifice ; but if you are unrighteous, sin lieth at your door, and must lie there, till it is removed by repentance and atonement, (doubtless, such atonement as God himself had before appointed.)

But it may be farther objected ; *If Moses knew that sacrifices were originally instituted by God, with manifest marks of acceptance, as in the case of ABEL, why did he not give a clear, distinct account both of the institution, and the manner of acceptance ?*

I answer, because such a relation was unnecessary. The *Jews* to whom he wrote, knew very well that their own sacrifices were of divine institution ; and that God manifested his acceptance of them, upon the first solemn oblation after that institution, by miraculous fire from the divine presence, as we read in the ninth chapter of *Leviticus* ; and they

could have no reason to doubt, that they were so instituted, and so accepted from the beginning. Nor needed they to be then informed of a truth, which, doubtless, a clear uninterrupted tradition had long made familiar to them.

Besides this, there is reason to believe, that this rite was loaded with many additional ceremonies, at its second institution under *Moses*, in order to guard the *Jews* from the infections of the heathen in this point ; and therefore, it might not be proper to explain the matter more fully to a rebellious people ; who might think themselves ill used by any additional burden of trouble or expense in this practice ; however really necessary to their well-being.

And thus having shown, both from reason and Scripture, that sacrifices were originally instituted by God, I proceed in the next place, to inquire what ends were intended by Almighty God to be served by this institution ?

Now the true way to judge rightly of the wisdom of any institution, established at any certain time, is, to consider what was necessary or expedient to be done, on such an occasion. And if the institution is found to be well and wisely fitted to answer the exigencies of the occasion, then we may safely pronounce such an institution wise and well appointed.

Whereas then, reason evinces, that sacrifices were instituted by God ; and the Scripture shows this to have been done soon after the fall : therefore, to judge rightly of the wisdom of this institution, we should inquire what was necessary to be done, as things then stood, between God and his creatures. And this will be best known, by inquiring, what was the condition of his creatures at that time.

In the first place then, we know, that *Adam and Eve* were now sinners ; received into mercy, but in danger of relapsing. Surely then it was necessary, that they should have a sense of their guilt, and of the mercy shown them ; and that they should be guarded against the danger of relapsing. In the next place, it is certain that they had forfeited their lives by their transgression : and if so, was it not necessary they should be minded of the forfeit they had made, in order to a just and grateful sense of the goodness of God in remitting it ? They were also now naked, and infirm : both decency and health required that they should be clothed. They were also doomed to die, and to moulder into dust, as a punishment of their sin. It was surely fit they should know the nature of their punishment, in order to judge from thence of the heinousness of their offence ; and in order to be better prepared to undergo it. More than all this ; God knew that they were to beget children who should inherit their own corruption and infirmity. And certainly it was fit that they also should be early deterred from sin ; and have early monitions of the goodness and mercy of God.

All this was evidently expedient to be done at this time, (as shall be shown more at large immediately :) and if all these purposes of wisdom and mercy could be effectually attained by any one institution, certainly that institution must needs be wise, and well appointed. Now we find one institution appointed about this time, and but one, *viz.* that of sacrifices. It remains then, that we now carefully inquire, whether any, or all these ends could be attained by that institution.

And in order to do this more clearly, I must remind you of what I observed in a former disserta-

tion, that a sense of dependence upon God, was for *Adam's* interest, even before the fall : and that some memorial of it was necessary, in manifestation of that state ; and in order to keep up a constant sense of it in his mind. Now if a sense of dependence upon the supreme Being was necessary in a state of innocence and perfection ; surely much more in a state of guilt and infirmity ; when the guidance, assistance, and restraint, of infinite wisdom and almighty power, were much more wanted. In a state of perfection, such a memorial of dependence was evidently most proper for *Adam*, as was best fitted to mind him at once, of the felicity of that happy state in which God had placed him, and the danger of losing it. To this purpose, the tree of life, and the tree of death, were both placed full before his eyes ; in a very distinguished and remarkable situation ; as a sure and constant monition, that God had placed life and death in his own choice ; and that his happiness and misery depended wholly upon himself.

(To be concluded in our next.)

FOR THE CHRISTIAN'S MAGAZINE.

*On the formation of a good Conscience.**(Concluded from page 137.)*

BUT how shall we avoid the danger of copying the vices, as well as the virtues, of such men; or even of taking the stone instead of the bread? So far as words can guard against that fatal mistake, the Apostle has satisfied the inquiry. "Be ye followers of me, even as I am of Christ." With the open Bible in your hand, and the perfect example of Jesus, the point in which all the rays of heavenly light are concentrated, before your eyes, scan the ways of mankind: the Bible will enable you to recognize true virtues. On the other hand, these virtues will display new features and a new lustre, and create a new interest. From the examples of good men you will learn traits of righteousness which you had not sagacity to deduce from the divine law; and will feel the importance of good conduct more sensibly than from speculation. This mode of studying our duty has its dangers, but let us not be immoderately intimidated; let us not suppose that all the advantages are on the side of iniquity.

The man who sternly refuses to copy any thing from mankind, will indeed avoid some errors; but will have a less correct conscience than if he had cautiously attended to the ensamples of rectitude which human life furnishes. Facts admit of no litigation. And who will ever question the facts, that an habitual association with bad men, soon

blinds and paralyzes even good consciences ; while an association with good men, particularly in their best moments, when engaged in the solemnities of religion, or the duties of justice and mercy, gives a surprising elevation to conscience? Away with that malignant ingenuity which scrutinizes human nature, and dissects it to the heart's core, only to drag into day and public view, every foible, sin, abomination ; while it avoids as sacrilege, so much as to point with the finger at the corner in which a virtue reposes ! It is not scriptural, it is not just, it is not good. Will not the mind become polluted by this perpetual association with vice and folly ? But what shall be said of that starched pride of Pharisaism, which makes it the first principle of conscience not to see, or at least by no means to acknowledge, the existence of any virtue beyond the precincts of its party ? Which with great solemnity admits that there may be some truth in other parties ; and with excess of candour hopes there are some good men among them ; itself first the effect of a bad conscience, and then the cause of a worse ? Preserving unimpaired the right and duty of animadversion, reproof, rebuke, that sin may not lie upon our brother ; let us not forget that the grace of God, shining in his church and people, has its rights also ; a right, to be recognized, admired, imitated.

But to close the subject, it may be remarked, that it is necessary to establish the dominion, as well as to enlighten the eyes of conscience. There is a distinction to be made between the clear perception of our duty and that energy of mind which prompts us to perform it.

Without the latter, the former can only aggravate the guilt of misconduct. Melancholy facts

VOL. I.—N^o. III. 2 M

evince that they are not the same things, nor exist in equal proportion; nor does the one imply the other. Conscience, though blind, may be energetic, and even when enlightened, may be feeble and inoperative.

Youth, and especially the period of youthful conversion, is the season when conscience usually displays the most decided dominion over human conduct. At that period, how tender, how scrupulous is conscience! To eat, to drink, to smile, to omit, even under the most urgent necessity, or while discharging the most essential duties of life, the smallest punctilio of external devotion, is sufficient to throw conscience into convulsions. It is thus that religion is sometimes converted into a yoke of bondage which human nature can scarcely sustain. One has only to cast his eyes on the acts and sufferings in which superstitious heathens and Christians have gloried, to be well convinced that in conscience, power and light are different attributes. There is some reason to be afraid, that our consciences lose their power in some cases, just as they enlarge their information. With any assignable degree of intellectual light, we may find men in all the stages between gloomy superstition and absolute abandonment. When the light of truth has eased men of one suppositious duty after another, and has banished causeless remorse, they are apt to congratulate themselves as if emancipated from superstition; and we congratulate them also. But while they discharge conscience from thralldom, let them not dispense with its services altogether. Let it continue to impel them to those real duties, the superior importance of which shines with demonstrative evidence. Let it reprove those real crimes, which illumination has left without excuse;

let its approbation be the more cherished as it becomes more correct.

If an inquiry were instituted into the means of rendering this impulsive power of conscience more perfect, no answer perhaps could be given, except to inculcate the necessity of keeping it in continual operation. Action only is the means of improving all our mental powers. No other means, if there be any other, are within our reach. Our minds possess to a certain extent the power of directing their own operations. If we silence conscience, and call on our other faculties for their vote, the decision may be anticipated. Passions will clamour for their gratification; Sophistry will warp and perplex our moral ideas to produce that state of doubt and scepticism in which the empire of the mind falls to the most tyrannical lust. Reflection will be avoided by plunging deeper into crimes; by the distractions of continual activity; and by the intoxications of incessant sensuality. At length an interview with conscience, which can no longer sooth, but censure, will be avoided; for we hate the monitor who never speaks good to us, even though he were a prophet of God.

Let the man who would live under the government of an energetic conscience, beware of cherishing, even for a moment, any sceptical ideas on the subject of sin and duty. Let him listen to no argument for the omission of duty or commission of a crime. Let the eye of God, the awful solemnities of a judgment day, the exposure then to be made of the secrets of the heart, before the face of the universe, the gulf on the left hand of his judge, the heaven on his right, ever be present with him, to second the voice of conscience in calling him to his duty. In the exercise of self examination, let him every day, or at least at short and regular pe-

riods, habituate conscience to the exercise of her judicial powers, and the whole man to recognize her authority. Let his conduct be such that his conscience shall often pronounce the sentence of approbation; for this will render her voice the voice of a friend. Let him be the undaunted advocate of virtue. Let him not blush to inculcate upon others those duties to which he is most averse himself; that while personal partiality is excluded, he may establish his convictions, and enlist his feelings, his consistency and character, on the side of rectitude. To add no more, let him pray without ceasing. Five minutes of earnest prayer will do more to strengthen conscience than the speculations of a century.

But it is time to terminate an essay already too long. The intention was to treat of conscience as an improveable power. The observations offered will show that it is so; and it is hoped will suggest the principal means to be employed for that purpose. The important and irrefragable principle that all religion flows from the effectual operation of the sanctifying Spirit of God, has not been out of sight a single moment. But as that Spirit works in us both to will and to do; as his agency consists in rendering us active in righteousness, the consideration of our own agency in forming a good conscience was conceived to be no improper subject for an essay. Impious it undoubtedly is, and as absurd as it is impious, to suppose that moral rectitude, the glory of man, can flow from any other source than from the free gift of the Father of mercies. But it is equally absurd, and not less impious, to talk of the divine spirit's operations, and pray for them, and persuade ourselves that we have them, while we neglect to occupy the powers and privileges with which God has unquestionably endowed us.

FOR THE CHRISTIAN'S MAGAZINE.

On the mode of perpetuating the Visible Church.

IT was shown, in the preceding number, that the covenant with Abraham and his seed, was an *ecclesiastical* covenant; i. e. was made with the *visible church*, and is of equal duration. We proceed to another and very important part of our inquiry. *How were the covenant-character and privilege to be transmitted from one age to another, till the consummation of all things? Or, which is the same, how was a succession of the "seed" to be preserved?*

This was to be accomplished in two ways.

1st. In all cases of original connexion with the church; that is, where the individual was without the bond of the covenant, previous to his being of adult age, he was to be admitted on his *personal faith* in that religion which the covenant was instituted to secure. This term of communion with the people of God has never varied. It remains, at the present hour, precisely what it was at the formation of the Abrahamic covenant. They who do not enjoy, or have not embraced, the gospel, are "without." They are "strangers," "foreigners," "aliens," "afar off," and must continue such till they come to the knowledge of the truth. No Jewish nor Pagan foot must cross the threshold of the church, without "repentance toward God, and "faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ." About

this there is no dispute. About the qualifications requisite in adults for their admission to the privileges of the church, there is not the same agreement.

Some think that a general profession of Christianity is all which she may exact; alleging in support of their opinion, the example of the apostles, who demanded, say they, nothing more than a confession that *Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God*; and therefore they conclude that nothing more ought to be demanded now.

But it is not to be denied that this proposition contains the substance of all the doctrines and predictions of the Old Testament, concerning the Redeemer's person and work. No man could give it his intelligent assent, without a knowledge of those doctrines and predictions; nor repose his hope upon their truth, without that divine faith which receives the *whole* testimony of God, and operates, with a purifying influence, upon the heart and life. The scriptures refer the existence of such a confession, when not hypocritical, to a much higher cause, and attribute to the confession itself much stronger effects, than are even thought of by those who, at this day, would establish it as the all-comprehending term of Christian fellowship. "I give you to understand," says Paul, 1 Cor. xii. 3, "that no man can say that Jesus is the Lord, but *by the Holy Ghost*."—And John, 1 Ep. v. 1, 5. "Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ, is *born of God*"—"Who is he that *overcometh the world*, but he that believeth that Jesus is the Son of God." It is evident, upon the very face of these passages, that nothing was further from the mind and the practice of the Apostles, than the recognizing as Christians and the admitting into Christian fellow-

ship; all or any who barely assented to the general proposition, that "Jesus is the Christ." Much less can such an admission be justifiable now, when millions learn, from mere habit, to repeat that proposition without weighing its sense, or even comprehending its terms. Christianity is not a thing of rote. And there can be no doubt, that multitudes would flock to the church, reiterating as often as you would wish, their belief that "Jesus is the Christ;" who should, nevertheless, be found, upon a strict examination, to be either ignorant, or enemies, of every truth comprehended in their own creed. This cannot be. Christianity is not chargeable with the madness of cherishing in her own bosom, and that designedly, the seeds of her own destruction.

Some think that soundness in the doctrines of revelation, without scrutiny into practical character, or, at least, without solicitude on that point, is sufficient to justify admission into the church, and to the enjoyment of her privileges.

This opinion is not more correct than the former. It strips the church of her responsibility on the score of moral purity; annihilates her duties with regard to the chief end of her creation; viz. that she might be the mother of a holy seed, of a "peculiar people, zealous of good works;" dissevers the connexion between faith in Christ and conformity to his image; and acts, not indeed upon the notion that provided a man's life be good, his faith is a matter of indifference; but upon its converse, equally absurd and abominable, that a right belief may dispense with the obligations of holiness.

Some think, that doctrinal soundness combined with fair morals, fixes the limit of our inquiries. This opinion, though far preferable to the others,

labours, notwithstanding, under a material defect. It shuts out investigation of the history of a man's heart and conscience; in other words, of his religious experience. This must certainly form a part of his profession which is to be tried by the rules of the written word. The gospel, if received in truth, has revolutionized his soul. It has taught him to hate sin, his own sin, and to abhor himself for it before God—It has taught him to renounce dependence upon his own righteousness; abjuring it, in every form and degree, as the ground of his acceptance with his judge; to rest, with absolute and exclusive reliance, upon the righteousness of our Lord Jesus Christ; and to live by faith upon him as the Lord his strength. They who have but slightly attended to facts, need not be told that it is very possible, and very common, to have a speculative orthodoxy and an unstained reputation, with as complete an absence of the whole of this spiritual efficacy of the gospel upon the heart, as if no such thing were either mentioned in the bible or existed in our world. And it would be strange indeed, if the church of God, in admitting men to her distinguished privileges, should never ask a question concerning the most glorious and only saving effect of that very gospel which her members are supposed to believe.

Some, in fine, think that religious experience is the sole test of admission into the church. Provided a man can satisfy them of his conversion, and they are not always hard to be satisfied; if he can relate a plausible story of his feelings; can talk of his distress, and of his comfort; and has learnt to deal in joys and extacies, it is enough. How he came by his experience, he probably cannot tell, and his spiritual guides often omit to ask. And

Visible Church—transmission of privilege. 277

yet this is a point upon which often turns the discrimination between true and false in religion ; between rational experience, and fanaticism ; between the good influences of the Spirit of God, and their counterfeits. It is lamentable that so large a proportion of conversions, which are the fruit of tumultuous meetings, and the theme of newspaper praise, prove to be of this class. Dark views, gross ignorance, and even flat contradictions in the simplest truths of Christianity, are no obstacle. Thousands go from sin to God ; from nature to grace ; from condemnation to pardon ; from despondency to rapture ; and when interrogated about the *process* by which this marvellous transition was accomplished, have little or nothing to say, but that *they have felt so!* And, what is still more astonishing, they have been “ translated from darkness to light,” without being illuminated ! For the uttering of incoherent exclamations, and the chattering over a set of phrases, though accompanied with vehement passion, with shrieks and fallings, and faintings, and fits, and trances, must not pass for divine illumination, nor divine influence of any sort. When we consider the mechanism of the human affections, and how rapidly emotion is propagated, by sympathy, through promiscuous crowds, we can explain all the phenomena which, in this matter, have lately attracted the public wonder, without recourse to supernatural agency ; and must be convinced that nothing can be more precarious than the tenure by which these sudden converts hold their profession. And although many, to whom, therefore, these remarks will not apply, disclaim that wild frenzy which others have rashly mistaken for an effusion of the divine Spirit, yet it is not easy to make *mere* experience the rule of estimating Christian character, and of admitting

VOL. I.—N°. III. 2 N

to Christian privilege ; and at the same time keep clear of extravagances. For let the imagination, freed from the restraint of purified reason, be once excited; let it be impelled by a fervid but blind devotion, and it will rush, with resistless impetuosity, into excesses fit only to dishonour the Christian name, and to desolate the Christian church.— Wherever the understanding is dismissed from religion, nothing but mischief can ensue ; and this is always done, in a greater or less degree, where the exercises of the heart are assumed as the basis of our judgment without ascertaining their dependence upon knowledge.

Upon the whole we may conclude, that an adult, in order to his right reception into the Christian church,

Must be acquainted with, at least, the leading doctrines of revelation :

Must be able to “ give a reason of the hope that is in him,” by showing that these doctrines have operated upon his experience :

Must make an open, unequivocal avowal of the Redeemer's name : and,

Must be vigilant in the habitual discharge of his religious and moral duty.

He, in whom these things meet, is a Christian, and to be recognized as such by the Christian church.

But now arises another question. Does the church, in bringing an adult to the test of the foregoing requisites, and pronouncing him worthy of her communion, act upon the principle of her discovering that he is a regenerated person ; and that he *really is*, in the sight of God, what he *appears to be* in the sight of men ?

By no means. The church, as conducted by a system of instituted ordinances, which men admin-

ister, is altogether *visible* ; and it would be absurd to make an invisible quality the criterion of visible communion.

Our Lord Jesus Christ, who fell into no mistakes, actually did admit an unconverted man, a hypocrite, a traitor, a devil, into the number not only of his disciples, but even of his apostles : thereby instructing his church that the secret state of the soul before God is not to be her rule of judgment. He knew, from the beginning, who should betray him ; and yet permitted the infidel to mingle in his train ; to continue in his service, to share the honours of his sincere followers ; and never cast him off till he had proved his rottenness by an overt act of treachery. All which would have been impossible, had the reality of a gracious condition been the ground of church connexion. And it betrays something very different from modesty to set up a term of religious fellowship which would convict the master himself of corrupting his own church.

God has reserved to himself the prerogative of exploring secret motives. “ I, Jehovah, search the heart. I try the reins.” And it is a source of ineffable consolation that none but himself *can* try them. The obtrusion of the creature is completely barred out by his own unchangeable constitution. I bless him for it. I had rather perish than have my heart searched by men or angels : and I put them all at defiance to declare what passes in my breast any further than I myself inform them by my own act. Whoever, therefore, maintains that the *reality* of conversion is the reason of admission to Christian privilege, lays down a rule which never can be applied. There are none who furnish more conclusive evidence of its nullity, than those who most warmly contend for it. A single observation will put this in

a strong light. They who, without the aid of a revelation either from myself or my creator, can read my hidden thoughts on one occasion, can read them on every other. Therefore, if they can ascertain sincerity in religion, they can equally ascertain it in their civil transactions; and consequently would never be imposed upon. But to such lengths they do not pretend to go; that is, they proclaim the falsity of their own doctrine, and the futility of their own rule. How dare they who cannot detect a perjury in the custom-house, or a lie in the shop, represent themselves as able to detect hypocrisy in religious profession? It is foolish conceit; it is contemptible quackery. Take notice how they use their own rule. They get a man to recount his experience. If satisfied with that, they set him down as converted. You see, that for the facts on which they build their judgment, they have only his own word; and yet they talk of ascertaining his state! Two plain questions on this head, and we shall leave them:

If their man should say nothing at all, how would they find out his state?

If he should happen to amuse them with a tale of experience such as they approve, and he never felt, where is their *knowledge* of his state?

As for those who undertake to *discern spirits*, without producing their authority from the father of spirits, under his broad seal of miracles, nothing is so amazing about them as their effrontery. All sober men should eschew them as jugglers and impostors. An astrologer who casts nativities from the aspect of the planets; or a strolling gipsy who predicts the history of life from the palm of a child's hand, is as worthy of credence as they.

The result is, that when, according to, our best

judgment, we perceive those things which are the known and regular effects of Christian principle, we are to account their possessor a brother, and to embrace him accordingly. In other words, *a credible profession of Christianity*, is all that the church may require in order to communion. She may be deceived; her utmost caution may be, and often has been, ineffectual to keep bad men from her sanctuary. And this, too, without her fault, as she is not omniscient. But she has no right to suspect sincerity, to refuse privilege, or to inflict censure, where she can put her finger upon nothing repugnant to the love or the laws of God.

It must of necessity be so. For the principle now laid down is inseparable from human nature, and pervades every form of human society. Examine them all, from the great commonwealth of the nation down to the petty club, and you will meet with no exception. When an alien becomes a citizen, he takes an oath of allegiance to the government. When one becomes a member of a literary, a mechanical, a benevolent, or any other association, he accedes to its constitution and rules. These are their *professions* respectively. They may profess falsely: But that is nothing to the society, so long as the falsehood is locked up within their own breasts: They are accounted, and rightly accounted, "good men and true," till they forfeit their reputation and their immunities by some criminal deed. Who doubts that individuals unfaithful in heart to their engagements, are scattered through all these combinations? Yet who would deem it better than madness to decide on their external relations without a warrant from external acts? What horrible confusion would follow a departure from this maxim? Nothing can be true

which contradicts any of the great analogies of God's works ; nor can his church be established by the operation of a principle which, in every other case, would destroy all confidence and intercourse among men.

A profession, then, of faith in Christ, and of obedience to him, not discredited by other traits of character, entitles an adult to the privileges of his church. And this is the first way of securing a succession of the covenanted seed, and of handing down their blessings to the end of time.

But the *second* and principal channel of conveyance is *hereditary descent*. The relations and benefits of the covenant are the *birthright* of every child born of parents who are themselves of "the seed." "I will establish," says God, "my covenant between me and thee, and *thy seed after thee, in their generations, for an everlasting covenant.*" The substance of which, to repeat a preceding proposition, manifestly is, that as soon as a new individual is generated from this seed, he is within the covenant, and, according to its tenour, God is his God. This is a characteristic of every public covenant which God has made with man. Take, for example, the covenants with Adam and with Noah. Every human creature comes into being under the full operation of both these covenants. In virtue of the one, he is an "heir of wrath;" and in virtue of the other, an heir of promise to the whole extent of the covenant-mercy. He has the faithfulness of God pledged to him, as one of Noah's covenanted seed, that the world shall not be drowned by a second deluge ; nor visited by another calamity to exterminate his race.

Now, what imaginable reason can be assigned, why, in the covenant with his visible church, the

uniform and consistent God should depart from his known rule of dispensation, and violate all the natural and moral analogies of his works and his government? It cannot be. There is no such violation; there is no such departure. Nor is it so much as pretended to have happened from Abraham till John the Baptist, or perhaps the day of Pentecost. But what was in the ministry of the Baptist? What in the ministry of Jesus Christ? What in the effusion of the Holy Spirit at Pentecost, to destroy a radical principle of that very church which John, and Jesus, and the Spirit of Jesus, were sent to bless and perfect? The notion is wild. And if, as has been already demonstrated, the covenant with Abraham and his seed was a covenant with the visible church—if this covenant has never been abrogated—if its relations and privileges, with an exception in favour of adults who desired to come in on the profession of their faith, were to be propagated in the line of natural generation, *THEX*, it follows, that the infant seed of persons who are under this covenant, are themselves parties to it; are themselves members of the church; and whatever privileges that infant-seed had, at any given period in the history of the church, it *must retain* so long as the covenant is in force. But the covenant is in force at this moment; therefore, at this moment, the covenant privileges of the infant seed are in force. Visible membership is one of those privileges; therefore the infant seed of church-members are also members of the church.

However men may corrupt and have corrupted the ordinance of God, so as to reject the visible means which he has appointed for perpetuating his church, yet as they cannot overset his government, they are compelled to see the principle here con-

tended for, operating, with irresistible force, every hour before their eyes. For whether they will, or whether they will not, the fact is, that the church of God, with an exception before mentioned, ever has been, and is now, propagated by hereditary descent. There is not, perhaps, in any nation under heaven that has been once christianized, and has not sinned away the gospel, a single Christian who has not received his privileges as an inheritance from his fathers. Let us then beware how, in opposing infant church membership, we fight against a principle which is wrought into the essence of all God's constitutions respecting man.

ANECDOTE.

The late Rev. Dr. Nisbet, celebrated for his profound erudition, and ready wit, being asked, How he would define modern philosophy? replied, That "it consists in believing every thing but the truth, and exactly in proportion to the want of evidence; or, to use the words of a poet, In making windows that shut out the light, and passages that lead to nothing."

FOR THE CHRISTIAN'S MAGAZINE.

*Considerations on Lots.*N^o. II.

IT has already been proved from the very nature of the thing, that a lot is, in every form and upon every occasion, an appeal to the most High God, as the governour of the world; and that the decision obtained by it is to be regarded as his decision*. My doctrine, however, comes clothed with an authority much higher than that of argument; the authority of his own oracles. *The lot is cast into the lap; but the whole disposing thereof is of the Lord.* Prov. xvi. 33. This "whole disposing," a good translation for a term of great latitude†, cannot comprehend less than the following declarations:

1. That as soon as the lot leaves the hands of men, it passes into the hand of God.
2. That the direction of it to its issue is his own act: and,
3. That he acknowledges the result as a judgment given by himself.

Can there remain any doubt on this point with a serious mind? Is there any suspicion that the reasoning upon it may have been overstrained, or the sense of the passage, just quoted, mistaken? Let us compare them with scriptural facts.

The patriarch Jacob, on his dying bed, foretold, by the spirit of prophecy, the future condition of

* See p. 162—171.

† מִשְׁפָּטָר

his sons, and even marked out the districts which some of them should inhabit*. Moses, in his parting blessing, was equally particular with respect to certain of the tribes. And yet the land of their inheritance, by a statute of Moses himself, was directed to be *divided by lot*†; and was actually so divided under the inspection of Joshua, Eleazar, and the principal men of the nation‡. Thus, also, in the election of the first king of Israel, Saul, the son of Kish, a Benjamite, was pointed out to Samuel the prophet, by special revelation, as the man whom God had designated for that high station. For *The Lord had told Samuel in his ear, saying, "To-morrow about this time I will send thee a man out of the land of Benjamin, and thou shalt anoint him to be captain over my people Israel."* And when Samuel, the next day, saw Saul, the Lord said unto him, "*Behold the man whom I spake to thee of! This same shall reign over my people.*" In pursuance of this intimation, Samuel took Saul apart, and poured a vial of oil upon his head, and kissed him, and said, "*Is it not because the Lord hath anointed thee to be captain over his inheritance?*"

This affair, the reader will notice, was between Samuel and the new monarch alone; as the former had, of set purpose, excluded all witnesses||. It appears also to have been kept a profound secret: For when God had given to Saul "another heart," and the prophetic spirit had fallen upon him, the people were astonished, and "said one to another, "What is this that is come to the son of Kish¶?" But had they known the nature of the interview between him and Samuel, they would have been pre-

* Gen. xlix. † Numb. xxxiii. 54. ‡ Joshua xiv. 1--5.

§ 1 Sam. ix. 15--17. x. 1. || Ch. ix. 25--27. x. 1, 2. ¶ Ch. x. 9--11

pared for this singular, and to them inexplicable, occurrence.

Shortly after these transactions, the good old prophet assembled the tribes of Israel, before God, in Mizpeh; and when he had, in the most dignified manner, but without success, remonstrated against their folly and their sin in rejecting their God, and desiring a king, he ordered them to present themselves by their tribes, and to choose their king by lot. The tribes came near; the lot was cast; and fell first on the tribe, next on the family, and finally on the person, of Saul*.

Other instances are at hand, but these two are sufficient. The certainty of the event is previously ascertained in both, by the testimony of God; and yet the lot is cast in the same manner as if nothing had been revealed! Who does not see, that the credit of his prophets and the truth of their inspiration, were put, by such a proceeding, to the most hazardous of all possible experiments? Who does not see, in the exact coincidence of the sortilege with the prediction, a divine finger directing the lot to that same issue which a divine prescience had foretold? The alternative is plain. You must either deny the scriptural narrative to be true, or you must concede that the "whole disposing of these lots was from the Lord." Samuel exclaimed, when Saul was produced to the people, *See ye him whom the Lord hath chosen* †? They knew of no choice but that of the lot. They never so much as hesitated whether it was the divine act or not. Nor was their opinion at all uncommon. The very same opinion runs through the whole history of lots as recorded in the bible. And, by the way, it is not impertinent to ask, How such a notion took possession of

* 1 Sam. x. 17—21. † Ch. x. 24.

the minds of men? To say that superstition early prevailed, and that it easily corrupts the moral and intellectual powers, may satisfy an infidel, but not an inquirer, far less a thinker. Superstition obscures, abuses, and degrades whatever it touches, but it creates nothing. It misapplies, and throws into a thousand absurd contortions, the religious character of man; but without the pre-existence of that character it could have no materials to act upon. The lot could never have been an engine of superstition; I will add, could never have found its way into sober discussion, and thence into foolish pastime, but in consequence of a deep laid conviction that it is a mode of manifesting the divine will. Ring the changes upon the word superstition as often and as loud as you please; you do but beg the question: you give no explanation; you are not a hair's breadth nearer the solution of the problem. Besides, in the cases which we have examined, there was no room for superstition. It is not the attribute of that blind and senseless tyranny to look into the secrets of a future age; and the coincidences between the prophecy and the lot, both in the division of Canaan and the elevation of Saul, were too many, too minute, and too public, to have been either fortuitous or fraudulent. What remains, but that the conviction of which we are speaking could have had no other origin than a faith in the particular providence of God, commingling with affairs apparently the most casual, overruling them to a proper termination; and instamping the lesson upon the use of the lot? This beautifully elucidates certain scriptural phraseologies which otherwise are hardly intelligible. "Thou sustainest *my lot**." "Thou shalt stand in *thy lot*†." "The

* Ps. xvi. 5. † Dan. xii. 13.

rod of the wicked shall not rest upon the *lot* of the righteous*. “*Inheritance*” (*lot*) “among them that are sanctified †.” “Giving thanks unto the Father who hath made us meet to be partakers of the *inheritance* (*lot*) of the saints in light ‡.” “Neither as being lords over God’s *heritage*” (*lots* §.)

How could men ever have submitted their wishes, their reason, their fortunes, their lives, to the lot, without a strong assurance that the wise and righteous God speaks by it? How could the term “lot” have been adopted to signify their condition and circumstances, as ordered by his providence, without a settled belief that the lot is regulated by his providence? Or, if this belief is erroneous, how could it have been admitted into the *devotional language* of his church, and sanctioned, from time immemorial, by his Spirit of truth?

These considerations preclude, in a great measure, an objection which readily offers itself, and is not without force. “That the lots mentioned in scripture, were extraordinary, and became appeals to God, and expressed his will, in virtue of his own commandment, which is equally necessary to every similar application of them; and, therefore, that the instances quoted do neither prove his particular agency in ordinary lots, nor furnish any general principle of reasoning as to their nature and use.”

This objection, though deemed by some to be unanswerable, is not valid.

1. It is incorrect in its *facts*. For although there are instances of God’s directing an appeal to him by lot for special purposes; yet there are others in which the appeal was not founded upon any such

* Ps. cxxv. 3. † Act. xxvi. 18. ‡ Coloss. i. 12. § 1 Pet. v. 3.

direction ; and so must have rested upon the known design of the lot.

2. It is incorrect in its assumption, viz. that it was the special injunction of God which converted the lot into an appeal to him. Whereas the injunction *pre-supposes* such an appeal as being essential to the lot ; and in appointing it to be employed on special occasions, only appointed the use of a *known method of bringing a matter before the divine tribunal*, in preference to other methods which might have been selected.

3. The objection throws its authors and advocates into that gulf of Atheism to which, it was demonstrated in our first paper, the denial of God's providence in the lot most certainly tends.

From the whole of the foregoing view we collect, that the lot is an act of high and solemn worship, as an appeal to the God of the earth and of the heavens must necessarily be ; and that it ought never to be interposed but in matters which warrant such an appeal.

What then are the uses of the lot ? When is it proper ? and how should it be conducted ?

The uses of the lot are two.

1. It bears witness to a *particular Providence*.

It does not merely acknowledge him as an upright judge who will, at such time as shall please him, reward the good and punish the evil ; but it incorporates with an act of worship, a profession of faith that he is present, and pronounces judgment *on the spot*. It is *his* finger which moves the lot, and *his* voice which utters the decree ! The operation, then, of the lot, is to check, by a *visible rebuke*, that forgetfulness of God to which we are so prone, and which produces, in all their variety, the bitter fruits of iniquity and of wo—to assert

his dominion not only over every world, but over every creature, and over all the circumstances which relate to that creature's happiness or misery—to erect a barrier against the inroads of both speculative and practical Atheism—and to strengthen the influence of that pure and undefiled religion which is built upon the doctrine of a particular Providence

2. The lot is of use to determine questions among men.

Like the oath it is a last resort. The one appeals to God for the sincerity of our declarations: The other, for the direction of our choice. They are different forms of acknowledging his government, but the effect of both is the same,—to put an end to controversy, by putting a limit to human research. Thus the scripture represents them—

<p>“ <i>An OATH,</i> “ For confirmation, is “ <i>an end of all strife.</i>” Heb. vi. 16.</p>	<p>“ <i>The LOT,</i> “ <i>Causeth contentions</i> “ <i>to cease, and parteth</i> “ <i>between the mighty.</i>” Prov. xviii. 18.</p>
---	---

The parallel is exact; and leads to the second question,

When is the lot *proper*?

In cases of importance; which cannot be decided by other means in the exercise of our reason; and for the prevention or termination of strife.

The case must be *important*; for appeals to the living God with thoughtless frequency, upon mere trifles, is an impiety which cannot be indulged with impunity, nor thought of without horror.

The case must not only be difficult, but such as our *best discretion is unable to bring to a comfortable issue.*

For if we appeal directly to the judgment of God in things which may be fairly and wisely settled without so appealing, we depreciate the value, by superseding the exercise, of our rational faculties—we endeavour to disturb the order which God has established, subjecting the tribunal of human reason to the tribunal of his supremacy; in as much as we attempt to abolish the inferior tribunal by withdrawing causes which are of its proper jurisdiction: and thus, impeaching his wisdom, not honouring his throne, we provoke him rather to inflict his curse than to command his blessing.

Cases in which the lot may lawfully be used, are such as these :

The division of property; when the portions of it are adjusted with impartiality and skill; and yet the claimants cannot agree upon the distribution.

The appointment of men to a service of peculiar interest or hazard; when more than the requisite number appear; and their respective qualifications or disqualifications are pretty equally balanced.

The selection of victims; when several, involved in the same crime, are under the same condemnation: but the government, leaning to mercy, and resolving to make an example, requires only a part to suffer, and does not name the individuals.—The reader can easily add other illustrations.

I have only to answer the third question upon this head; viz.

How should the lot *be conducted*?

As it is an act of worship, the glorious majesty of him with whom they have to do, should be present to the minds of the worshippers. Passion, levity, indifference, should be laid aside. The name of God should be invoked by prayer; and the lot

cast as under his eye. When the issue is declared, the parties concerned should repress every feeling of resentment or dissatisfaction; and acquiesce with promptitude and reverence, as they undoubtedly would have done, had their almighty umpire rendered himself visible, and given sentence in their hearing.

There cannot be a happier elucidation of the right manner of applying the lot, than the example of the apostles at the election of a colleague to fill the place of Judas. They knew that an apostle could be chosen only by the immediate act of their master in heaven. They knew, however, that he must have certain qualifications which Peter mentioned. They looked round among their brethren, and found *two* thus qualified. They had gone as far as they could go in fixing upon the man by ascertained rules, and an insuperable difficulty presenting itself in the circumstance of *two* answering the general description, while only *one* was wanted, they refer the decision to their ascended Lord. Having set the candidates before him, *they prayed and said, "Thou, Lord, (it was the Lord Jesus to whom they prayed,) "Thou, Lord, which knowest the hearts of "all men, show whether of these two thou hast chosen; that he may take part of this ministry and "apostleship, from which Judas, by transgression, "fell, that he might go to his own place." And they gave forth their lots; and the lot fell upon Matthias; and he was numbered with the eleven apostles**. The decision was received with profound submission, as the decision of the Lord Jesus himself. Not a soul disputed it; not a whisper was heard of discontent or of doubt. Let Christians, in their use of the lot, go and do likewise.

* Acts i. 24—26.

FOR THE CHRISTIAN'S MAGAZINE.

A contrast between the death of a Deist and the death of a Christian: being a succinct account of that celebrated Infidel, DAVID HUME, Esqr.; and of that excellent Minister of the Gospel, SAMUEL FINLEY, D. D. in their last moments.

Letter from Adam Smith, L. L. D. to William Strahan, Esqr. giving some account of Mr. Hume during his last sickness.

Kirkaldy, Fife-Shire, Nov. 9, 1776.

DEAR SIR,

IT is with a real, though a very melancholy pleasure, that I sit down to give you some account of the behaviour of our late excellent friend, Mr. Hume, during his last illness. Though, in his own judgment, his disease was mortal and incurable, yet he allowed himself to be prevailed upon, by the entreaty of his friends, to try what might be the effects of a long journey. A few days before he set out, he wrote that account of his own life, which, together with his other papers, he left to your care. My account, therefore, shall begin where his ends.

He set out for London towards the end of April, and at Morpeth met with Mr. John Home and myself, who had both come down from London on

purpose to see him, expecting to have found him at Edinburgh. Mr. Home returned with him, and attended him during the whole of his stay in England, with that care and attention which might be expected from a temper so perfectly friendly and affectionate. As I had written to my mother that she might expect me in Scotland, I was under the necessity of continuing my journey. His disease seemed to yield to exercise and change of air; and when he arrived in London, he was apparently in much better health than when he left Edinburgh. He was advised to go to Bath to drink the waters, which appeared for some time to have so good an effect upon him, that even he himself began to entertain, what he was not apt to do, a better opinion of his own health. His symptoms, however, soon returned with their usual violence; and from that moment he gave up all thoughts of recovery, but submitted with the utmost cheerfulness, and the most perfect complacency and resignation. Upon his return to Edinburgh, though he found himself much weaker, yet his cheerfulness never abated, and he continued to divert himself, as usual, with correcting his own works for a new edition, with reading books of amusement, with the conversation of his friends; and, sometimes in the evening, with a party at his favourite game of Whist. His cheerfulness was so great, and his conversation and amusements run so much in their usual strain, that, notwithstanding all bad symptoms, many people could not believe he was dying. "I shall tell your friend, Colonel Edmonstone," said Doctor Dundas to him one day, "that I left you much better, and in a fair way of recovery." "Doctor," said he, "as I believe you would not choose to tell any thing but the truth, you had better tell him,

“ that I am dying as fast as my enemies, if I have
“ any, could wish, and as easily and cheerfully as
“ my best friends could desire.”

Colonel Edmonstone soon after came to see him, and take leave of him ; and on his way home, he could not forbear writing him a letter, bidding him once more an eternal adieu, and applying to him, as to a dying man, the beautiful French verses, in which the Abbé Chaulieu, in expectation of his own death, laments his approaching separation from his friend, the marquis De La Fare.

Mr. Hume's magnanimity and firmness were such, that his most affectionate friends knew, that they hazarded nothing in talking or writing to him as to a dying man, and that so far from being hurt by this frankness, he was rather pleased and flattered by it. I happened to come into his room while he was reading this letter, which he had just received, and which he immediately showed me. I told him, that though I was sensible how very much he was weakened, and that appearances were in many respects very bad, yet his cheerfulness was still so great, the spirit of life seemed to be still so very strong in him, that I could not help entertaining some faint hopes. He answered, “ Your hopes are
“ groundless. An habitual diarrhœa of more than
“ a year's standing, would be a very bad disease at
“ any age : at my age it is a mortal one. When I
“ lie down in the evening, I feel myself weaker than
“ when I rose in the morning ; and when I rise in
“ the morning, I feel myself weaker than when I
“ lay down in the evening. I am sensible, besides,
“ that some of my vital parts are affected, so that I
“ must soon die.” “ Well,” said I, “ if it must
“ be so, you have at least the satisfaction of leaving
“ all your friends, your brother's family in particu-

“lar, in great prosperity.” He said that he felt that satisfaction so sensibly, that when he was reading a few days before, Lucian's Dialogues of the Dead, among all the excuses which are alleged to Charon for not entering readily into his boat, he could not find one that fitted him; he had no house to finish, he had no daughter to provide for, he had no enemies upon whom he wished to revenge himself. “I could not well imagine,” said he, “what excuse I could make to Charon in order to obtain a little delay. I have done every thing of consequence which I ever meant to do; and I could at no time expect to leave my relations and friends in a better situation than that in which I am now likely to leave them; I, therefore, have all reason to die contented.” He then diverted himself with inventing several jocular excuses which he supposed he might make to Charon, and with imagining the very surly answers which it might suit the character of Charon to return to them. “Upon further consideration,” said he, “I thought I might say to him, Good Charon, I have been correcting my works for a new edition. Allow me a little time that I may see how the public receives the alterations.” But Charon would answer, “When you have seen the effect of these, you will be for making other alterations. There will be no end of such excuses; so, honest friend, please step into the boat.” But I might still urge, “Have a little patience, good Charon; I have been endeavouring to open the eyes of the public. If I live a few years longer, I may have the satisfaction of seeing the downfall of some of the prevailing systems of superstition.” But Charon would then lose all temper and decency. “You loitering rogue, that will not happen these many

“ hundred years. Do you fancy I will grant you a
“ lease for so long a term ? Get into the boat this
“ instant, you lazy, loitering rogue.”

But, though Mr. Hume always talked of his approaching dissolution with great cheerfulness, he never affected to make any parade of his magnanimity. He never mentioned the subject but when the conversation naturally led to it, and dwelt no longer upon it than the conversation happened to require: it was a subject, indeed, which occurred pretty frequently, in consequence of the inquiries which his friends, who came to see him, naturally made concerning the state of his health. The conversation which I mentioned above, and which passed on Thursday, the 8th of August, was the last, except one, that I ever had with him. He had now become so very weak, that the company of his most intimate friends fatigued him ; for his cheerfulness was still so great, his complaisance and social disposition were still so entire, that when any friend was with him, he could not help talking more, and with greater exertion, than suited the weakness of his body. At his own desire, therefore, I agreed to leave Edinburgh, where I was staying partly upon his account, and returned to my mother's house here, at Kirkaldy, upon condition that he would send for me whenever he wished to see me ; the physician who saw him most frequently, Dr. Black, undertaking in the mean time, to write me occasionally an account of the state of his health. On the 22d of August, the Doctor wrote me the following letter :

“ Since my last, Mr. Hume has passed his time
“ pretty easily, but is much weaker. He sits up,
“ goes down stairs once aday, and amuses himself
“ with reading, but seldom sees any body. He finds

“ that even the conversation of his most intimate
“ friends fatigues and oppresses him ; and it is
“ happy that he does not need it, for he is quite
“ free from anxiety, impatience, or low spirits ; and
“ passes his time very well with the assistance of
“ amusing books.”

I received, the day after, a letter from Mr.
Hume, myself, of which the following is an ex-
tract :

“ *Edinburgh, 23d August, 1776.*

“ *My dearest Friend,*

“ I am obliged to make use of my nephew's
“ hand in writing to you, as I do not rise to-day.

“ I go very fast to decline, and last night had a small
“ fever, which I hoped might put a quicker period
“ to this tedious illness, but unluckily it has, in a
“ great measure, gone off. I cannot submit to
“ your coming over here on my account, as it is
“ possible for me to see you so small a part of the
“ day ; but Doctor Black can better inform you
“ concerning the degree of strength which may
“ from time to time remain with me. Adieu, &c.”

Three days after I received the following letter
from Dr. Black :

“ *Edinburgh, Monday, Aug. 26, 1776.*

“ *Dear Sir,*

“ Yesterday, about four o'clock, afternoon, Mr.
“ Hume expired. The near approach of his death
“ became evident in the night between Thursday
“ and Friday, when his disease became excessive,

“ and soon weakened him so much, that he could
 “ no longer rise out of his bed. He continued to
 “ the last perfectly sensible, and free from much
 “ pain or feelings of distress. He never dropped
 “ the smallest expression of impatience ; but when
 “ he had occasion to speak to the people about him,
 “ always did it with affection and tenderness. I
 “ thought it improper to write to bring you over,
 “ especially as I heard that he dictated a letter to
 “ you, desiring you not to come. When he be-
 “ came very weak it cost him an effort to speak, and
 “ he died in such a happy composure of mind, that
 “ nothing could exceed it.”

Thus died our most excellent, and never to be
 forgotten friend ; concerning whose philosophical
 opinions men will, no doubt, judge variously, every
 one approving or condemning them, according as
 they happen to coincide or disagree with his own ; but
 concerning whose character and conduct there can
 scarce be a difference of opinion. His temper, in-
 deed, seemed to be more happily balanced, if I
 may be allowed such an expression, than that per-
 haps of any other man I have ever known. Even
 in the lowest state of his fortune, his great and ne-
 cessary frugality never hindered him from exercis-
 ing, upon proper occasions, acts both of charity
 and generosity. It was a frugality founded, not
 upon avarice, but upon the love of independency.
 The extreme gentleness of his nature never weak-
 ened either the firmness of his mind, or the steady-
 ness of his resolutions. His constant pleasantry
 was the genuine effusion of good nature and good
 humour, tempered with delicacy and modesty, and
 without even the slightest tincture of malignity, so
 frequently the disagreeable source of what is called
 wit in other men. It never was the meaning of his

raillery to mortify ; and therefore, far from offending, it seldom failed to please and delight, even those who were the objects of it. To his friends, who were frequently the objects of it, there was not perhaps any one of all his great and amiable qualities, which contributed more to endear his conversation. And that gayety of temper, so agreeable in society, but which is often accompanied with frivolous and superficial qualities, was, in him, certainly attended with the most severe application, the most extensive learning, the greatest depth of thought, and a capacity in every respect the most comprehensive. Upon the whole, I have always considered him, both in his lifetime and since his death, as approaching as nearly to the idea of a perfectly wise and virtuous man, as perhaps the nature of human frailty will permit.

I ever am,

Dear sir,

Most affectionately yours,

ADAM SMITH.

Some of the last choice words of DOCTOR SAMUEL FINLEY, President of the College of New-Jersey.

“Friday, July 11, 1766, the Rev. Mr. Richard Treat came to visit the Doctor, who desired that he would pray by him. Being asked what he should pray for ; he answered, “Beseech God that he would be pleased to let me feel, just as I did at that time when I first closed with Christ, at which time I could scarce contain myself out of heaven.”

VOL. I.—Nº. III. 2 Q

Dr. S. acquainted him that he could live but a few days longer ; at which he lifted up his eyes with much composure, saying, " Then welcome Lord Jesus." He declared himself under the greatest obligations to the Doctor for his kind and diligent attendance during his illness, and said, " I owe " a large catalogue of debts to my friends ; which " will never be charged to my account ; God will " discharge them for me."

July 13th, Lord's-day noon. Dr. C. came to his bed-side, and told him there appeared a very visible alteration in his countenance, by which he judged death was not far off. He raised himself upon his pillow, and broke out, " Then may the Lord bring " me *near* to himself—I have waited with a *Canaan* " *hunger* for the promised land—I have often won- " dered that God suffered me to live—I have won- " dered more that ever he called me to be a minister " of his word. He has often afforded me much " strength, and though I have abused it, he has " returned in mercy. Oh ! how sweet are the pro- " mises of God ! Oh ! that I could see him as I " have seen him heretofore in his sanctuary ! Al- " though I have earnestly desired death as the hire- " ling pants for the evening shade, yet will I wait " my appointed time. I have struggled with prin- " cipalities and powers, and have been brought al- " most to despair—Lord let it suffice."

He now closed his eyes, and fervently prayed that God would show him his glory before he departed hence—that he would enable him to endure patiently to the end—and, particularly, that he might be kept from dishonouring the ministry. He resumed his discourse, saying, " I can truly " say that I have loved the service of God—I know " not in what language to speak of my own unwor-

“thiness; I have been undutiful: I have honestly
endeavoured to act for God, but with much
weakness and corruption.” Here he lay down,
and spoke as follows: “A Christian’s death is the
best part of his existence. The Lord has made
provision for the whole way, provision for the
soul and for the body. Oh! that I could recollect
sabbath blessings! The Lord has given me
many souls as a crown of my rejoicing. Blessed
be God, eternal rest is at hand: Eternity is long
enough to enjoy my God. This has animated
me in my severest studies. I was ashamed to
take rest here. Oh! that I could be filled with
the fulness of God! that fulness which fills heaven.”

One asked him, if it was in his choice either to live or die, which he would prefer? He replied,
“To die. Though I cannot but say I feel the
same difficulty with St. Paul. But should God
by a miracle prolong my life, I will still continue
to serve him: his service has ever been sweet to
me. I have loved it much. I have tried my
master’s yoke, and will never shrink my neck
from it. His yoke is easy, and his burden light.”

“You are more cheerful, sir,” said one of the company. “Yes, I rise or fall as eternal rest appears nearer or further off.”

It being observed to him, that he always used that expression ‘*Dear Lord*’ in his prayers; he answered, “Oh! he is very dear, very precious indeed! How pretty for a minister to die upon the sabbath! I expect to spend the remaining part of this sabbath in heaven.”

One said, “You will soon be joined to a blessed society; you will for ever converse with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, with the spirits of just men

“made perfect, with old friends, and many old-fashioned people.” “Yes, sir,” he replied, with a smile, “but they are a most polite people now.”

He frequently expressed great gratitude to his friends around him, but very particularly to the kind family he was in; and said, “May the Lord repay you for your tenderness of me; may he bless you abundantly, not only with temporal but spiritual blessings.” Addressing himself to all that were present, he said, “Oh! that each of you may experience what, blessed be God, I do, when ye come to die! May you have the pleasure of reflecting in a dying hour, that with *faith and patience, zeal and sincerity*, you have endeavoured to serve the Lord; that each of you may be impressed, as I have been, with God’s word, looking upon it as substantial, and not only fearing, but unwilling to offend against it.”

To a person about to return to Princeton, he said, “Give my love to the people of Princeton; tell them I am going to die, and that I am not afraid of death.” He would sometimes cry out, “The Lord Jesus take care of his cause in the world.”

Monday, 14th. Waking this morning, “Oh! what a disappointment have I met with; I expected this morning to have been in heaven.” His great weakness prevented his much speaking to-day: what few words he uttered, breathed the language of triumph.

Tuesday, 15th. With a pleasing smile and strong voice he cried out, “Oh! I shall triumph over every foe! The Lord hath given me the victory! I exult, I triumph. Oh! that I could see untainted purity! Now I know that it is impossible that faith should not triumph over earth and hell; I

“ think I have nothing to do now but to die. Perhaps I have ; Lord show me my task.”

After expressing some fears that he did not endeavour to preserve his remaining life ; through eagerness to depart ; and being told he did nothing inconsistent with self-preservation, he said, “ Lord Jesus, into thine hands I commit my spirit. *I do it with confidence, I do it with full assurance.* I know that thou wilt keep that which I have committed unto thee. I have been dreaming too fast of the time of my departure. I find it does not come ; but the Lord is faithful, and will not tarry beyond his appointed time.”

When one who attended him told him his pulse grew weaker, he expressed with pleasure, That it was well. He often would put forth his hand to his physicians, and ask them how his pulse beat ; and would rejoice when he was told it was fluttering or irregular.

In the afternoon the Rev. Mr. Spencer came to see him, and said, “ I am come, dear sir, to hear you confirm by facts the gospel you have preached. Pray how do you feel ?” The Doctor replied, “ Full of triumph. I triumph through Christ. Nothing clips my wings but the thoughts of my dissolution being prolonged. Oh ! that it was to-night. My very soul thirsts for eternal rest.” Mr. Spencer asked him, what he saw in eternity to excite such vehement desires in his soul ? He replied, “ I see a God of love and goodness—I see the fulness of my Mediator—I see the love of Jesus. Oh ! to be dissolved ; to be with him ! I long to be clothed with the complete righteousness of Christ, not only imputed but inherent.” He desired Mr. Spencer to pray before they parted. “ Pray that God would preserve me from evil—that

“ he would keep me from dishonouring his great name in this critical hour ; and support me in my passage *through the valley of the shadow of death.*”

He spent the remaining part of the day, in bidding farewell to, and blessing his friends ; and exhorting such of his children as were with him. He would frequently cry out, “ Why move the tardy hours so slow ?”

July 16th, his speech failed him. He made many efforts to speak, but seldom so distinct as to be understood. Mr. Roberdeau desired him to give some token whereby his friends might know whether he still continued to triumph. He lifted up his hands and said, “ Yes.” This afternoon he uttered several sentences, but little could be collected from them.

Some of his very last words concerning himself were, “ After one or two more engagements the conflict will be over.” About nine o'clock he fell into a sound sleep, and appeared much freer from pain than for several days before. He continued to sleep without moving in the least till one o'clock ; when he expired without a sigh or a groan, or any kind of motion, sufficient to alarm his wife, and those friends who were about his bed. During his whole sickness, he was never heard to utter one repining word. He was at times tortured with the most excruciating pains ; yet he expressed in all his behaviour an entire resignation to the divine will. In all his affecting farewells to his relations and friends, he was never seen to shed a tear, or show the least mark of sorrow. He often checked his affectionate wife when she was weeping ; and he expressed his unshaken confidence in the promises of his God, whenever he spoke of his dear children.

Death of Samuel Finley, D. D. 307

His truly polite behaviour continued to the last, and manifested itself whenever he called for a drop of drink to wet his lips. Every one around him was treated with that same sweetness and ease that were so peculiar and natural to him. In fine, he was a most striking example of that *faith* which kindles love in the heart, and produces the sweet fruits of meekness, gentleness, patience, and every Christian grace and virtue."

Some remarks on the foregoing narratives, will be given in our next.

REVIEW.

ART. VIII.

A collection of Essays on the subject of Episcopacy, which originally appeared in the Albany Centinel, and which are ascribed principally to the Rev. Dr. Linn, the Rev. Mr. Beasley, and Thomas Y. How, Esq. With additional notes and remarks. New-York, T. & J. Swords, 1806. 8vo. \$1.

(Continued from page 211.)

THE advocates for the Hierarchy labour hard to show that any argument from official names to the offices designated in the New Testament, is inconclusive. They even pronounce it "good for no thing." Their hope is to render the scripture, thus far, neutral; that if it bear no testimony for them, it shall bear none against them. Whether they have succeeded in this attempt or not, we leave to the dispassionate judgment of the reader, who, with a desire of perceiving and embracing the truth, has deliberately considered the review in our last number.

We now follow them to their argument from the scriptural *facts*, upon which they avowedly rest the weight of their cause.

The *first* of these facts is the triple order of the priesthood among the Jews.

“ We find,” says the Layman, “ three orders of officers in the Jewish church ; and, in the Christian, there have always been three orders answering to these. What Aaron, his sons, and the Levites were in the temple, that bishops, priests, and deacons are in the Church. Such is the concurring testimony of the primitive fathers. Take that of St. Jerome, whom the advocates of parity are fond of quoting, and to whom, therefore, it is presumed, they will not object. “ *That we may know the apostolical economy to be taken from the pattern of the Old Testament, the same that Aaron, and his sons, and the Levites, were in the temple, the bishops, presbyters, and deacons, are in the church of Christ.*” It is too absurd to attempt to turn this parallel into ridicule. By the very same mode of proceeding you may destroy the whole Christian dispensation. In all that he has said upon this point, the miscellaneous writer has contributed much more to the support of infidelity than of any other cause.

“ How far, then, do we carry this argument ?

“ We say, simply, that the law being figurative of the gospel, in all its important parts, the Jewish priesthood was, of course, typical of the Christian. For this we have the express declaration of the apostle Paul, and the advocates of parity will not pretend to controvert the position. Well, then, the priests of the law serving as “ *the example and shadow of heavenly things,*” the circumstance of there being three orders in the Jewish ministry, furnishes a strong presumption against the doctrine of parity. *We do not rely upon this as proof. We merely state it as presumptive evidence entitled to real attention.* It gives us, we contend, possession of the ground, and throws the burthen of proof upon our opponents.

“ Now, what says the miscellaneous writer in reply to all this ? He talks to us of the dress of the Jewish high priest ; asking, very sagaciously, where are the *golden ephod*, the *breast plate*, the *embroidered girdle*, in which Aaron and his

successors were clad. I call upon him here to lay his hand upon his heart, and say, whether this is just reasoning. He knows it is not. What, the Jewish priesthood not figurative of the Christian, because of a variety in dress! Is it necessary, in order that one thing be typical of another, that there should be no points of difference between them? No more than it is necessary that we should be able to rise to the perfection of the character of Christ, because we are called upon to propose him as the model for imitation, and to become holy as he is holy.

“Is the miscellaneous writer aware of the conclusion to which his mode of reasoning conducts? If he has proved that the Jewish priesthood was not typical of the Christian, he has proved equally, that the law was not a shadow of the gospel; thus destroying, effectually, all connexion between the Old and New Testament. Is there no difference between our Saviour and the Paschal Lamb by which he was prefigured? Abraham, Moses, Joshua, David, were all types of Christ; but were there no points of distinction between these men and the Saviour of the world? Give to the infidel the weapons of this writer, and how easily will he demolish, with them, the whole fabric of Christianity! If the points of difference which have been mentioned, between the priesthood of the law, and of the gospel, prove that the one was not typical of the other, they equally prove that our Saviour was never prefigured, and that that intimate connexion, between the Jewish and Christian dispensations, which has been so much relied upon by the defenders of the faith, never existed but in the imaginations of men. But I feel as if I were insulting the understanding of the reader, in dwelling on this point. I dismiss it, therefore, especially as I have not been able to bring myself to believe that the writer had any thing more in view, in it, than a flourish of rhetoric to attract the vulgar gaze.

“The Mosaic dispensation, then, was figurative of the Christian. The priesthood of the law was typical of the priesthood of the gospel. The former consisting of distinct and subordinate orders, a strong presumption thence arises in favour of that distinction and subordination of office which, until the days of Calvin, characterized, without a single exception, the Christian church. This we contend,

as was said before, gives us possession of the ground, and throws the burthen of proof upon the advocates of parity.

“ So much then for the Jewish priesthood. It was a shadow of the Christian priesthood, according to the express declaration of the apostle Paul. While the miscellaneous writer does not venture openly to deny this, but rather seems to admit it, in representing the whole Jewish system as typical, he endeavours, nevertheless, in an indirect manner, to destroy all relationship between the priesthood of the law and of the gospel, by dwelling on the variety of dress, with some other subordinate points of distinction. Here he acts with his usual imprudence ; tearing up, in his rage against Episcopacy, the very foundation of the Christian faith*.”

The same analogy is thus traced by Cyprian :

“ Why should not the orders of the priesthood under the old economy be supposed to typify those orders that were to be established under the new ? Besides, the fact is, that the Christian dispensation was not so much the abolition, as it was the fulfilment of the Jewish. Christ came, not to *destroy*, but to *fulfil* the law and the prophets.

“ It is true, indeed, we possess not the Jewish form of church government. We possess one, however, which is the consummation of the Jewish—a government of which the Jewish was an imperfect image. We possess a priesthood more glorious than the Levitical, inasmuch as it ministers under a more glorious dispensation—inasmuch as it performs purer and more exalted offices—inasmuch as, in its nature and offices, it is the glorious substance which was only faintly shadowed out under the law.

“ We think, therefore, that we stand on substantial ground when we maintain that we derive *a strong argument in demonstration of the divine origin of our form of church government*, by showing that on this point the new dispensation is made to correspond with the old ; is made the true substance of which the old was the shadow. What the high priests, the priests, and the Levites, were in the temple, such are the bishops, the presbyters, and deacons, in the church of Christ. This is the uniform language of the fathers. This is the conclusion to which the *data afforded us by the apostles inevitably lead*.

* No. VIII. *Collec.* p. 110, 111.

“Such was the model of church government instituted by God himself, and intended to be transmitted through all ages, with modifications that should vary, no doubt, according to the varying circumstances of mankind; provided these modifications affected not its great and cardinal principles. We say that the Jewish priesthood was the image of the Christian. We say that it is sound reasoning to deduce the probable form of the substance from the lineaments of it that may be traced in its image*.”

It is somewhat curious to observe the rapid *growth* of this argument from the Jewish to the Episcopal priesthood. With the Layman it is not *proof*; it is merely “*presumptive evidence*, entitled to real attention.” By the time it has travelled to Cyprian, it is a “*strong argument in demonstration of the divine origin of their form of church government*;” and it places them, as well it may, “on substantial ground.” But while we are looking through Cyprian’s magnifier, at this Jewish image of the “Christian priesthood,” he suddenly shifts his glass, and the giant, DEMONSTRATION, dwindles down again into the dwarf, PROBABILITY. “We say,” adds he, in the next paragraph, “that it is sound reasoning to deduce the *probable* form of the substance from the lineaments of it that may be traced in its image.” One hardly knows what to do with writers who drive their argument backwards and forwards between “proof” and “presumption;” between “probability” and “demonstration;” as if a rational debate were a game at shuttlecock! But they are not without excuse; for to one who can see the tendency of this argument of theirs, it is pretty clear that they did not know what to do with themselves. For if, as they assure us, the Jewish was a *type* of the Christian priesthood—if the former was “a shadow,” and a “faint shadow,” of which the latter is the true

* No. VIII. *Collec.* p. 119, 120.

and “glorious substance,” then there *must be* a coincidence between the essential parts of the type, and the essential parts of the thing typified. But according to the divine institution, the three orders of the high priest, the priests, and Levites were essential to the legal priesthood; and if this was typical of the evangelical “*priesthood*,” there must of necessity be three orders in that also. If it were not so, the type would not tally with the antitype, the image would not represent its object, and the end of the typical system would be defeated. A body with a head would as soon cast a shadow without one, as a type of three orders represent a reality of two, five, or seven. This reasoning supposes that the *number* of orders enters into the *nature* of the type; and on the same supposition rests the Episcopal argument. For if the number of orders in the Jewish priesthood constituted no part of the type, it is extreme weakness to mistake it for a “demonstration,” or even a “presumption,” that there ought to be three orders in the thing typified. It is producing your type to prove that the thing typified possesses a property which the type does not exhibit. The fallacy is too obvious to impose upon a child.

On the other hand, if the *number* of orders in the Jewish priesthood makes a part of the type, and the Christian ministry is the thing typified, the conclusion is inevitable, that there *must be* three orders in the Christian ministry. If *such* a typical relation really exists between the ministry of the old and of the new economy, we will lay down our pen. Our cause is desperate; the hierarchy has triumphed, but not a Protestant hierarchy. For according to all the laws of typical analogy, it is not more necessary that there be three orders in the

“Christian priesthood,” than that the highest order be confined to a single person. In this point the Jewish and the Episcopal priesthood differ *essentially*. There is no likeness between the type and the antitype. Who, that intended to institute a set of *resemblances*, would ever dream of appointing a numerous body of Levites to represent a numerous body of deacons; a numerous body of priests to represent another numerous body of priests; and then finish by putting at the head of his system a *single high priest*, to represent an order of ten thousand bishops? Nay, if the Episcopal argument here is sound, it concludes much more forcibly in favour of the Papal than of the Protestant hierarchy. The former preserves, in her single pontiff, an essential feature of the type, which the latter, by her order of bishops, has perfectly obliterated. Thus, then, the case stands; if the typical character of the Jewish priesthood does not include its orders, the Episcopal inference from them in behalf of the bishops, priests, and deacons, is palpably false: If it does, while the Presbyterian perishes, the church of Rome gains much more than the church of England.

But this notion of the typical property of the grades of priesthood in the Jewish church, is an Episcopal fiction. It has no real existence. The decisive proof is, that the Levitical priesthood typified our Lord Jesus Christ, in whom there could be no place for different orders. Its several grades, as such, had nothing to do with its typical character and functions. These lay in another direction altogether.

We, therefore, advance a step higher, and deny the whole doctrine of the hierarchy, in so far as it makes the Jewish priesthood a type of the Chris-

tian ministry. The Layman has asserted that “the law being figurative of the gospel, in all its important parts, *the Jewish priesthood was, of course, typical of the Christian**.” To the same purpose Cyprian, “*We say that the Jewish priesthood was the image of the Christian†.*” These are the assertions; now for the proof. Cyprian tells us, that it “is the uniform language of the fathers— the conclusion to which the data afforded us by the *apostles inevitably lead.*” The Layman, that “for this,” viz. that the “Jewish priesthood was typical of the Christian, we have *the express declaration of the apostle Paul,*” and that “the advocates of parity will not pretend to controvert the position.” But they certainly do, sir; confident as you are of the negative. They not only venture to controvert, but engage to refute, your position. They maintain that the apostles have not afforded any data which can lead to such a conclusion. Cyprian has mentioned none: and the only passage which the other has quoted in his own justification, he has misunderstood and misapplied. The considerations which make against them, are numerous and weighty.

1. The scriptures nowhere draw a parallel or comparison between the rank and functions of the ministry of the Old Testament and that of the New. And if the former was designed to be the model of the latter, the omission is altogether unaccountable. They neither say nor insinuate that the priests under the law were a type and image of which the truth and substance are to be sought in the ministers of the new dispensation. The nature and use of the legal institutions are explained with minute accuracy by the apostle Paul, in his epistle to the He-

* No. VIII. *Collec.* p. 310.

† No. IV. *Collec.* p. 320.

brews. He treats them as types of "Jesus Christ, "and all the effects of his mediation in grace and "glory;" but of their typical relation to the Christian ministry, not a single syllable.

Here the Layman interrupts us with "the express declaration of the apostle Paul." Let us have it. "The priests of the law serving as 'the example and shadow of heavenly things,' the circumstance of there being three orders in the Jewish ministry furnishes a strong presumption against the doctrine of parity*." The "express declaration" of the apostle, it seems is, that "the priests of the law serve as the example and shadow of heavenly things†;" representing his meaning to be, that the priests of the law are that example and shadow. We have a small objection to this assertion of the Layman; and that is, that, like Cyprian's story of bishop Ephaphroditus, it puts into the mouth of the apostle a speech which he never uttered. There is neither in the passage quoted, nor in any other passage of the epistle to the Hebrews, nor in the whole New Testament, such a declaration as the Layman ascribes to Paul. He has either quoted from memory, which we suspect to be the fact, and so has forgotten what the apostle said; or else is as unlucky in his criticism as his poor friend Cyprian. The apostle says, "the priests who offer gifts according to the law, serve," not AS, but "UNTO the example and shadow of heavenly things." It was not the priests, but the things to which they ministered, that constituted the "example and shadow." This is obvious upon the first inspection of the text†. The apostle is discoursing of the tabernacle, its furniture and

* No. viii. *Coll.* p. 110. † P 111.

† Οἱ τῶν ὑποδείγματι καὶ σκιά λατρεύουσι τῶν ἐπουρανίων. Heb. viii. 5.

service. These were the “example and shadow.” The substance, the “heavenly things,” was Christ Jesus, his sacrifice and intercession, with all their blessed effects in the salvation of men. This is the apostle’s own interpretation. For these same priests whom he here describes as “serving unto the example and shadow of heavenly things,” he elsewhere describes as “serving the *tabernacle**.” The tabernacle, therefore, not the priests, were the “example and shadow of the heavenly things.” And that this is the apostle’s meaning, is “yet far more evident.” For in the 9th chapter, after detailing the construction, the furniture, and the service of the tabernacle †, he says that this tabernacle, thus framed, equipped, and attended, was *a figure for the time then present* ‡. “But Christ being come,” proceeds the apostle, “an high priest of good things to come, by (*through*) a greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands, that is to say, not of this building; neither by the blood of goats and calves, but by his own blood, he entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us.”

This “greater and more perfect tabernacle,” is the human nature of the Son of God, in virtue of the once offering up of which as a sacrifice for sin, he entered into heaven itself for us. It is this blood of his, typified by the “blood of goats and calves,” which “purges our conscience from dead works to serve the living God.” These are the “good things to come;” these “the heavenly things,” of which the first tabernacle was the “example and shadow.” The “Christian priesthood,” as it is

* Οἱ τῆ σκηνῆ λατρευόντες. Heb. xiii. 10. † v. 2—7. ‡ v. 9.

improperly and offensively termed, does not even appear in the comparison. If the Layman has discovered it among the "heavenly things," his penetration is acute indeed. Instead, therefore, of producing an "express declaration" of the apostle to support his doctrine, he has only put a text to needless torture; for his witness, like Cyprian's in the affair of Epaphroditus, knows nothing of the matter.

It is further worthy of notice, that the New Testament *never* applies to the Christian ministry those terms which express the office of a priest, and which were invariably applied to the priesthood of the law. Jesus Christ is called a priest, an high priest, a great high priest; but not his ministers. On the principle that he is the true priest whom the priests of the law prefigured, this is perfectly natural. But is it not inconceivable, that the appropriate title of the priesthood should be given to the typical priests; to the form—to the shadow—and uniformly withheld from the priests who are the substance represented by them? Why this change of language? If the priestly character, office, and work, have been fulfilled in our Lord Jesus Christ, and if he, as the sole priest of the church, is now appearing in heaven for us, the reason of the change is as clear as noon day. There are no more official priests, there is no more "priesthood," in the church upon earth; and therefore the name is laid aside. But if there are such priests and priesthood, and if these are the very substance of which the old priests were but a shadow, it will baffle all the ingenuity of the hierarchy to the end of time, to assign even a tolerable reason why the Spirit of wisdom has refused them their official designation, and has altered the whole official style of the church! The ministry under the new dispensation is represented as the

ascension gift of our glorified master*. Ordinary and extraordinary officers are enumerated, but not a word of the Jewish orders being a type of the Christian ministry. Not a word of priests or priesthood, of altars, of sacrifices, or any of the sacrificial language to which the hierarchy is so devoted. She has thought fit, and she shall answer for it, to bring back and affix to her clergy and their functions; to her sacramental table and its elements, a set of denominations which the Holy Ghost not only never annexed to the ministry and ordinances of his own creation; but which he had, with pointed care, excluded from the New Testament!

Our assertion, therefore, stands firm, that the apostolic writings furnish no data which can lead us to the “conclusion” of Cyprian, or the “position” of the Layman. Whence, we again ask, whence this silence? Why is so important a property of the typical priesthood overlooked? Is not the “glorious substance,” of which it was only a “faint shadow,” so much as worthy of notice? and that too in a set treatise of the legal shadows and their corresponding substances? It is indisputable, their own words evince it, that if the Layman and Cyprian, and their several coadjutors, had prepared such a treatise; whatever place they might have allotted to the “apostle and high priest of our profession,” the dignity of the episcopal priesthood would have filled up one of their most animated chapters. Having found so much of their own image where Paul found so little, it is but right to supply his deficiencies, and to administer a delicate rebuke for his negligent exposition!

2. A comparison of the Levitical with the Episcopal priesthood, will demonstrate that the former was not, and could not be, a type of the latter.

* Eph. iv. 11.

The grades are ranged thus :

<i>Type, or Shadow.</i>	<i>Antitype, or Substance.</i>
HIGH-PRIEST,	BISHOP,
PRIEST,	PRIEST,
LEVITE,	DEACON.

Now in what do they resemble each other ?

Did the high-priest *ordain* the priests ? No. Did he *confirm* the people ? No. Had he the exclusive right of government ? No. On the other hand ; Do the bishops discharge any duty analogous to the offering up of the yearly sacrifice on the great day of expiation ? No. Have they the peculiar privilege of entering into the immediate presence of God ? No. Is the oracle of God attached to their persons ? or have they any special right of declaring the divine will ? No. He who has sagacity enough to detect in the appropriate functions of the high priest any thing that deserves to be called a type of the functions appropriated to a Christian bishop, can never be at a loss for type and antitype, so long as any two objects remain within the bible or without it. Their prerogatives and offices are so absolutely dissimilar, that to make the one an image of the other, is to pour overwhelming ridicule upon the whole system of typical ordinances. The success will not be much better, if we go down to the second and third grades of the priesthood. If the reader has an hour which he cannot employ more profitably, he may throw it away in hunting for likenesses between the priests of the law and of the gospel ; between the Levite and the Episcopal deacon. We have enough of it. Our argument is this, that as typical officers must have typical functions, if the functions of the legal priesthood did not typify those of the Christian, then was not the one priesthood a type of the other. To insist upon

a typical meaning in the number of orders, and to discard, as mere circumstances, the respective functions of those orders, is a distinction which reason laughs at, and a sound head will hardly adopt.

3. As typical officers and typical functions are correlate ideas, the former necessarily implying the latter, we remark, that if the Jewish priesthood prefigured the Christian ministry, as a type its antitype, then it follows, that we have in the functions of the priesthood now, the substance of that which in the functions of the Levitical priesthood was only a type. That is, the priests now offer up the true sacrifice for sin, and are our mediators and intercessors with God, upon the footing of their sacrifice. It cannot be doubted that the *priestly* office of old was typical; and its sacrifices typical. Whoever, then, is the real priest, offers the real sacrifice. But he is the real priest of whom the priests of the law were a type. And the priests of the law were a type, says the hierarchy, of our priesthood: therefore the priesthood of the hierarchy offers up the true sacrifice for sin! There is no getting rid of the conclusion. The apostle Paul reasons in the same manner, from the typical relation of the old priests and their sacrifices to Jesus Christ and his sacrifice. He insists, that because they were shadows and Christ the substance, therefore Christ, the true priest, has put away sin by the offering up of himself as the true sacrifice. We see that the doctrine of the hierarchy is irreconcilable with that of the apostle. He teaches that the Levitical priesthood and their offerings were typical of Jesus Christ and his offerings. The hierarchy teaches that the Levitical priesthood typified the evangelical ministry. Both cannot be true:

The same type cannot signify a single high priest who offered up a true and proper sacrifice for sin, and an order of priests who offer up no such sacrifice. If Christ is the substance of the legal priesthood, the Episcopal hierarchy is not. If that hierarchy is the substance, Jesus Christ is not. The reader has his choice, whether he will side with the hierarchy at the expense of the apostle, or with the apostle at the expense of the hierarchy! Whether he will look for the substance of the Levitical priesthood in the Son of God and his mediatorial work, or in the administrations of the Episcopal clergy! Whether—But we check ourselves. A stranger instance of infatuated zeal has rarely occurred. The genius of the Old Testament types shall be perverted; their beautiful correspondence with their objects shall be marred; the principle of a whole book of the New Testament, (the Epistle to the Hebrews,) shall be set aside; but an argument, though merely a presumptive one, for the hierarchy, shall not be given up!

The only escape from this dilemma appears to be through a distinction between the particular character of the Old Testament priests as such, and their general character as ministers of religion. It may be yielded, that in the former they were types of Christ; and maintained that in the latter they were types of the Christian ministry. The distinction is of no avail; and its best effect is to protract the death of the Episcopal plea for a minute longer. If both their particular character as priests, and their general character as ministers of religion were typical, they were nothing but types. The worship which they offered up was typical worship; their prayers were typical prayers; their instructions to the people, typical instructions. The

church in which they ministered was a typical church. All was type. There was no reality. But this is absurd. God had as real a church, and dispensed as real blessings, by real ministers before, as since, the evangelical dispensation. Whatever typical *ordinances* might be set up, the church itself never was a type. It is a *whole*, and one part of a whole cannot be a type of another part. And as there were real ministers in a real church under the law, if you will have them to be types in their general character, you make the ministry of the church at one period and in one form, the type of her ministry at another period under another form. This is a contradiction. For the same persons could not be, at the same time, and in the exercise of the same functions, under the same relations, both shadow and substance. It destroys also the nature of the church of God; giving us all type before the new dispensation, and all substance after it. So that in fact, according to the scheme we are considering, there was no such thing as a church at all under the law, but only the *shadow* of a church. We have one step further in this typical climax. The sinners under the law were only typical sinners; the saints only typical saints; the salvation of the soul only a typical salvation; and, for aught we can see, the God of salvation only a typical God!

View it in any light you choose: The doctrine of the Layman, Cyprian, &c. concerning the Old Testament types, is inconsistent with itself; with the doctrine of the apostle Paul, and with all the known relations of type and antitype. Yet while they are spreading this confusion; while they are displaying the most absolute want of acquaintance with both the Old Testament and the New, they have the assurance to tell us that if we “have prov-

“ ed that the Jewish priesthood was not typical of
 “ the Christian, we have proved equally that the law
 “ was not a shadow of the gospel : thus destroying
 “ effectually, all connexion between the Old Tes-
 “ tament and the New*.” It seems, then, that al-
 though we have Christ the true priest and true sa-
 crifice ; and the effects of his mediation in pardon-
 ing sin, in purging the conscience, and in present-
 ing an efficacious intercession before God in the
 highest heavens—we have nothing to the purpose ;
 we are “ destroying the whole Christian dispensa-
 “ tion ;” we are doing “ much more to the support
 “ of infidelity, than of any other cause † ;” we are
 “ tearing up the very foundations of the Christian
 “ faith”—Why?—because we will not admit the
 episcopal clergy to be the substance of which the
 Levitical priesthood was only the shadow ! It is
 amazing, it is humiliating, that men who have need
 that *one teach them which be the first principles of the
 oracles of God*, should talk so confidently. Nay,
 in the very act of sanctioning all this misconcep-
 tion, misconstruction, and wresting of the scrip-
 tures, Mr. H. has permitted himself to ask Dr.
 Linn, whether he is “ really ignorant of the nature
 “ of the types of scripture,” or whether he is “ guil-
 “ ty of wilful *misrepresentation* ‡ ?” Such questions
 as these ought not to have been put by Mr. *Ho-*
bart.

So much for the first fact to which the disputants
 for the hierarchy have appealed.

Their *second* fact, is the triple order of the
 “ priesthood” during our Lord’s personal converse
 with men.

“ Whilst our Saviour remained on earth,” (says Cyprian,)
 “ he, of course, held supreme authority in his church. The

* LAYMAN, No. viii. p. 110. † P. 110. ‡ Note to *Call.* p. 37.

twelve were appointed by him as his subordinate officers. The seventy disciples constituted a still lower order. There existed, then, in the church of Christ, at this time, *three distinct grades* of ministers. When our Lord ascended into heaven, when he breathed upon the twelve, and said, "As my father hath sent me, so send I you," he transmitted to them the same authority which he himself had retained during his continuance amongst them: the twelve commissioned their presbyters and deacons to aid them in the administration of ecclesiastical government. Before their death they constituted an order of ministers, to whom they conveyed that supreme authority in the church which was lodged in their hands during their lives*."

Thus, also, the Layman:

"Jesus Christ commissioned twelve, and the seventy; but he gave them no authority to commission others. The high power of ordination was exercised by himself alone. Here, then, were three orders; our *Saviour*, the great head of the church; the twelve *apostles*; and the seventy *disciples*†."

We should be much entertained, and possibly edified, by the history of the three orders and their succession, as compiled by the Layman and his learned colleague, were we not disturbed by some difficulties which we cannot well remove,

Our *first* difficulty, as to this second stage of the triple order, relates to John the Baptist. He was certainly the Redeemer's messenger, and exercised a contemporary ministry. Why is he left out of the list? His extraordinary functions cannot be the reason; for those of his master were more extraordinary than his own. But he was neither the Christ, nor one of the twelve, nor one of the seventy. If you take him into the catalogue, you have *four* orders; if you leave him out, you must leave out his master likewise; and then you will have but *two*. In either way the history of the hierarchy sticks.

* CYPRIAN, No. II. *Coll.* p. 62. † LAYMAN, No. IX. *Coll.* p. 153.
VOL. I.—No. III. 2 T

Our *next* difficulty relates to the co-existence of the Jewish and Christian priesthoods. The church of God was either organized under the Christian form, during our Lord's continuance upon earth, or not. If not, there was no Christian priesthood, and consequently no orders of priesthood. If she was, then did she actually subsist under two forms at the same time. For it is certain that the legal form remained, till the offering up of the "word made flesh," in sacrifice for sin. Moreover, our Lord Jesus Christ was indubitably the head of the church under her Jewish form. She was, with her whole system of worship, his property. *He came unto his own**. He was in the temple, the lord of the temple, and acted as such. Now if his personal presence as the head of the church made him an order in her evangelical ministry, that same presence in the Jewish church made him one of the orders of the Jewish priesthood. Admit this, and we are troubled with an additional order in that priesthood; deny it, and we have lost one of the Christian orders. The former compels us to take *four*, the latter allows us but *two*. Scylla and Charybdis over again for the history of the *three* orders!

Our *third* difficulty relates to the principle upon which, in the present case, the triple order is founded. The Layman and Cyprian, as a shoal of other writers had done before them, work up the apostles and seventy disciples into two orders of priesthood; and that their canonical number might not be wanting, they complete it by adding the Redeemer himself!

Now, we had always thought, with the apostle Paul, that Christ was *faithful as a son over his own house*: that the church itself is the house; and that

* Εἰς τὰ ἴδια ἦλθι. Joh. i. 11.

all the ministers of the church are his *servants*. It was really a stroke worthy of “giants in theology,” to make the Lord himself one of the orders among his own servants! And seeing that his ascent into heaven never stripped him of any relation to his church, and that he actually exercises the priestly office at this moment before the throne of God, the consequence is, either that there are now *four* orders of the priesthood, or that there were but *two* in the days of his flesh. The same perplexity stares the hierarchy once more in the face; and if she will have three orders, neither more nor less, she must depose her master in order to make way for her bishops!

Our *fourth* difficulty relates to the *nature* of the succession.

Christ transmitted to the twelve, says Cyprian, “the *same authority* which he himself had retained during his continuance among them; and the twelve commissioned their presbyters and deacons to aid them in the administration of ecclesiastical government,” and “before their death, constituted an order of ministers to whom they conveyed” their own “*supreme authority.*”

Some how or other, we have lost the seventy disciples in this arrangement. Probably they were promoted to bishopricks. However that be, the descent of “power” is very distinctly stated. Christ conveyed the *same authority* which he himself exercised to the apostles; and the apostles conveyed the same authority which they exercised to the order which they constituted before their death; that is, the order of bishops. So, then, the order of bishops have now the very same authority which Christ himself had when he was upon earth! But Christ was the “lord and master” of

the church ; so are the bishops ; and for that reason are very properly styled, in some places, *Lords bishops* ! Christ was the *proprietor* of the church—so are the bishops, no doubt ! Christ had authority to appoint sacraments and to mould the government of his church according to his pleasure : so have the bishops, beyond controversy ! It seems, then, that they are the successors not so much of the apostles, as of the Lord Jesus Christ himself : that he is gone away to heaven, and has deputed to them *in solidum*, by the lump, the whole authority which he himself possessed ! A fair inheritance we own ; and very goodly heirs ! Having established this point, we wonder that they put themselves to any further trouble in making out their title to “ the pre-eminence ! ” There is a short cut to the resolution of every difficulty about the affairs of the church, and every thing else. Go to the bishops ! Christ had unlimited authority over the conscience, and they have succeeded him. Ecclesiastical history is not barren of instances wherein they have acted up to the spirit of their trust. England can witness, that, in one day, they threw upon the mercy of the persecutor, and the comforts of famine, *two thousand* of the best men and the most glorious ministers of the gospel, that ever blessed a nation or adorned a church : and a great proportion of them for not submitting to impositions upon conscience for which the warrant of the divine word was not so much as pretended. But the Episcopal warrant was perfectly clear : and the Puritans were righteously deprived for not bowing to the successors of Jesus Christ ! “ Come set “ us the five mile act to music*.” Let us compen-

* • An act of 17th Charles II. by which non-conformist ministers were prohibited, unless in crossing the road, to come or be, on any pretence whatever, after March 24th, 1665, within *five miles* of any city,

state the fast of the 30th January for the martyrdom of Charles*, with the festival of St. Bartholomew †, for the judgment of the Presbyterians!

They who can persuade themselves that the Episcopal prelates enjoy the same power, which was vested in our Lord Jesus Christ, are welcome to their consolation. *We* are, as yet, a great ways off from the line of converts.

Our *fifth* difficulty relates to the question, whether the twelve were really a superiour order to the seventy? We cannot perceive in the New Testament any characters of such superiority. On comparing the history of their appointment, we find their commission was the same both in form and in substance; that they had the same powers, the same instructions, the same cautions, the same support; in short, that their whole mission was the same. Let any man of common candour read the account of it in Matthew and Luke; and let

town corporate, or borough that sent burgesses to parliament; or with in five miles of any parish, town or place, wherein they had, since the act of oblivion, been parson, vicar, or lecturer, &c.; or where they had preached in any conventicle.

* Charles I. of tyrannical memory, was beheaded on the 30th January, 1649. He called himself, and was called by some others, a *martyr*. The anniversary of his martyrdom has afforded the High church clergy many fine opportunities for displaying their zeal for "the church," and mourning over her calamities.

† The famous "*Act for the uniformity of public prayers and administration of sacraments, and other rites and ceremonies, &c. in the church of England;*" which received the royal assent on the 19th May, 1662, and took effect on the 24th of August following, being *St. Bartholomew's day*. Assent and consent to its provisions were to be declared by that day, on pain of deprivation of their livings, if the offenders were in the ministry; and if schoolmasters or tutors, three months imprisonment and a fine of five pounds sterling. About *two thousand* ministers could not, with a good conscience, comply; and they were deprived accordingly.

him discover, if he can, any thing that bears the semblance of a superiour and inferiour order. To facilitate his inquiry we subjoin the passages alluded to—

The TWELVE :

Matthew ix. 37—x. 16.

“ Then saith he unto his disciples, The harvest truly is plenteous, but the labourers are few. Pray ye therefore, the Lord of the harvest, that he will send forth labourers into his harvest. And when he had called unto him his twelve disciples, he gave them power against unclean spirits, to cast them out, and to heal all manner of sickness, and all manner of disease. Now the names of the twelve apostles are these ; the first, Simon, who is called Peter, and Andrew his brother ; James the son of Zebedee, and John his brother ; Philip and Bartholomew ; Thomas, and Matthew the publican ; James the son of Alpheus, and Lebbeus, whose surname was Thaddeus. Simon the Canaanite, and Judas Iscariot who also betrayed him. These twelve Jesus sent forth, and commanded them, saying, Go not into the way of the Gentiles, and into any city of the Samaritans enter ye not : but go rather to the lost sheep of the house of

The SEVENTY :

Luke x. 1—16.

“ After these things the Lord appointed other seventy also, and sent them two and two before his face into every city and place whither he himself would come. Therefore said he unto them, The harvest truly is great, but the labourers are few : pray ye therefore, the Lord of the harvest, that he would send forth labourers into his harvest. Go your ways : behold, I send you forth as lambs among wolves. Carry neither purse, nor scrip, nor shoes : and salute no man by the way. And into whatsoever house ye enter, first say, Peace be to this house. And if the son of peace be there, your peace shall rest upon it : if not, it shall turn to you again. And in the same house remain, eating and drinking such things as they give : for the labourer is worthy of his hire. Go not from house to house. And into whatsoever city ye enter, and they receive you, eat such things as are set before you ; and heal the sick that are therein ; and

The TWELVE.

Israel. And, as ye go, preach, saying, The kingdom of heaven is at hand. Heal the sick, cleanse the lepers, raise the dead, cast out devils: freely ye have received, freely give. Provide neither gold, nor silver, nor brass, in your purses; nor scrip for your journey, neither two coats, neither shoes, nor yet staves; for the workman is worthy of his meat. And into whatsoever city or town ye shall enter, inquire who in it is worthy; and there abide till ye go thence. And when ye come into an house, salute it. And if the house be worthy, let your peace come upon it: but if it be not worthy, let your peace return to you. And whosoever shall not receive you, nor hear your words, when ye depart out of that house or city, shake off the dust of your feet. Verily I say unto you, It shall be more tolerable for the land of Sodom and Gomorrah, in the day of judgment, than for that city. Behold, I send you forth as sheep in the midst of wolves; be ye therefore wise as serpents, and harmless as doves. He that receiveth you, receiveth me; and he that receiveth me, receiveth him that sent me."

The SEVENTY.

say unto them, The kingdom of God is come nigh unto you. But into whatsoever city ye enter, and they receive you not, go your ways out into the streets of the same, and say, Even the very dust of your city, which cleaveth on us, we do wipe off against you: notwithstanding, be ye sure of this, that the kingdom of God is come nigh unto you. But I say unto you, That it shall be more tolerable in that day for Sodom than for that city. Wo unto thee, Chorazin! wo unto thee, Bethsaida! for if the mighty works had been done in Tyre and Sidon, which have been done in you, they had a great while ago repented, sitting in sackcloth and ashes. But it shall be more tolerable for Tyre and Sidon at the judgment than for you. And thou, Capernaum, which art exalted to heaven, shalt be thrust down to hell. He that heareth you, heareth me; and he that despiseth you, despiseth me; and he that despiseth me, despiseth him that sent me."

If, after all, the twelve were an order superiour to the seventy, the evidence, whether in these or other parts of the evangelical narrative, is too subtle for our clumsy senses. The Layman, however, whose perceptions are not so dull, has been more fortunate. Let us betake ourselves to his aid.

“The twelve,” says he, “were superior to the seventy, both in *dignity* and *power*.”—

They were superior in “*dignity*.”

How is this proved? Thus—

1. “The apostles are every where spoken of, as “the constant attendants of our Lord.” Therefore they were of a higher rank than the seventy! The Layman is as active as he is sharp sighted; but the ditch between his premises and his conclusion being rather too wide for us to leap, we cannot conveniently follow him.

But the Layman has forgotten that there were others, beside the apostles, who are mentioned as the constant attendants of our Lord*, and who received from that circumstance no pre-eminence of authority whatever. The Layman's first argument, then, is “good for nothing.”

2. “The commission of the apostles was much “more general” than that of the seventy. The latter “were sent before our Lord into the cities “*whither he himself would come*.” The former were directed “to preach the gospel to all the “Jews.” A minister, therefore, who should be instructed to make a preaching tour through the United States, would be of a higher grade than one whose labours should be confined to the state of New-York! If this argument of the Layman is not very satisfactory, it is at least ingenious. There is something vastly pleasant in regulating the grandeur of the priesthood by the length of a journey;

* Acts i. 21.

and determining its grades with a pair of geographical compasses!

3. "The inauguration of the twelve was much more solemn than that of the seventy." Therefore, they must be of a superiour order. Because all the world knows that it is impossible to appoint, though on different occasions, officers of the same rank without the very same degree of solemnity. This is demonstration! Is it not, good reader? But in what was the inauguration of the twelve more solemn than that of the seventy?

"In relation to the first," replies the Layman, "we find our Saviour directing his disciples to pray to God to send labourers into the harvest. We find him continuing himself a whole night in prayer. In the inauguration of the seventy there was nothing of all this solemnity." P. 154.

Nothing! If we read our bible correctly, there is the same direction about prayer to the Lord of the harvest, for labourers in his harvest, coupled with the mission of the seventy, and of the twelve. With respect to his continuing in prayer the whole night previous to the choice of his apostles, is the Layman sure that their appointment was the special cause of our Lord's being thus employed? That he never prayed in this manner upon any other occasion? And particularly, before the election of the seventy? And supposing him to be sure of all this; how does it affect relative dignity? Christ prayed all night before appointing the twelve, and not before appointing the seventy, *therefore* the twelve were a superiour order of ministers! It seems, then, that it was not preaching the gospel, nor performing mighty works in his name, which lay so near the Saviour's heart when he was about to send forth his messengers, as to engage him all night in prayer; but it was the desire to set off a

VOL. I.—N^o. III. 2 U

superiour order of them with suitable eclat!— When the *twelve* are to be commissioned, he prays all night. When the *seventy* are to be commissioned, he is not at the same trouble; and this merely to show that they are not of such high dignity as the others! Poor disciples! To have the same duties and the same trials with your twelve superiours, and much less interest in your master's affections and prayers! It was no small matter, we see, to be a bishop or something like one, in the days of his flesh: and if the Layman will undertake to prove that the successour-bishops have still the same enviable privilege, we shall not refuse him the praise of courage! However, if they act up to the *principle* of his argument, there is one inference which we think may be drawn from it with rather clearer evidence than his own for the pre-eminence of the apostles above the seventy; and that is, that when the hierarchy is about ordaining bishops, she prays most fervently; and when presbyters are to be ordained, she does not think it worth while to pray at all!

The Layman proceeds:

“The apostles were, likewise, superior,” viz. to the seventy, “in *power*.” P. 154.

How is this proved? Thus:

“They alone received the commission to offer the eucharistic sacrifice of bread and wine.”

We stay not to comment on the popish style of this passage. “Eucharistic *sacrifice!*” The scripture knows neither the name nor the thing, in reference to the *commemoration* of our Lord's death in the sacrament of the supper. The Layman's argument for the superiority of the twelve is, that they alone were authorized to administer this sacrament. Indeed! How, then, came it to be ad-

ministered by the Episcopal priests who are not the successours of the apostles? Either this power does not prove superiority of rank, or else the hierarchy has transferred to an inferiour order, one of the peculiar functions of the superiour; and thus corrupted the institutions of Christ. The Layman has his option. It will not be possible to evade the alternative; because the Lord's supper is an ordinance of perpetual obligation, and could not be administered by the apostles till after his death; nor is there a shadow of proof that it was ever administered by them till after his ascension, and the descent of the Holy Spirit at pentecost. Prove what it will, it cannot prove the superiority of the twelve above the seventy during his abode upon earth. And what is more, there is nothing in the institution of the supper to express the conveyance of authority to administer it. There is nothing but the appointment of it for the observation of the church. *This do in remembrance of me; for as often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup, ye do shew the Lord's death till he come.* But all communicants "do this in remembrance of him," they all "show forth his death," in the holy supper, as much as did the apostles. The commission to administer the sacraments, and govern the church, was not given till the very moment of his departure from earth.

In the next place :

"To the twelve," says the Layman, "were twelve thrones appointed, whereon they should sit, judging the twelve tribes of Israel." P. 154.

As this language is altogether symbolical, he should have fixed its meaning before he quoted it as a proof. This he has not done, and it is not our business to do it for him. But Cyprian has conceded

that Christ held, in his own hands, the supreme authority while he was on earth ; the Layman himself has told us, that the twelve, during this period, had not the power of ordination ; and men who had power neither to govern nor to ordain, are not very fitly depicted by the symbols of men " sitting upon " thrones, and judging the twelve tribes of Israel." The Layman has again mistaken and misrepresented the passage, *part* of which he has cited. It stands thus, in Mat. xix. 28. " Jesus said unto them, " Verily I say unto you, that ye which have followed me in the regeneration, *when the Son of Man shall sit in the throne of his glory*, ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel." It appears from Luke, ch. xxii. that this promise was addressed to the twelve just before our Lord's passion. Whatever, then is meant by the " twelve thrones," and the " judgment of the " twelve tribes of Israel," it was not, and could not be possessed by the apostles, till after their master's *exaltation* : till he should sit in the *throne of his glory*. He was to bestow it upon them after he should have " ascended up far above all heavens," and not before. This is the text on which the Layman relies for proof of the pre-eminence of the twelve during our Lord's *humiliation*, when *he did not* sit in the throne of *his glory*, and consequently *they did not* sit on *their* thrones.

But " on them," *viz.* the twelve, " was to rest the fabric of the church. *The wall of the city having twelve foundations, and in them the names of the twelve apostles of the Lamb.*" Rev. xxi. 14.

Another blunder, as usual. A symbolical representation of a state of the church which has not yet happened, is to prove that the twelve were superiour to the seventy in the days of their master's flesh,

and before they had received any commission whatever to govern!

There is one argument more.

“ Upon the happening of a vacancy, by the apostacy of Judas, Matthias was raised to his bishoprick, being numbered with the eleven apostles, and taking a part of their ministry. Acts i. Matthias had been one of the seventy. For this we have the testimony of Eusebius, of Jerome, of Epiphanius. Mark, Luke, Sosthenes, with other evangelists, as also the seven deacons, were of the seventy, if the primitive fathers of the church be at all to be relied upon as witnesses of facts. And these persons, even after their promotion, were still inferior to the twelve, being under their government.” P. 154.

The elevation of Matthias to the apostleship took place *after* the eleven had received their commission from the risen Saviour, and after he had ascended to heaven: and this is to prove that they were superiour to the seventy *before* his passion. Truly the Layman has a right to make himself merry with the logic of his opponents! But did the seventy retain, after Christ's resurrection, the commission which they had before his death, or did they not? If they did not, the Layman's argument goes to the wall at once. If they did, then it is strange that their official character is never so much as mentioned after the resurrection, in any part of the New Testament. And it is no less strange that the Layman should represent any of them as being *promoted* to the office of *deacons*. Lower they could not be, to be in the “priesthood” at all. And if they were *next* the apostles, as they were put in a preceding part of the discussion, their being made *deacons*, was a promotion *downwards*. They must have been, as belonging to the priesthood, either of the order of deacons, or of a superiour order; if deacons, their ordination to that office by the

apostles was a farce; if of a superiour order, it degraded them. The Layman has again his choice. But whether they were *then* degraded, or promoted, or neither, what has this to do with their own office or that of the apostles, during our Lord's abode upon earth?

So much for the Layman's proofs that the twelve were superiour to the seventy. He has not proved, nor can he, with the whole phalanx of the hierarchy to help him, prove, either from their commission, or from their acts, that the twelve exercised or possessed an atom of power over the seventy

But our difficulties are not yet ended. We encounter a formidable one in the fact, that the Christian church *was not organized at all during our Lord's residence on earth.* The ministry of the baptist, his own ministry, and that of the apostles and the seventy, were all *preparative.* The church could not be organized under the new dispensation, till the Jewish form ceased; and that could not cease till the Messiah had "finished transgression, made an end of sin, and made reconciliation for iniquity," by the sacrifice of himself. Accordingly, he gave his apostles their high commission after his resurrection; and they did not so much as attempt to act upon it, till, as he had promised, they were "endued with power from on high," by the descent of the Holy Ghost at pentecost. *Then* they were able to speak in the name of a master who was "set on the right hand of the throne of the majesty in the heavens." Then, and not till then, did the church put on her New Testament form. It is, therefore, perfectly idle to infer what this form should be, from her appearance in her unformed state.

Once more. Had the Episcopal writers even made good their assertions concerning the state of

the church in the period we have been reviewing, it would avail them nothing. Because our Lord has settled the platform of his church, the leading principles of her order, by positive statute; and this precludes, to the whole extent of the statute, all reasoning from analogy. We have nothing to do but to ascertain what he has enacted.

Thus have the proofs drawn, in favour of the hierarchy, from the Jewish priesthood, and from the state of the church during our Lord's personal ministry, vanished, successively, at the touch.—Grosser abuse of the divine word than we have had occasion to expose, cannot easily be found. The Layman hardly approaches a text without disfiguring it. He is young, very young, in the study of his bible. This is *some* excuse; and, in his being a *layman*, he has an apology which cannot be extended to Cyprian, Vindex, or Cornelius. If reading the scriptures, like correct interpreters, were to be the test, we much fear that, in the issue of the present trial, neither himself, nor his reverend associates, would be entitled to plead *the benefit of clergy*.

(*To be continued.*)

☞ *We are under the necessity of postponing several Reviews, and the History of the Mission to the South-Seas, in order to insert some valuable recent information.*

RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCE.

FOREIGN.

BRITISH AND FOREIGN BIBLE SOCIETY.

A SOCIETY having been formed with the above designation, it has been judged expedient to submit to the public a brief statement of the *reasons* which exist for such a society, of the specific *object* which it embraces, and of the *principles* by which its operations will be directed.

The **REASONS**, which call for such an institution, chiefly refer to the prevalence of ignorance, superstition, and idolatry, over so large a portion of the world ; the limited nature of the respectable societies now in existence, and their acknowledged insufficiency to supply the demand for bibles in the United Kingdom and foreign countries ; and the recent attempts which have been made on the part of infidelity to discredit the evidence, vilify the character, and destroy the influence of christianity.

The exclusive **OBJECT** of this society is, to diffuse the knowledge of the holy scriptures, by circulating them in the different languages spoken throughout Great Britain and Ireland ; and also, according to the extent of its funds, by promoting the printing of them in foreign languages, and the distribution of them in foreign countries.

The PRINCIPLES, upon which this undertaking will be conducted, are as comprehensive as the nature of the object suggests that they should be. In the execution of the plan, it is proposed to embrace the common support of Christians at large; and to invite the concurrence of persons of every description, who profess to regard the scriptures as the proper standard of faith.

It may be necessary to add, in soliciting the countenance of the public, that in consequence of the enlarged means of instruction, which the lower classes in this country have enjoyed of late years, a desire of perusing the scriptures has considerably increased among them; and also that in Wales, Ireland, Switzerland, Germany, Denmark, and other parts of the world, bibles are greatly wanted, and, in some, are sought for with an eagerness, which, but for authentic assurances to that effect, would scarcely be credited.

Influenced by these considerations, a numerous and respectable meeting, (which was convened at the London tavern, on the 7th of March, 1804, GRANVILLE SHARP, Esq. in the chair,) Resolved,

That a society should be formed, entitled,

THE BRITISH AND FOREIGN BIBLE SOCIETY;

of which the sole object should be to encourage a wider circulation of the holy scriptures, not only through the British dominions, but, according to its ability, in other countries, whether Christian, Mahometan, or Pagan.

VOL. I.—N^o. III. 2 X

At a subsequent general meeting, held at the London tavern, on Wednesday, the 2d of May, 1804,

GRANVILLE SHARP, Esq. in the chair,

A report of the committee was read, purporting that they had been occupied in opening communications with various persons of influence in different parts of the United Kingdom, and of the Continent, for the purpose of obtaining important intelligence, of augmenting the funds of the society, and otherwise promoting its interests ;

The following revised plan of the society was then unanimously adopted :

1. A society shall be formed with this designation,

The British and Foreign Bible Society,

of which the sole object shall be to encourage a wider circulation of the holy scriptures.

2. This society shall add its endeavours to those employed by other societies for circulating the scriptures through the British dominions, and shall also, according to its ability, extend its influence to other countries, whether Christian, Mahometan, or Pagan.

3. Each subscriber of one guinea annually shall be a member.

4. Each subscriber of twenty pounds at one time, or who shall by any one additional payment increase his original subscription to twenty pounds, shall be a member for life.

5. Each subscriber of five guineas annually, shall be a governor.

6. Each subscriber of fifty pounds at one time, or who shall by one additional payment increase his original subscription to fifty pounds, shall be a governor for life.

7. Governors shall be entitled to attend and vote at all meetings of the committee.

8. An executor paying a bequest of fifty pounds shall be a member for life; or of one hundred pounds, a governor for life.

9. Each member shall be entitled, under the direction of the committee, to purchase bibles and testaments, for the purpose of gratuitous distribution, at the society's prices, which shall be as low as possible.

10. The annual meeting of the society shall be held on the first Wednesday in May; when the treasurer and committee shall be chosen, the accounts audited, and the proceedings of the foregoing year reported.

11. The committee shall consist of thirty-six laymen; of whom twenty-four who shall have most frequently attended, shall be eligible for re-election for the ensuing year. Six of the committee shall be foreigners resident in London or its vicinity; half the remainder shall be members of the church of England; and the other half members of other denominations of Christians.

12. Every clergyman and dissenting minister, who is a member of the society, shall be entitled to attend and vote at all meetings of the committee.

13. The treasurer and secretaries, for the time being, shall be considered as members of the committee.

14. No person deriving any emolument or profit from the society, shall be entitled to sit or vote in the committee.

15. The committee shall conduct the business of the society; appoint all officers except the treasurer; have power to call special general meetings;

and shall be charged with procuring for the society suitable patronage, both British and foreign.

(Signed)

GRANVILLE SHARP, *Chairman.*

The following is the substance of some letters received by friends of this institution ; and is subjoined in confirmation of part of what is stated above with respect to the want of bibles.

From a Clergyman in North Wales.

The Sunday schools have occasioned more calls for bibles, within these five years, in our poor country, than perhaps was ever known before.

The possession of a bible produces a feeling, which the possession of no one thing in the world besides could produce. In many houses, containing numerous families, there is but one bible ; of course, the young people and servants are frequently debarred the free use of it, though anxiously desirous of that privilege.

The last Oxford edition of the Welsh bible was bought up, with the greatest avidity, principally by the lower class, and there were not half enough to supply the demand. I have seen some of them overcome with joy, and burst into tears of thankfulness, on their obtaining possession of a bible, as their own property and for their free use. Young females in service have walked thirty miles, with the mere hope of obtaining from me a bible ; and have returned with more joy and gratitude, than if they had obtained great spoils.

We, who have half a dozen bibles by us, and are in circumstances to obtain as many more, know but little of the value, which those put upon *one*, who before were scarcely permitted to look into a bible once a week.

From a Clergyman in the city of Basil, in Switzerland.

In the houses of people in good circumstances, both in town and country, bibles are always to be met with ; but there are many day-labourers and working-manufacturers without a bible. Scarcely a week passes, in which I am not applied to for bibles by poor children, in order to learn the texts which I appoint them ; and my means are not sufficient to satisfy all these demands. There are no public institutions, for distributing the bible, in our canton.

From the Clergyman of a large parish, containing five villages, in Alsace.

My parish borders upon French Lorraine, where all are Roman Catholics, many of whom have procured bibles from us ; these are few, however, compared with those who are still destitute, but desirous to possess them. I have also distributed many New Testaments, even to Romish priests, some of whom, through ignorance, have burnt them ; which was told me by some of their own people with great concern. I always keep a stock of both German and French bibles ; partly to lend, partly to sell and some to give away. In order to be enabled to do this, I make it a practice to lay by three tenths of my income. Had I not adopted this practice, I

should not have been able to do any thing of the kind.

From a Merchant at Nuremberg, in Germany.

I take this opportunity of recommending to the attention of the benevolent, my poor fellow Christians in Austria, Karinthia, Stiria, and Hungary ; and to request the favour of them to assist us in procuring bibles and New Testaments, which are very much wanted by a great number of young people, both in schools and in private houses. By this means a vast deal of good may be done. People are in general too poor to purchase these essential books. There are, besides, a great number of poor servants of both sexes, whose wages are frequently not sufficient to clothe them, much less to purchase a book for edification. There are likewise old people, who would gladly employ their time in reading the holy scriptures, if they could obtain them. Often when sitting in my warehouse, at the fair of Linz, (one of the chief towns in Austria,) numbers of people, young and old, children and servants, flock about me, exclaiming, “——, have you not brought us again a bible or a hymn book from your friends? We are not able to purchase any. We have enough to do to get bread : and yet we would wish to get to heaven too. O pray our fellow Protestants kindly to remember us again.” I have, indeed, several times had the pleasure to receive a present of bibles, &c. as also contributions in money ; so that I have been enabled to distribute numbers of them in schools and private houses. This year, however, I have, as yet, received nothing, although applications to me increase.

THIRD REPORT

OF THE

COMMITTEE

OF THE

BRITISH AND FOREIGN BIBLE-SOCIETY.

YOUR committee, in presenting to the British and Foreign Bible-Society, the report of their proceedings, since the last general meeting, will endeavour to furnish a comprehensive rather than a detailed view, of the several objects which have engaged their attention, during this third year of the society's existence.

Notwithstanding the counteraction occasioned by the war, the impulse given by the example and encouragement of this society, to religious associations and individuals on the continent, still continues to produce a most pleasing effect:—The circulation of the German New Testament printed by the Bible-Society at Nuremberg, is very extensive; a considerable number of copies of it has been sent to Protestant congregations which were in great want of them, through various parts of the Austrian dominions; and it is matter of satisfaction to know that such seasonable supplies have been thankfully received.

From the peculiar facilities afforded by the city of Basle for promoting the object of the association, and from other considerations arising out of the effects of the war, the German Bible-Society has deemed it advisable to transfer the centre of its operations from Nuremberg to that city: though the committee in the latter place have not ceased to exert themselves for the promotion of the common cause.

A very respectable committee of clergymen and gentlemen have been constituted at Basle for that purpose, and their attention has been particularly directed to provide a cheap edition of the bible complete. Your committee having received full information of their plans, proceedings, and funds; and being convinced that the further assistance of the British and Foreign Bible-Society would not only materially tend to facilitate the accomplishment of this undertaking, but greatly enlarge its extent, resolved to present the German Bible-Society with the sum of 300*l.* in addition to a former donation of 200*l.* They have the satisfaction to learn, that by this opportune aid, the number of 250,000 German bibles in clear and excellent types, may be successively furnished at a very cheap rate, for the benefit of present and future generations.

Your committee have further to notice the operations of "The Religious Society" established at Basle, and mentioned in their last report*, so far as those operations relate to the circulation of the scriptures. It appears that they purchased 1500 copies of the French Protestant bible, partly by their own funds, and partly by the 100*l.* remitted from this society; and that of these copies several hundred have been distributed in Lausanne, Mont-

* Page 119.

mirail, Besançon, Strasburgh, and some even in the interior provinces of France.

The members of the British and Foreign Bible-Society will readily anticipate the impediments to the progress of the Bible-Society at Berlin, in consequence of the calamities which have overwhelmed the Prussian dominions. But though its operations have been unavoidably relaxed, they have not been entirely suspended : on the contrary, in a country which had unhappily become the theatre of war and devastation, the Prussian Bible-Society, encouraged and assisted by your committee, has actually proceeded in printing a Bohemian bible ; and had, at the date of the last account from Berlin, advanced in this undertaking as far as the Psalms.

Your committee doubt not that the same zeal which has stimulated exertion, under circumstances so discouraging, will continue to animate the Prussian Bible-Society, till the important work which it has undertaken shall be completed.

Your committee have also particular satisfaction in noticing the active benevolence of an officer who holds the rank of major in the service of his Prussian majesty. Having been apprised that 3,000 copies of the Bohemian New Testament remained for sale in the Hallish Bible-Institution, he purchased them at his own expense, and transmitted them to Bohemia for gratuitous distribution.

In consequence of information from the reverend Mr. Glogau of Koeningsberg, that the inhabitants of Lithuania were in great want of bibles, your committee expressed their willingness to afford the aid of this society, in printing a new impression of a Lithuanian bible, if undertaken by a respectable printer in Koeningsberg.

VOL. I.—N^o. III. 2 Y

They have to lament the interruption for the present, of all further communication on this interesting subject, from the unfortunate proximity of Koeningsberg to the theatre of war.

The society will recollect the resolution of their committee, stated in a former report, to grant 150/ for promoting the circulation of the holy scriptures, if a Bible-Society for that purpose should be formed, in the Russian province of Esthonia.

The notification of this resolution was accompanied by an intimation on the part of your committee, that the proposed society should be established on a scale to embrace Livonia, Finland, and other Protestant provinces of the Russian empire. It appeared, however, from their correspondence with the reverend Mr. Carlblom, that the situation of Esthonia, from physical and political impediments, was ill calculated for the central point of a society on so extensive a scale.

The eventual donation of your committee remains therefore as originally proposed. A correspondence however has been entered into with some Protestant clergymen in Petersburg, at the recommendation of the reverend Mr. Carlblom, for the purpose of ascertaining the religious state of the Russian Protestant provinces, and accompanied by a promise, that if by the united counsels and exertions of these respectable gentlemen, it should be found practicable to establish a Bible-Society for the provinces in question, your committee would afford them assistance in promoting the beneficial objects of such an institution.

The attention of your committee has not been confined to the provinces of the Russian empire which have been mentioned; it has also been particularly attracted by information of the great want

of bibles among the Russians in general ; and they have adopted such measures upon it, as will, they trust, in due time enable them to decide how far it may be in their power to supply the deficiency.

In consequence of an application for German bibles and Testaments to be distributed among the German colonies near the Wolga ; instructions have been given by your committee to Doctor Knappe at Halle, to send 400 bibles and 200 Testaments from the Bible-Institution of that place, for the accommodation of the colonies above named.

In the course of their correspondence, your committee received information of the extreme scarcity of bibles in Iceland, and at the same time, that a society of respectable clergymen of Fuhnen in Denmark, with a view to supply this deficiency, had resolved to print an edition of 2000 copies of the New Testament in the Icelandic dialect.

The inhabitants of this remote island are supposed to amount to nearly 50,000, and their habits and dispositions are of a description to justify the most reasonable expectations, that the liberality of the society could never be bestowed on objects more worthy of it, or with a fairer prospect of beneficial effect :—Your Committee were therefore happy to embrace such an opportunity of supplying the spiritual wants of their brethren in Iceland, by furnishing the necessary funds for increasing the proposed edition of the Icelandic New Testament to 5000 copies : they have likewise expressed their readiness to assist the printing of the whole Icelandic bible.

Your committee, reverting to the notice in their last report, that under the auspices of the college at Fort William in Bengal, the scriptures were in a course of translation into the languages of almost

the whole continent of Oriental India, and having received information, that the assistance of this society would greatly contribute to forward this most laudable and important undertaking ; resolved for such purpose, to place the sum of 1000*l.* at the disposal of the Calcutta corresponding committee, which has been duly informed of the resolution.

By a communication very recently received from the reverend Doctor Brown, provost of the college of Fort William, your committee are in possession of specimens, partly printed and partly manuscript, of translations into ten of the Oriental languages, among which are the Shanscript and the Chinese. These translations are in different degrees of forwardness, and to their completion nothing is now wanting, under the divine blessing, but funds sufficiently ample.

A proposal having been made to your committee from the Edinburgh Missionary Society, to assist them in procuring Arabic types and a supply of paper for the purpose of printing an edition of the New Testament in the Turkish language, under the direction of their missionary, Mr. Brunton, at Karass, on the border of the Caspian sea ; and this proposal having been accompanied with a representation from their correspondents, that the Turkish language is spoken from the banks of the Wolga to the borders of the Euxine ; your committee, after mature deliberation upon all the circumstances of the case, resolved to supply a font of Arabic types to be cast by Messrs. Fry of London, and also paper sufficient for 5000 copies of the proposed Testament. To the adoption of this resolution they were partly influenced by the consideration of that liberality with which their brethren in Scotland have contributed to the funds of your society ; but

chiefly by the prospect of furnishing the Christian scriptures, in a language they understand, to a people occupying so large a portion of country, and living under the degrading dominion of Mahomedan superstition.

Your committee will only briefly advert to their other proceedings in the course of the year, respecting foreign nations and settlements; and it is with real satisfaction they are enabled to state, that the British soldiers at the Cape of Good Hope, the inhabitants of Newfoundland, Halifax, and Nova Scotia; the settlers at Van Diemens Land, the French at St. Domingo, the Spaniards at Buenos Ayres, the colonists of New South Wales, and some of the distressed Protestants in Mecklenberg, have been, or are in a course of being supplied by the funds of the British and foreign Bible-Society, in a greater or less degree, with the means of spiritual knowledge in their respective languages. Your committee had provided themselves with the means of doing this kindness to the Spaniards in South America, by the 2000 * copies of the Spanish New Testament which they had printed chiefly with the view of supplying the prisoners of that nation in this country: and it may be proper to add, that a further impression of 3000 copies is now nearly finished.

Under the general head of their foreign transactions, your Committee have also to mention, that the printing of an edition of the Scriptures in the Calmuc and Arabic dialects is under their consideration.

It now remains for your committee to report summarily their transactions for promoting the bb-

* Second Report, p. 121.

ject of the society within the United Kingdom: and here they have the sincere gratification to state, that its importance, so far from being diminished in the public estimation, appears to increase in magnitude, and to attract proportionate encouragement, both from the most respectable societies and individuals.

The completion of the Welsh New Testament was noticed in the former report; and your committee have received information on which they can rely, that the mode in which it has been executed, has obtained very general approbation. The Welch and Gaelic bibles are also in a very advanced state of progress, and will be completed with all the expedition consistent with a due attention to correctness. Various editions of the New Testament in English, and one of the entire bible, have also been printed at the expense of the society, in a manner which your committee trust will be deemed satisfactory.

That a still greater number of copies has not yet been completed, and that members have not been supplied in proportion to their demands, is not owing to any want of attention in your committee, but to circumstances which it was utterly out of their power to control.

They have the most satisfactory assurance that every exertion has been made by the University of Cambridge, for expediting the performance of its engagements with the society; and as an additional number of printing presses is now employed for this purpose, your committee confidently hope, that all impediments to the efforts of the society in providing a sufficient supply of Bibles and Testaments for circulation within the United Kingdom, will now be removed.

It has been the constant care of your committee to attend to the more pressing exigencies, in supplying societies or individuals with the holy scriptures, for circulation or use, and upon terms adapted to the circumstances of those for whose benefit they were intended.

This observation will be accurately verified by the following brief recital of their proceedings in this respect within the United Kingdom.

The association at Dublin “for discountenancing vice, and promoting the knowledge and practice of the Christian religion,” and “the Bible-Society” at the same place, have been accommodated with grants of bibles and Testaments to the extent of their respective applications, on the terms mentioned in the last report.

Two thousand Testaments have also been consigned to the care of a clergyman in the south of Ireland, to be disposed of at a price subject to his discretion. A gentleman in the north of the same kingdom has been furnished with 1000 copies at one half the original cost, for distribution among the poor; and a member of your committee has also received an equal number on the same terms, for the use of Sunday schools in different parts of that country.

Of the successful manner in which the clergyman alluded to, has distributed the copies which had been consigned to his care, your committee have received a very gratifying account.

By the benevolent assistance of individuals who have undertaken the charge of distributing the scriptures, in the instances now to be enumerated, your committee have had the gratification to furnish copies of the New Testament, and occasionally of the whole bible, repeating the supplies as they were cal-

led for, to the convicts at Woolwich, the prisoners in Newgate, and other jails; the German soldiers and seamen at Margate, Gosport, Guilford, Dublin, and other places; the sea Fencibles on the Essex coast, and the French and Spanish prisoners of war.

From the information received by your committee respecting the last mentioned persons, it appeared that 2410 French prisoners out of the number of 5178, and 800 Spanish prisoners out of 1700, all at Plymouth, were capable of reading the New Testament in their respective languages, and were also anxious to obtain the means of doing it. With these means they have been supplied by the British and foreign Bible-Society, and it will be most satisfactory to the members of it to be informed, that the anxiety of the Spanish prisoners to obtain the New Testaments offered to them, exceeded all conception; that many sought them with tears and earnest entreaties; and although the number allotted was nearly enough for all, they could scarcely be pacified until their wants were individually gratified. Your committee will close the description in the words of their correspondent:—"I have since witnessed the most pleasing sight my eyes have ever beheld; nearly a thousand poor Spanish prisoners sitting round their prison walls—doing what? reading the word of God, with an apparent eagerness, that would put many professing Christians to the blush!"

Nor will it be less gratifying to the society to learn, that the New Testaments voted to the convicts at Woolwich, were also most cordially received by them.—To each mess a Testament has been allotted.

For the immediate benefit of the poor Welsh re-

siding in England, it has also been resolved to allow Welsh ministers who are not subscribers to the institution, to purchase Welsh editions of the Scriptures at reduced prices for the benefit of their respective congregations.

The Association in London for aiding the funds of the institution, by means of small monthly subscriptions, particularly noticed in the last report*, is permitted to purchase the bibles and Testaments of the Society at the reduced prices, to an extent apparently equal to its exigencies, and to the present means of the Society for supplying them. It has also been determined by a recent resolution, to furnish such supplies of bibles and Testaments as can be spared, at the cost prices, to that highly valuable institution, "the Naval and Military Bible-Society."

In these various proceedings, your Committee trust that they have fulfilled the wishes of the Society, by promoting the object of its institution in a mode calculated to produce a beneficial effect.

They have here further to mention, that in consequence of more particular intelligence, they have taken the subject of printing the Scriptures in the Irish language into re-consideration; and that they are now employed in procuring more extensively than heretofore the means of deciding upon a question of so much moment to the diffusion of religious knowledge in Ireland.

It now remains for your Committee to notice the increasing funds of the Society by the liberal contribution of Societies and individuals with which they have been assisted.—A donation of 1000*l.* from the right honourable the Countess of Bath,

* Second Report, p. 135.

has been most gratefully acknowledged by your Committee, through their President; and such an act of pious munificence will, they are persuaded, command the cordial acknowledgments of every member of the Society.

The friends of the Society in Scotland still continue their liberal support, both by congregational and individual contributions; and the lamented loss of David Dale, Esquire, of Glasgow, has been supplied by the agency of W. Muir, Esq. at the same place, who imitates, in prosecuting the Society's interests, the zeal and activity of his predecessor. The funds of the Society have also been further augmented by congregational collections in Wales. The Association in London already mentioned, has made a second and liberal contribution to the Society; and a similar association for the same object has, in the course of the last year, been instituted at Bath. Your Committee could enumerate various other instances, which have received their acknowledgments, and which will appear in the Appendix to their report.

The valuable collection of books and manuscripts belonging to the Society, has also been further augmented by presents from Mr. Granville Sharp, the reverend S. H. Tracy, the Missionary Society, the reverend Mr. Cracknell, and the reverend John Owen.

In making this acknowledgment to the several individuals enumerated, the Committee cannot refrain from remarking, that presents of this description will always be considered as valuable benefactions to the institution.

Your Committee, in the conclusion of their last report, adverted to the afflictive dispensations of Providence, which had visited other nations, and

to the exemption which, by the Divine blessing, our country had enjoyed—as a motive for more than common gratitude to the Great DISPOSER of events; and as an argument of increased obligation, for endeavouring to promote his honour by the diffusion of the Holy Scriptures. The events of the last year cannot but recall the same allusion, and more forcibly impress the obligation suggested by it. Amidst the thousands on the continent who have suffered by the calamities of war, without any active participation in it, the supposition that the bible, supplied directly by the means, or indirectly by the encouragement and influence of this Society, may have afforded to many the only consolation against despair—cannot be deemed extravagant. But even a few such instances, whether we look to prisons or hospitals, to the calamities of war, or the various other evils which require such consolation, would furnish an ample remuneration to the Society, for the labours and expense they have incurred: But remuneration is not their object: to preach the Gospel to the poor; and to heal the broken-hearted, was the constant occupation, on earth, of the LORD, whom we all profess to follow; and such profession is of itself an obligation, felt and acknowledged by the Members of this Society, to disseminate those Records in which his doctrines are contained.

It is to the honour of this country, that so many Societies exist in it, for the purpose of supplying the poorer classes with the Holy Scriptures: but it is the peculiar honour of the British and Foreign Bible-Society, that its exertions have an unlimited range; and that they are directed to circulate the doctrines of inspiration amongst foreign nations, whether near or remote; whether Christian, Mahomedan, or Pagan. The spirit of emulation which

it has excited on the Continent, and the activity which it has called forth at home and abroad, prove the value of its example, and the power of its influence, in producing effects of the utmost importance to the interests of Christianity.

To enlarge upon the benefits which may result from an institution of this nature, must be superfluous to those who feel how much the happiness of individuals, and the prosperity of nations, depend upon their observance of the doctrines contained in the Holy Scriptures; and their still greater importance with respect to the eternal happiness or misery of mankind.—But it must be a gratification to the Members of the Society to mark, in the recital which has been submitted to them, the successful progress of the institution towards the attainment of its object, and the prospect of future utility gradually opening in magnitude and extent.

Whether the sphere of its operations be measured from North to South, from Iceland to the Cape of Good Hope, and Van Dieman's land; or from East to West, from Hindostan and the shores of the Caspian, to Buenos Ayres and the lakes of North America, the range is immense; and your Committee are fully justified in repeating an assertion in their last report, "that they see no other limits to the beneficial operations of the institution than that which its funds may prescribe;"—because they are so well able to show the progress of its verification.

There remains one quarter of the globe, to the native inhabitants of which the assistance of the Society has not yet been extended; although the means and practicability of effecting it have not escaped the consideration of your Committee, and will progressively engage a larger portion of their attention.

Your Committee allude to Africa, the natives of which having now been relieved, by the legislature of this country, from the bitterest afflictions that ever desolated the human race, may be better disposed to respect those doctrines, which inculcate the love of God and Man, since the proof lately furnished, of the influence which they exercise over the principles and conduct of those who profess them.

The facts and observations now submitted to the General Meeting, supply the best recommendation for the continuance and increase of that support, which has enabled the British and Foreign Bible-Society to be so extensively useful. In the confidence authorized by this remark, your Committee will conclude their report, with indulging the animating hope, that by the progressive efforts of the Society in circulating the Holy Scriptures, “the earth shall be filled with the knowledge of the glory of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea.” Habakkuk ii. 14.

State of the Protestants in Germany.

WE are informed that a letter has been received by a gentleman in Baltimore, from a respectable correspondent in Wirtemberg, Germany, giving an account of most important occurrences in the religious world.

“ Cardinal Fesch,” he says, “ Bonaparte’s uncle, is appointed chief of the church, over all the Congregations of the Rhenish confederation, and has actually been acknowledged as such by all the Protestant Princes, although he is a Roman Catholic. He had scarcely taken his seat at Augsburg, before every thing began to incline towards Catholicism, with the poor betrayed flock of Protestants. Our Protestant clergy, (says the letter,) are to lay aside the dress they have hitherto worn, as they commanded neither respect nor made any show in their present mode, and are to wear mass-weeds; and our prelates actually wear them now, and are obliged to wear on their breasts the order of Maria in a golden cross. A great number of Catholic mass-books have been printed in the German language, which are divided into hours of prayer, and which are now actually read before preaching, at the altar in the Protestant churches on the frontiers. The apostasy from religion is every where attributed to want of respect for the Pope; it must, say they, be re-established, and the Pope be viewed as the firstling of the kingdom of God. An universal union of religion, under the direction of the pope-dom, was every where spoken of, and no person had, for fear of Bonaparte, as yet, made any opposition. A new sect had also appeared, signaling themselves by a particular dress and by a sign which every one wears on his hat, who have actually deified Bonaparte.”

Panoplist.

We think it important to the interests of Christianity, to preserve from oblivion the following detection of a base and insidious forgery. We extract it from the *Palladium* of May 26, 1807.

FORGERY DETECTED.

[Some of our readers may remember, that about the beginning of the present year, we extracted from a *Philadelphia* paper, a curious account of certain writings found in a globe of marble, dug up at *Aleppo*, from which it was inferred, that the *Apocalypse* or *Revelation*, was written by *Cerinthus*, and not by *Saint John*. This account was given in a *Philadelphia* paper, as a translation of an article from the *Marseilles Gazette*, of the 20th of October, 1806. A writer, under the signature of *Cephas*, commented on this narrative in the *Palladium*; and expressed his fears, that this story was transcribed from a French paper into some of ours by some disciple of *Tom Pain*, to discredit the validity of the New Testament. Some gentlemen who knew the circumspection of Editors of periodical papers, at this time, in Roman Catholic countries, doubted if such a publication ever appeared in a French Newspaper: among these was *Dr. Waterhouse*, who being a member of the *Marscilles Academy of Sciences*, &c. wrote to one of his correspondents in that city, and enclosed the publications on that subject from our paper; and on Friday he received, via *Philadelphia*, the following letter in answer to his queries:—]

Marseilles, March 28, 1807.

SIR,

Immediately on the receipt of your letter of the 12th of January, I went to the Printer and Editor of the *Marseilles Gazette*, to inquire agreeably to

your wish, respecting the "*Extract of a letter from a gentleman in Aleppo, to his friend in this city,*" said to be printed in the *Marseilles Gazette* of October 20, 1806. On examining the number of that date, there was not to be found a single word of the matter! I was accompanied in my researches by M. ACHARD, the Director of our public Library, and perpetual Secretary to our Academy of Arts and Sciences. This is an old gentleman, endowed with much learning, especially in antiquities, and whose son is actually the Printer and Editor of the *Marseilles Gazette*. He assured me that he had no recollection of any such article as appeared in the *Philadelphia* paper, and in the *New England Palladium*, purporting to be a translation from the *Gazette* of this city. We examined with strict attention, *all the Gazettes from the 1st of August until this day*; and it is our opinion, as well as the opinion of many other gentlemen, that the piece which caused so much alarm in the timorous consciences of your country, is an absolute lie—or has been published in some other paper; but of which, we have no knowledge whatever.

The vessel which carries this, will sail off to-morrow, or I would have annexed a certificate of Mons. ACHARD, and of the Magistracy of this city, to support what I have said. I hope, however, that the minds of your friends of the clergy will be satisfied with what is said above.

You are at liberty to use my letter as you think proper. I remain, &c. &c.

LOUIS VALENTINE.

Dr. WATERHOUSE, *Professor, &c.*

[*Dr. Valentine is a learned and respectable physician—has been in the United States; is a member of our American Academy of Arts and Sciences, and well known to some of our most respectable citizens who have travelled in France.*]

Panoplist.

THE
CHRISTIAN'S MAGAZINE.

FOR THE CHRISTIAN'S MAGAZINE.

*Brief Historical Sketches of the Reformed Dutch
Church, in the United States.*

THE first emigrants from Holland to America settled in what is now called the state of New-York. We know little of their character or circumstances. But, although it is probable that they were chiefly adventurers, and busily engaged in the pursuit of worldly gain, they were by no means regardless of religion. It is certain that they paid an early attention to the public worship of God; and whenever their number became sufficient, immediately organized and established churches, after the model of those which they had left in their native country.

These emigrants, being under the immediate patronage of the Directors of the Dutch West-India Company, very naturally solicited the aid of that body in procuring ministers for their churches. Accordingly, whenever a new congregation was formed, or whenever a vacancy occurred in

VOL. I.—N^o. IV. 3 A

one that had been before supplied, application for a minister was made to the West-India Company, through whose instrumentality, and under whose auspices, ministers, so desired, were sent out.

The Directors of this company were chiefly citizens of Amsterdam; and, upon receiving letters from the churches in their new colony, they put them into the hands of the ministers of that city, as better informed in ecclesiastical affairs than themselves, and especially as more acquainted with suitable characters for a service which was then considered as peculiarly hazardous, and as subjecting those who engaged in it to nothing less than a painful and perpetual exile from their native land. The ministers thus provided, were ordained and sent forth by the Classis of Amsterdam, with the approbation of the Synod of North-Holland, to which that Classis belongs.

This mode of proceeding, undesignedly and imperceptibly formed a particular connexion between the Dutch churches in America, and the Classis of Amsterdam; and eventually constituted an implicit subordination of those churches to the Synod of North-Holland, exclusive of all the other Classes and Synods which compose the body of the national Reformed Church in the Netherlands. The right of ordaining ministers for America, and of deciding all ecclesiastical controversies which might arise in the colony, being thus, at first, casually vested in that Classis and Synod, was afterwards tenaciously claimed by them, without any previous consultation, or formal resolution, of the other judicatories in the Netherlands, or any explicit agreement on the part of the churches in America for that purpose.

The ministers who came over to America, felt

an attachment to the Classis which sent them, and were disposed by a sense of interest, as well as by inclination, to maintain a connexion with that body, and the right of appeal to its authority. And the ministers of Amsterdam very cheerfully sustained the burden of this foreign correspondence, as the best and only method, then practicable, of aiding and preserving these distant churches, who were destitute, feeble, and incapable of supplying their own wants. The Classis of Amsterdam has long signalized itself by paying great attention to foreign churches. With those in the East-Indies it has maintained, from the time of their first formation, a constant correspondence, and a connexion similar to that which subsisted with the churches in the colony of New-York. Through the medium of the same Classis, the German Reformed Churches in Pennsylvania have also procured their ministers from Germany, and been in the habit of submitting to a similar dependence and subordination. A fund for defraying the expenses of the German ministers in their travels to Holland, and their subsequent voyage to America, has been long placed at the disposal of the Classis, and very faithfully applied. It does not appear that any such pecuniary aid was provided for the Dutch ministers who came to this country. The churches here always defrayed the expenses of their voyage, and supported them after their arrival.

From the foregoing statement, it will be seen that the Dutch church in New-Netherlands*, while the colony was under the government of the West-India Company, was the established church, and

* The name by which the Colony was then called.

considered as a branch of the national church of Holland. How far the colonial government directed or watched over its concerns, is very imperfectly known: but there is reason to believe that the Governour, or Director-General, and council, had much to do in procuring and settling ministers, and in ordering the amount and the means of their support. This may be called the *first period* of the Dutch Church in America. It began with the first ecclesiastical organization, and continued until the year 1664, when the colony was seized by a British force, and came under the government of the Duke of York.

During this period, churches were planted at *New-York*, (then *New Amsterdam*,) at *Flatbush*, *New-Utrecht*, *Flatlands*, (then *New-Amersfort*,) *Esopus*, and *Albany*. The church at *New-York* seems to have been first organized. The records of that church, which, in general, have been kept in a very neat and accurate manner, begin with the year 1639, and contain, with few omissions, regular lists of ministers, elders, deacons, members admitted to full communion, marriages, and baptisms, from that time. The first minister of this church was the *Rev. Everardus Bogardus*; but when he came from Holland, how long he continued his ministrations here, and what degree of success attended his labours, no authentic documents now remain to inform us. There is a tradition among his descendants, that he became blind, and returned to Holland, some time before the surrender of the colony to the British, in 1664. After *Bogardus*, during the Dutch government, *John Megapolensis*, and *Samuel Megapolensis*, were also ministers of the church of *New-York*. The latter appears to have been a prac-

tising physician in the city, as well as the officiating clergyman, when the British forces took possession of the colony.

The first place of worship built by the Dutch, in the Colony of New-Netherlands, so far as we are informed, was that which was erected in the fort at New-Amsterdam, (New-York,) in the year 1642; under the administration, and with the formal permission of *William Kiest*, Director-General. The second, it is believed, was a Chapel, built by Governour *Stuyvesant*, on his own *Bowery*, (or *Farm**,) in the neighbourhood of the city. The year in which the latter was erected, is not certainly known. The names of the first ministers, and the times of erecting the first churches in the other parts of the colony, during this period, cannot now be ascertained.

With the surrender of the colony to Great-Britain, in 1664, the situation of the Dutch church in America materially changed. It was no longer the established church. Still, however, the alteration in its circumstances was less than might have been expected. At the time of the surrender, and afterwards in the treaty of peace, concluded in 1676, it was expressly stipulated, that the "rights of conscience with regard to worship and discipline," should be secured to the Dutch inhabitants. And as these constituted the mass of the population; as the greatest portion of wealth and respectability belonged to the Dutch church; and as the late Governor, *Stuyvesant*, and some other of

* The Dutch word *Bouerij*, corrupted into *Bowery*, signifies *Farm*. Hence arose the name of that part of the city of New-York which stands on, and near, the *Stuyvesant* estate. The Governour's farm being emphatically called "the *Bowery*," or "the *Farm*," by the inhabitants of the city.

the most distinguished men in the colony, were among the elders and other officers of that church, it was for a long time considered not only as the predominant, but also as decidedly the most respectable, religious denomination in the colony.

This may be called the *second period* of the Dutch church in America. It extended from the year 1664, to the year 1693. During this period, the Dutch churches in New-York, though under the civil government of Great-Britain, still acknowledged the authority of the Classis and Synod in Holland, to which they had formerly submitted; and still received ministers from them as before. And that Classis and Synod also continued, to watch over and cherish these American churches.

During this period, the Dutch church in America was somewhat extended. Two or three more congregations were organized on Long-Island, near the city of New-York; another was formed in the city of Schenectady; one on Staten-Island, or Richmond county; three or four in different towns on the Hudson; and several, it is believed, in the colony of New-Jersey. The precise dates, however, of these establishments, it is now difficult to determine.

This period was also distinguished by another circumstance. While new congregations were slowly planting in different parts of the country, the ministers of the oldest and most conspicuous churches, such as those of *New-York*, *Albany*, and *Esopus*, claimed and enjoyed a kind of Episcopal dignity, having all the country churches round them under their care, especially those which were not furnished with pastors; and considering it as an infringement of

their prerogative, if any minister officiated in them without their knowledge and concurrence. This claim, though not very consistent with the strictly Presbyterian model of the church of Holland, probably arose from some circumstances, in the early settlement of the colony, which rendered the exercise of such a prerogative by a few ministers of the principal towns, expedient, if not necessary. Its continuance for some time after those circumstances, and the consequent necessity ceased, is perfectly conformable to the ordinary course of human affairs.

The ministers, who, during this period, officiated in the church in the city of New-York, were the Rev. Messrs. *Samuel Dresius*, *William Van Nieuwenhuysen*, and *Henry Solyns* *. Those who served the church of Albany, during the same period, were the Rev. Messrs. *G. Schauts*, and *Godefridus Dallius*. But little is known concerning the characters and labours of these men. And with regard to the names, the order of succession, &c. of the ministers of the other towns in the colony, the remaining records are still less satisfactory.

Such was the situation of the Dutch church, from 1664 to 1693; not, indeed, established by law, but greatly predominant in numbers, and decidedly pre-eminent in wealth and respectability. This pre-eminence, however, was in a considerable degree, surrendered in the year last mentioned. In that year, Colonel *Benjamin Fletcher*,

* *Henry Solyns* appears to have had not only a liberal education, but also some degree of literary enterprise. In about two years after his arrival in America, he addressed to Dr. *Cotton Mather*, on the appearance of his "*Magnalia Americana*," a *Latin poem*, which is still extant in some of the editions of that work.

who had been appointed Governour the year before, a man of great ardour and boldness, and warmly attached to the Episcopal church, proposed and urged a kind of religious establishment in favour of that church. There were at that time few Episcopalians in the colony. These chiefly resided in the city of New-York, and in the counties immediately adjacent. They consisted, for the most part, of the officers of government and their dependants, and a portion of the military force. To establish the Episcopal church, under these circumstances, was so evidently unreasonable and unjust, that scarcely any one would have proposed it, but a person of Governour *Fletcher's* character. He met with no small difficulties in the attainment of his object. The House of Assembly, when it was first proposed to them, were decidedly hostile to the measure. But being partly hoodwinked, and partly bullied by the Governour, they at last reluctantly agreed to the plan, and passed an act on the 21st of September, 1693, establishing the Episcopal church in the city and county of *New-York*, and in the counties of *West-Chester*, *Queen's*, and *Richmond*. The act was drawn, and the whole business conducted in an artful and covert manner. The inhabitants of each of the counties above-mentioned, were directed by this act, to choose annually ten vestrymen and two church-wardens; these vestrymen and church-wardens were empowered to make choice of the minister or ministers for each district; and for the support of these ministers, a certain sum was directed to be assessed on the inhabitants at large, of all denominations, and raised in each county. The act, indeed, did not explicitly enjoin that the ministers thus chosen should

be of the Episcopal church ; and by an explanatory act, passed several years afterwards, it was even declared that dissenting ministers might be chosen. But by lodging the right of choice with the vestry-men and church-wardens alone, it was well known that Episcopal ministers would be always, of course, elected; and this was in fact the case. So that from the year 1693, to the year 1776, that is, between eighty and ninety years, the Dutch and English Presbyterians, and all other non-episcopal inhabitants of the city and county of *New-York*, and of the counties of *West-Chester*, *Queen's*, and *Richmond*, besides supporting their own churches, were forced to contribute to the support of the Episcopal church.

(*To be continued.*)

*Of Sacrifices.**(Concluded from page 267.)*

WHEN man had forfeited his life, by his transgression, and God, notwithstanding, decreed to receive him into mercy ; nothing, certainly, could better become the wisdom and goodness of God than the establishment of some institution, which might at once be a monition both of the mercy of God and the punishment due to sin ; and forasmuch as God knew that man would often sin, and should often receive mercy, it was necessary that institution should be such as might frequently be repeated ; and in the repetition frequently remind man of his own endless demerit, and the infinite goodness of God to him.

And what institution could do this more fully or more effectually than that of sacrifice for sin ? sacrifice for sin plainly teaching these two points :

1st. That every sin was a forfeiture of the offender's life : And,

2dly. That notwithstanding this, God would however have mercy on the sinner ; and accept of some other life, as a ransom, in lieu of that forfeiture.

1st. I say, this institution plainly taught that sin was a forfeiture of life. For when it directed that a life should be paid down upon every transgression, what could be a clearer document from such an institution, than that life was the forfeit of transgression ? Now if life be actually the forfeit of transgression, in every offender against God, it is evident that an institution which car-

ries that document with it, is so far well and wisely appointed, on every occasion that such a forfeiture happens to be made. And that life is the forfeit of every offence against God, is evident; forasmuch as being must manifestly be bestowed upon reasonable creatures, under condition of obedience to their Maker. Nor is it imaginable how God could bestow it otherwise. And if being is bestowed on condition of obedience, it is evident that disobedience forfeits it. For as God formed intelligent creatures for the attainment of happiness in conformity to that excellent order of things, which he so admirably established for the well-being of the whole; it was a necessary consequence, from the wisdom of that establishment, that all voluntary deliberate departure from that order should be a forfeiture of being. For otherwise it would follow that creatures had a right to continue in being, for reasons directly contrary to those for which they were first formed; i. e. for reasons inconsistent with wisdom and goodness: which is absurd: but at the same time that reasonable creatures evidently forfeit their being, by disobedience, yet certainly God may, if he pleases, continue it to them, for the same reasons for which he first conferred it; i. e. for the manifestation of his wisdom and goodness. And since he determined to continue it to man, after his offence, nothing could be more reasonable than that he should continue it under some memorial of his own mercy, and man's demerit; for if there were no memorial kept up of the heinousness of his offence, guilt would from that moment have no terrour. And if guilt once lost its terrour with men, corruption would quickly carry them on to endless enormity; and then

man would continue in being, for ends directly contrary to those for which he was preserved by the divine mercy, from the death which he had incurred, (which the wisdom and goodness of God could not allow :) and on the other hand, if there were no assurance of forgiveness, after transgression, the effect would be the very same; for despair would drive men to the same extremes of transgression, to which impunity would tempt them. And, therefore, both the wisdom and the goodness of God necessarily required such a memorial of mercy on this occasion, as should at the same time strike sure terrour into guilt: and what memorial could do this more effectually, than that which demonstrated life to be the sure, fixed forfeit, of every offence? And since sacrifices are fitted to effect this, beyond any thing we know of, it is evident that the wisdom and goodness of God are so far justified in the institution of them at this time.

In the next place, *Adam* and *Eve* were now not only naturally, but indecently naked. It is evident then in the first place, that decency required they should be covered; and besides this, the inclemency of the air, added to the infirmity of nature which sin had introduced, had now made clothing necessary: since otherwise their life must soon have become miserable; or rather must soon be destroyed, without some better protection than that of a few leaves. And since this exigence would likewise be fully answered by sacrifices, which would yield them covering, from the skins of the creatures so slain; this also is a new evidence of the wisdom of God in this institution. Nor is there the least reason to doubt, that the clothes made for our first parents, by divine ap-

pointment, immediately after the fall, were of the skins of the creatures offered up to God on this occasion ; for there is no reason to imagine that any of the beasts which were just made in perfection, should die so soon ; or would naturally die in many years after their creation. Nor was there any necessity that God should slay them for that sole end, when all the ends to be served by their death would be fully answered in the single institution of sacrifice : which I have now shown, and will yet farther show, to be in other respects wise and well-appointed, at that very time. To proceed then,

We learn from the command given, and the sentence denounced against *Adam*, that death was the penalty of his disobedience : and since it was so, certainly it was highly proper that he should know what he was to suffer ; and consequently, that he should see death in all its horror and deformity ; in order to judge rightly of the evil of disobedience, (and in order to be better prepared to undergo it.) And what could show this evil more strongly, than the groans and struggles of innocent creatures, bleeding to death for his guilt before his eyes, and by his own hands ? Sights of this kind are shocking to humanity, even yet ; though custom hath long made them familiar : with what horror then may we imagine they pierced the hearts of our first parents ? And how was this horror aggravated, when they considered themselves, as the guilty authors of so much cruelty to the beings about them ?

Nor is this all : this institution was yet more extensive in its influence. For since early impressions of the danger and horror of guilt, are the best securities against sin ; nothing surely could

be better fitted, to fix these impressions deep in the minds of children, than the sad necessity of shedding blood, introduced by sin: which it was easy for a prudent parent to inculcate, and impossible for a pious parent not to inculcate, on every occasion of killing the creatures in atonement for guilt. Especially when he himself felt all that horror of iniquity, which he would impress upon his children on that occasion. And therefore this institution was not only wise and necessary, with regard to *Adam* and *Eve*, but admirably contrived to convey an early abhorrence of sin into the minds of their offspring, from generation to generation.

Add to all this, that *Adam* was to be yet farther informed of death; and to this purpose when the groans and struggles of the dying animals were over, what ghastly and sad sights must the dead eyes and cold carcasses of the creatures yield him, before they were placed upon the altar; and in their ashes after? How dismal a meditation must it be, to consider the beauty and excellence of animate beings, reduced to a handful of dust? And what a shocking lecture of mortality must the remains of those creatures read to our first parents, in their several gradations from corruption to dust? Especially when they could not see them in that sad condition, but under the full assurance that they themselves must follow the same odious steps to destruction.

And is it possible to conceive how God could strike the human soul, with more sense of misery from guilt, or more abhorrence of the sad cause of that misery, than by this conduct? Such abhorrence of guilt, and such a loathing of life, that if the mercy of God had not caused some ray of

hope to shine through this scene of mortality and misery, it is not to be imagined how *Adam* and *Eve* could bear their being; and therefore there seems to be an absolute necessity, that when sacrifices pierced the heart of man with such dread and detestation of guilt and misery, they should at the same time be seals to some covenant of mercy from God.

That God entered into a covenant of mercy with man, immediately after the fall, is evident from the sentence passed upon the serpent; in which a covenant of mercy is necessarily implied. And can we doubt that sacrifices were the seal of that covenant? Especially when mercy is so plainly implied in the very nature of the institution; which teaches that though life be the forfeit of sin, yet God will in mercy, accept another life in lieu of the offender's.

And since reason evinces the necessity of some covenant of mercy at this time, can any man in his senses doubt the truth of those scriptures, which give us clearly to understand that it was made? (How far the sacrifices then offered, were types of *Jesus Christ, the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world*, is the business of another inquiry.) We find that God's usual way of ratifying covenants of mercy with mankind in after ages, was by sacrifices; and can we imagine that he failed to do so, when such mercy was more wanted than ever it was since the foundation of the world? And when such an establishment is demonstrably one main reason of the very institution of sacrifices? Is it to be imagined, that God should take care of the health of our parents' bodies on this occasion, and take none of the peace of their minds? Is it to be imagined, that God should soon after this, show so much solicitude

for an hardened murtherer, for so vile a wretch as *Cain* *, and take none now about two unhappy delinquents, oppressed with misery and at the point of despair? Had he so much mercy soon after upon one man; and would he have none now upon the whole race of mankind yet in *Adam*?

But here it may be objected, that when the flesh of animals was not eaten, their carcasses were of no use; and so there was no detriment to mankind in slaying the creatures for sacrifices; at least if they might preserve their skins for clothing, &c.

I answer, that supposing the skin not destroyed in sacrifice, (as it certainly was in some cases under the law, and probably was so before,) yet the destruction of the creatures was of manifold detriment; for as vestments of hair and wool soon succeeded the ruder coverings of skins; the annual growths of all such creatures as could be shorn, were of great emolument, even in the early ages of the world; especially to that part of mankind which led the pastoral life and dwelt in tents; and we find that *Abel's* sacrifice was of creatures of this kind: and it is probable, that creatures of other kinds were as useful in cases of carriage, as now, and more demanded; as the invention of more convenient vehicles hath now made a less number necessary for that purpose: nor is it improbable that they were also of some use in tillage; especially since that occupation began as early as *Adam*: many of them also might, for ought we know, be useful for food:

* For though it is said in a subsequent dissertation, that *Cain* was preserved in punishment, yet it is very consistent to suppose mercy mixed with all the divine chastisements in this world.

for milk might be eaten, when flesh was not ; nay, their very carcasses might be of as much use in culture then, as now ; they might also be the food of necessary domestic animals ; or the food of creatures of carriage, as at this day among the *Arabs*.

And this suggests another reason for the institution of sacrifices, *viz.* that sin should not go unpunished ; but should always be attended with sensible inconveniency. And the damage men suffered in the creatures destroyed in sacrifice for sin, was doubtless at all times a considerable inconveniency ; especially after the flood. Nor let any man regard these damages as trifles, since they were such in many cases, as wise legislatures have put in balance with human life.

The only difficulty now remaining, is, whether a command to destroy the lives of innocent creatures, be consistent with the divine goodness and mercy ?

But this will be no more a difficulty, when we consider that their subserviency to the ends of human life, is, as far as we can see, the sole end and purpose of their being ; and that it is their happiness, upon the whole, to be submitted to the dominion of man, and to be destroyed for his uses ; since they are by this means preserved from weather, from want, and from one another ; and relieved under diseases and distresses of every kind : and forasmuch as only a certain number of them can subsist conveniently together, it is evidently their interest to be delivered, by sudden destructions, from more lingering and cruel deaths.

And thus, having shown that sacrifices were of divine original ; that faith only could make them

acceptable to God ; and that many ends of infinite wisdom and mercy, were at once served by them : having also shown that there was an apparent necessity of God's making some covenant of mercy with *Adam* at this time, and that it is highly credible he did so ; I shall, with God's assistance, inquire in due time, how credible it may be that the death of *Christ* was figured in that covenant ; and was necessary to the redemption of the world in consequence of it.

In the mean time, I cannot without indignation, reflect upon the blind and insolent vanity of those wretched mortals, who, with such blasphemous and shocking temerity, set themselves to ridicule every institution of God, which the corruption or narrowness of their own heads and hearts hath made them incapable of comprehending ! Whereas, a very moderate degree of understanding, enlightened by a very moderate degree of learning and reflection, would naturally and almost necessarily, teach them the adorable wisdom and goodness of every such institution : or if it could not, yet a very small portion of humility might teach them, that every institution of God must be wise and good ; though possibly above the reach of poor short-sighted mortals. The least grain of humility could not but teach them the infinite distance and disparity between their own little narrow groveling conceptions, and that infinite extent of knowledge essential to *the high and mighty One, that inhabiteth eternity* : who hath assured us by the mouth of his holy prophet, that *his thoughts are not our thoughts, neither our ways his ways. For as the heavens are higher than the earth, so are his ways higher than our ways, and his thoughts than our thoughts.*

To whom be glory for ever and ever. *Amen.*

FOR THE CHRISTIAN'S MAGAZINE.

CHURCH OF GOD.

No. IV.

Initiating Seal.

ON the "sign of circumcision" which God annexed to his covenant with Abraham, as "a seal of the righteousness of faith," some remarks have already been made. In its immediate reference to the Patriarch's seed, it certified that they belonged to the church of God, and were entitled to all the privileges which she derived immediately from the covenant with their great progenitor. A right to this seal, was the *birthright* of every Hebrew; and it was accordingly applied to him when he was eight days old. That this right was not peculiar to the literal, but was common to the covenanted, seed, is clear from the case of proselytes, who having cleaved to the God of Abraham, were themselves circumcised, and imparted to their children all the prerogatives of a native Hebrew.

On the supposition, then, that circumcision had not been laid aside, as the covenant, of which it was the seal, has not, it would be at this hour the duty of professing parents to circumcise their infant sons; that is, to have an interest in God's covenant certified to their seed, by applying the seal of it to their male infants. Circumcision, however, having been discontinued, the question is, whether the seal which it conveyed has been

discontinued with it? If so, then these two consequences follow.

First, That there is no longer any initiatory seal for adults, any more than for infants: because an *abolished* seal can no more be applied to a man than to a babe; and thence,

Secondly, That the church of God is under the operation of an *unsealed covenant*; that is, that God has withdrawn the sensible pledge of his covenant relation to her. If it be said that Baptism is appointed to be the initiatory seal under the New Testament dispensation, and is directed to be applied to believing adults, the plea is true; but it concedes much more than suits the purpose of many who urge it.

(1.) As a seal must certify something; as no seal was ever ordained by God but as the seal of his covenant; and as no wise man will pretend that every lawfully baptized adult, is undoubtedly within the covenant of grace, it concedes that God *has a visible church in sealed covenant with himself*, distinct from that church which is composed of the elect only.

(2.) As he has never made a *new visible church*; nor drawn back from his old engagements, this plea concedes, that the church now in existence is the very church organized by the Abrahamic covenant; and that covenant the very one which is sealed to her by baptism. Then,

(3.) That baptism has come in the place of circumcision; and as adults are ordered to be baptized, without a syllable of the exclusion of infants, the application of circumcision must furnish the rule for that of baptism. And consequently, this same plea which is designed to preclude infant baptism, turns out to be a demonstra-

CHURCH of God—No. IV.—*Initiating Seal.* 385

tion of its divine right. Thus the point before us would be completely settled. But to wave this advantage, and to put the subject in another light, let us distinguish, in this matter of circumcision, between the substance and form. The substance of the ordinance, that which properly constituted the *seal*, was the certification to the person sealed, of his interest in God's covenant. The rite of circumcision was no more than the *form* in which the seal was applied. These two things must not be confounded. For, on the one hand, the *rite* may be, and was, and is yet, performed without any sealing whatever. The sons of Ishmael were circumcised, but they belonged not to the covenanted seed, and therefore circumcision sealed nothing to them. The Jews are circumcised still, but being cut off from the olive-tree, being cast out of the church of God, and suspended from the privileges of the covenanted seed, their circumcision is nothing. On the other hand, the seal had been the same, although administered by a different rite. The amputation of a toe, the perforation of an ear, the sprinkling of blood, or the anointing with oil, would have answered the purpose as well as circumcision. The essence of the seal lying not in the *rite*, but in the divine sanction which is given by that rite to claims on God's covenant. Now as it is self-evident, that this sanction may be conveyed under any form which he shall please to prescribe, it is a gross error in reasoning to conclude, that because the ancient form is laid aside, therefore the seal and all things certified by it are laid aside too. It would be quite as accurate to infer, that because the form of church polity is altered, therefore the church no longer exists. If it be objected, that "how-

ever distinguishable the seal and the sealing rite be from each other in theory, they are inseparable in fact ; as the former cannot be applied to us but through the medium of the latter ; and therefore if this be abolished, the other is to us as if it did not exist ;" I reply, that the objection concludes equally against the existence of a church upon earth ; for it must appear in some visible form, or else, *to us*, it is no church : and the argument is still good, that if the abolition of a particular form of sealing God's covenant, involves the abolition of the seal itself, then the abolition of a particular form of his church, involves the abolition of the church itself. The objection assumes the very point in debate, viz. that the seal of the covenant and a particular form of the sealing rite are co-existent, and perish together. Whereas, it is contended, that the cessation of the latter does by no means imply the cessation of the former ; but that the seal may remain the same, although the rite be changed ; and may pass, in its full virtue and efficacy, through successive forms of application. In truth, it is a fundamental principle, that *forms of dispensation do not affect the substance of the things dispensed*. Otherwise, the covenant of grace has been changed often. But if *five* forms of dispensation have not touched the substance of the covenant of grace ; nor *three* forms of dispensation, the substance of the covenant with Abraham ; why should the disuse of a particular mode of sealing this latter, draw after it the destruction of the seal itself ? and of all the relations and benefits sealed ? The issue is, that circumcision may be laid aside without infringing upon the covenant to which it was appended. It has been laid aside, and the question is, What has been substi-

CHURCH of God—N^o. IV.—Initiating Seal. 387

tuted in its place? As none of the parties to this controversy pretend that it has been succeeded by any other ordinance than baptism, the only alternative is, either that nothing at all has been substituted for it, or else that the substitute is baptism.

If nothing—then while the covenant is in force, and a covenant which must be sealed too, there is no method of applying the seal.

If nothing—then a privilege has been taken away from the church, and she has received no compensation; contrary to the whole tenour of God's dealing with her, and to the positive declarations of his word.

If nothing—then the apostle Peter led his hearers astray, in assuring them that the "promise was to them and their children," which, as Jews, they could not understand of any other promise than that made to Abraham; nor in any other sense, than as asserting the joint interest of their infants, with themselves, in the covenant of God, and, consequently, their right to the seal of that interest. One of the most stubborn and rational prejudices of the Jews against the Christian dispensation, was the fear of losing the privileges to which, as Abraham's seed, they had a covenant claim; and which they, with better excuse than Christians *now*, supposed to be inseparable from the law of Moses. "You mistake the matter," cries Peter, full of the Holy Ghost, "there is no thing in the gospel of Jesus Christ, nor the new economy which he has introduced, to destroy or abridge the mercies held out and secured by the covenant with Abraham. The Saviour is, himself, the chief blessing of that covenant. The evangelical dispensation displays its provisions

“ in clearer light, and greater extent. The promise subsists in unabated virtue, and with increased glory; it is, at this moment, as much as at any moment past, *to you and to your children*; but it is also to *all them that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call.*” How could the words of Peter be interpreted by a Jew? In no other way than this, that neither the covenant with Abraham, nor the seal of that covenant, nor the interest of his infant seed in it was abrogated, or to be abrogated, by the Christian dispensation. How could they be interpreted by a Gentile? In no other way than this, that persons who “ were afar off,” (the very phrase by which Paul describes the Gentiles,) being called by the gospel, should come into the full possession of all the benefits which are contained in the covenant with Abraham; that is, should enjoy, equally with the Jew, whatever, according to the nature of that covenant, is comprehended in the declaration, *I will be thy God, and the God of thy seed*: and equally with the Jew, the pledge and seal of this his privilege. The Apostle speaks of a promise well-known and highly prized. “ *The promise,*” without any explanation. “ *What promise?*” inquires the Gentile. Ask your brother, the Jew, rejoins the Apostle; he understands me thoroughly. It is the promise made to his father, Abraham; that in *his seed all the nations of the earth shall be blessed.* “ *True,*” you will interrupt, “ this is the Apostle’s meaning, and it says not a syllable of circumcision, nor of its relation to baptism; nor of infant church membership.” Yes, but it is a promise in Abraham’s covenant: it depends upon the immutability of that covenant. For no engagement

CHURCH of God—No. IV.—Initiating Seal. 389

whatever, can survive the covenant which gives it birth and validity. And this very promise, the Holy Ghost being judge, was to be so fulfilled, that the blessing of Abraham might come upon the Gentiles; which must mean that they and their seed should be admitted to the privileges granted to Abraham and his seed: so that the children of professing Christians, not less than themselves, should be within the covenant, and entitled to its seal. Thus the Jews evidently understood the Apostle; for among all their objections to the Christian system, they never objected the *exclusion of their infant seed from the church of God*. If, therefore, nothing has come in the place of circumcision, the Apostle acted disingenuously with his Jewish hearers; and quieted their apprehension by a fraud upon their consciences. The fraud extended to the Gentile converts; for it referred them to the Jewish standard of interpretation; and every one of the inspired penmen of the New Testament, is accessory to its influence, as there is not a sentence in all their writings to correct the error: and the deception will not end even with *them*—*****!

But if these things cannot be maintained—If there is no such mockery as a seal without a mode of sealing, and the primitive form of circumcision is abolished—If God has not stripped his church of a privilege, without giving her an equivalent—If the holy Apostle did not abuse the understanding of his hearers, nor sport with their faith in his veracity—then is baptism the substitute for circumcision.

But as this conclusion may be thought too strong for the general argument preceding it, let

VOL. I.—No. IV. 3 D

us submit it to a more direct proof, by inquiring into the scriptural account of both circumcision and baptism. And, *First*, let us see how this account stands with regard to them *separately*. It will be seen in the following contrast.

CIRCUMCISION,

1. Was an initiatory rite, by which the circumcised were owned as of the covenanted seed, and of the people of God.

2. Was a seal of the righteousness of faith. Rom. iv. 11. i. e. of the Justification of a sinner through the righteousness of the surety embraced by faith.

3. Was an emblem and a means of internal sanctity. *The Lord thy God will circumcise thine heart, and the heart of thy seed, to love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, that thou mayest live. Deut. xxx.*
6. See also ch. x. 16.

BAPTISM,

1. Is an initiatory rite, by which the baptized are numbered among the disciples of Christ, and the members of the church of God.

2. The person is baptized in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, (Act. ii. 38.) which is through faith in his blood; so that God is just and the justifier of him that believeth in Jesus.

3. Is a sign and means of our sanctification in virtue of our communion with Christ.—*Buried with him by baptism into death; that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life. Rom. vi.* 4. See also 1 Pet. iii. 21.

The parallel is certainly striking: Circumcision and baptism do both put a mark upon their subjects, as belonging to that society which God hath set apart for himself. They both signify and seal that wondrous change in the state of a sinner, whereby, being justified by faith, he passes from condemnation into acceptance with God; which doctrines of pardon and acceptance are exhibited

in that society alone, which, under the name of his church, God hath consecrated to himself, and of which he hath appointed the circumcised and baptized to be esteemed members. Both represent, and are means of obtaining, that real purity which is effected by the spirit of Christ; and is the characteristic of all those members of his church who are justified by faith in his blood. Such a coincidence cannot be casual. It bespeaks design. And seeing that circumcision and baptism do thus substantially answer the same ends, and that the former has ceased, the only sound conclusion is, that it has been succeeded by the latter. Change of dispensation was a sufficient reason why the form of sealing the covenant dispensed should also be changed; and the points of difference between baptism and circumcision, as covenant seals, are only such as were demanded by the nature of the change: the former being much better adapted to a more extensive and spiritual dispensation than the latter. And this is an additional consideration to show that the one has been substituted in the room of the other.

Let us proceed in our inquiry by examining, *Secondly*, into the scriptural manner of representing circumcision and baptism when they are spoken of *together*; or when baptism is mentioned in connexion with the covenant of which circumcision was the seal.—Take two examples.

1. The Apostle Peter, in his famous address to which there has already been frequent reference, assigns the perpetuity of Abraham's covenant, and the validity of its promise, as a reason why his Jewish hearers should be *baptized*. *Repent, says he, and be baptized every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, and ye shall*

receive the gift of the Holy Ghost ; for the promise is unto you and to your children. But how could this promise, being still assured to them and to their children, be a reason for their baptism in the name of Jesus Christ, unless baptism were a seal of that same promise as exhibited in the new economy? "Your circumcision sealed to you," says the Apostle, "your interest in the covenant with Abraham, as it was exhibited under the law: baptism seals your interest in that covenant, as it is exhibited in perfection under the Gospel. If you refuse the Lord Jesus, and the initiating ordinance of his dispensation, you refuse the better things which God has provided for you. If you yield yourselves up to the Lord Jesus Christ, you will have all that the promise contains in its application to this better state of things, sealed unto you; *therefore*, repent and be baptized." In this view, the argument is conclusive. In any other, it is of no force at all. What persuasion to baptism could there be in the consideration that the promise was to them and their children, if baptism had no relation to the promise? and what relation could it have unless as a seal, occupying the same place with regard to the promise under the new dispensation, which was occupied by circumcision under the old? Admitting this, every thing is clear. Two initiatory rites of the same general import, cannot exist together. The dispensation by Christ Jesus takes place of the dispensation by Abraham, with all the additions by Moses; the form of sealing the covenant under this, takes place of the form of sealing it under those. The greater contains all that was contained in the less, and supersedes it. Baptism supplants circumcision.

CHURCH of God—No. IV.—Initiating Seal. 393

2. In the epistle of Paul to the Colossians, is the following passage. “*In whom,*” viz. Christ, “*also ye are CIRCUMCISED with the CIRCUMCISION made without hands, in putting off the BODY OF THE SINS OF THE FLESH, by the CIRCUMCISION OF CHRIST; buried with him in BAPTISM, wherein also ye are RISEN with him, through the faith of the operation of God, who hath raised him from the dead.*” Chap. ii. 11, 12.

This is a very extensive proposition, made up of a number of subordinate ones which it is necessary distinctly to weigh.

1st. Both circumcision and baptism are to be viewed as signs of *spiritual mercies*. It is for this reason alone, that they are or can be employed as *terms* to convey the idea of such mercies.

2d. Circumcision was a sign of regeneration, and of communion with Christ, as the fountain of spiritual life. The apostle is treating of a believer’s *completeness in Christ—of circumcision in Christ*. That his meaning might not be mistaken, he explains himself of the *inward grace*, calling it, “*the circumcision made without hands,*” and to cut off all misconception, he explains his explanation, declaring this “*circumcision without hands,*” to be, *the putting off the body of the sins of the flesh, by the circumcision of Christ*.

3d. Baptism, too, is a sign of regeneration, and of communion with Christ, as the fountain of spiritual life.

In baptism, saith Paul, ye are “*buried with Christ,*” “*ye are risen with him,*” through a divine faith, “*the faith of the operation of God*”—Whereas ye were “*dead in sins, and the uncircumcision of your flesh,*” (uncircumcision put for the state of irregnecy,) God hath *quickenec you together with Christ*.

Collect now the result. A believer's sanctification, in virtue of union with Christ, Paul declares to be represented by both circumcision and baptism; for he expresses his doctrine by these terms indifferently; and annexes to them both, the same spiritual signification. He has, therefore, *identified* the two ordinances: and thus, by demonstrating that they have one and the same use and meaning, he has exhibited to our view the very same seal of God's covenant, under the forms of circumcision and baptism respectively. But as the same thing cannot subsist in different forms at the same time: and, as the first form, viz. circumcision, is laid aside; it follows, that the seal of God's covenant is perpetuated under the second form, viz. baptism; and that it signifies and seals in a manner suited to the evangelical dispensation, whatever was previously signified and sealed by the rite of circumcision.

If we again inspect the Apostle's proposition, we shall find, that he directs us to this conclusion, as well by the structure of his phraseology, as by the force of his argument. For, on the one hand, by the indiscriminate use of the terms circumcision and baptism, he appears to assume, as an indisputable fact, the substitution of the latter in place of the former; nor is it easy to conceive why he should discourse in this allusive manner, if the exchange were not perfectly understood among Christians: and, on the other hand, his language is so framed, as to assert that exchange. "Circumcised—in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh, by the *circumcision of Christ*; buried with him in *baptism*." What can the apostle intend, by the "*circumcision of Christ*?" Doubtless, not the literal rite, for this would de-

stroy at once the whole of his reasoning on the article of sanctification, in the same way as it is destroyed by those who interpret the phrase, "buried with him in baptism," of submersion of the body in the act of baptising. The apostle cannot so trifle. By the "circumcision of Christ," he means that righteousness of faith, that mortification of sin, that quickening influence, which flow from Christ, and were signified by circumcision. But that same righteousness of faith, and mortification of sin, and quickening influence, are also signified by baptism. But circumcision and baptism are external signs, which the apostle recognizes by specifying the things signified. In his transition from the one to the other, that is, from circumcision to baptism, as signifying, in their respective places, the very same blessings, he points to the transition which the church of God has made in fact, from the use of the former to the use of the latter. "With regard to the things signified," saith he, "there is no difference. The circumcision of Christ, and burial with him in baptism, are expressions of similar import; both declaring a believer's communion with him in his covenant-mercies. With regard to the outward sign, fellowship with Christ in his death and resurrection, is represented in baptism, as putting off the body of the sins of the flesh," was formerly represented in circumcision." If this be just, the inference is plain. Baptism is the *Christian* circumcision; the sign of baptism is the *Christian* form of sealing God's covenant, and, as such, has taken place of circumcision.

In confirmation of what is here advanced, let us look, for a moment, at the Apostle's account of

Abraham's circumcision ; Rom. iv. 11, &c. *He received the sign of circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of the faith which he had, yet being uncircumcised ; that he might be the father of all them that believe, though they be not circumcised ; that righteousness might be imputed unto them also. And the father of circumcision to them who are not of the circumcision only, but who also walk in the steps of that faith of our father Abraham, which he had, being yet uncircumcised.*

Two great prerogatives are here ascribed to Abraham :

1. That he should transmit, in the line of the covenanted seed, the righteousness of faith to all generations and nations, so as to be, in a sense which belonged, and could belong, to no other man, the *Father of all them that believe*.

2. That with the righteousness of faith, he should transmit the seal of God's covenant, by the intervention of which it was to be perpetuated in the world, and actually imputed to all believers. For he was not only the father of all them that believe, but "the father of *circumcision*" to them.

This cannot mean the things *signified* by circumcision ; for the apostle includes them in the first prerogative : and such an interpretation would convert into mere tautology, two propositions which are strongly distinguished from each other in the text. Circumcision, says the apostle, was a seal of the righteousness of the faith which Abraham had before he was circumcised : and he is the father of this circumcision to all them who walk in the steps of his faith ; that is, he transmits the sign and seal along with the thing signified ; conveying the evidence of God's covenant, as far and as wide as he conveys the blessing ministered

CHURCH of God—No. IV.—*Initiating Seal.* 397

by it, so that in whatever sense he is the father of them that believe, in the same sense is he the father to them of the seal of that righteousness which they embrace by faith: and further, the benefits conferred through the medium of Abraham's covenant, are asserted to be contemporary with the seal; both descending together from him to the last of the covenanted seed. The Apostle himself applies the principle, in the most positive terms, to the old and the new dispensation.

To the old dispensation—"The father of circumcision to them who are not of the circumcision only," evidently those who, being his descendants, or incorporated with them, were literally circumcised. They inherited the seal from their father Abraham. This is not questioned. But the Apostle extends the principle,

To the new dispensation—The "father of circumcision to them also who walk in the steps of his faith." In what sense is Abraham the "father of circumcision," as the Apostle maintains, to them who never were literally circumcised, and whom he expressly distinguishes from the circumcision? Manifestly in this sense, that they, being accounted of Abraham's seed, by their admission into the church of God, receive along with it, by inheritance from the patriarch, the seal of that covenant in which they are become interested. But circumcision is abolished long ago: yet Abraham is the father of circumcision to them at this hour. There is no avoiding a direct contradiction, but upon the principle, that though the outward rite of circumcision be discontinued, yet the substance of the ordinance, the seal of the cove-

VOL. I.—No. IV. 3 E

nant, abides; is applied under another form, and is as really inherited by the people of God from their father Abraham in that form, as it was inherited by them of old in the form of circumcision. But now, if this seal does not subsist in the ordinance of baptism, it has no existence at all; and there is no possible sense in which Abraham is *to us* the father of circumcision. Therefore, baptism has succeeded to circumcision.

This reasoning draws after it, infallibly, the church-membership of infants, and their right to baptism. For as there is no distinction between the mode in which Abraham has handed down the sealed privileges of God's covenant to those who were, and those who were not, of the circumcision; and as they were made over to the former, and their infant seed, they must also be made over to the latter and their infant seed. It is no objection to the foregoing argument, that baptism is administered to *female* infants, whereas only *males* were circumcised: because the *extension* of a privilege can never be pleaded as a proof of its *abrogation*; and the New Testament itself has positively annulled, in spiritual things, all pre-eminence and inferiority arising from condition or sex.

The only difficulty of any importance, under which the doctrine of these pages can labour, is the application of the seal of the righteousness of faith to multitudes who never had and never will have that righteousness; consequently, that the seal of God's covenant, who is the God of truth, is, by his own appointment, very often affixed to a lie.

The difficulty is precisely the same in reference to circumcision as to baptism. The former was undoubtedly "a seal of the righteous-

ness of faith ;” and as undoubtedly was often applied to multitudes who never had that righteousness. Did the God of truth, therefore, *certify a lie* ? Methinks so blasphemous a deduction, which is equally valid against his *acknowledged* institution of infant circumcision, as against his *disputed* institution of infant baptism, should make sober men, who cannot escape from it, suspect the soundness of their views. It is, moreover, the same difficulty which occurs in the celebration of the Lord’s supper, and in the baptism of adults ; unless we can be assured that *all* the recipients are *true converts*. But, indeed, the difficulty itself is created by erroneous notions of the nature of God’s church ; by confounding visible members with his elect—and his covenant to the church, with his covenant of grace in Christ Jesus. A proper application of this distinction will remove it, and *demonstrate that the seal of God’s covenant, does, in every instance, certify absolute truth, whether it be applied to a believer, or to an unbeliever ; to the elect, or to the reprobate.*

FOR THE CHRISTIAN'S MAGAZINE.

Considerations on Lots.

No. III.

IN the preceding numbers we have established to the satisfaction, we hope, of the serious reader, these two propositions :

1. That the *lot* is a direct appeal to God as the governour of the world, founded on the faith of a particular providence.

2. That when used on proper occasions, and in a proper manner, both of which have been explained, it is an act of high and acceptable worship.

From this doctrine the conclusion is plain, that all unnecessary, light, careless, or customary uses of the lot ; all uses of it, other than such as are holy, reverent, and warranted by the rules of the written word, are sinful, and to be avoided as profanations of the divine name.

For under the *name of God* is comprehended every thing by which *he makes himself known*. In the oath he is solemnly invoked as the Omniscient, whose " eyes are upon the truth." In the lot, a decision is put into his hands as the sovereign umpire between his creatures, who dispenses to them the most pure and perfect righteousness. In both, his dominion over us, his right to dispose of us and our affairs, and the account which we shall render to him, are fully acknowledged.

The sinfulness of profane swearing 'consists in

treating with levity, that NAME of God, which the spirits of heaven adore; in impairing our sense of his majesty; in weakening the restraint which his authority imposes on the lusts of men; and diffusing, in the same proportion, the influence of practical atheism. If, then, as has been proved, the lot is an ordinance of the same general nature with the oath; if it involves the same homage to the divine government; if it is calculated to promote the same great moral and social purposes, who can doubt that the irreligious use of it is of the same complexion with the irreligious use of the oath, and like it, belongs to that “taking of the name of the Lord in vain,” which, “the Lord will not hold guiltless?” We question not, that many who would on no account pollute their lips with a profane oath, are in the habit of misapplying the lot without any conscientious scruple whatever. The reason is to be sought in their want of instruction and reflection. That they sin, is not less certain, than that the lot is an appeal to God. Their sin, we hope, must be referred to ignorance; but that ignorance cannot be invincible; and is, therefore, culpable: and the excuse arising from it grows less valid with every opportunity of information, and with every call to “consider their ways.”

This deduction from the foregoing reasoning, we might submit, without comment, to the *conscience* of our readers. It contains the substance of those conclusions by which, on many accounts public and private, we wish them to try the use of the lot as it occurs in the present state of society. But as a general truth is often best perceived in its details, we shall exemplify our principle by pointing out several *abuses* of the lot.

1. It is often employed as a means of determining the spiritual state and character of individuals. This is done in three ways.

Cards, with texts of scripture on one side, the other being blank, are shuffled together, and then dealt out to the company, who read the text on their own cards, under an impression of its being a *divine message* to them respectively. To what lengths this species of *game* is carried, or under what restrictions it is conducted, we pretend not to know; but that such a game exists, we are perfectly certain.

In place of these cards the leaves of the bible are sometimes substituted: the book being kept shut, a *pin is stuck between the leaves*, and a message from God is looked for in one of the pages between which the pin is inserted.

Nearly allied to this, and substantially the same, is the practice of *opening the bible at random*, and taking the passage first caught by the eye, as the message intended.

These methods of applying the word of God, carry with them the mark of such puerile and absurd superstition, that it may seem needless even to mention them. But the mind in distress about eternal things, under the influence of erroneous views of religion, is often bewildered, and impelled by temptation, to expedients very ill calculated to yield relief. However incredible it may be thought, this very practice of *turning the bible into a lottery*, has filled some weak, yet well meaning people, with unfounded confidence, and driven others almost to desperation. One man finds on his card, or selects with his pin, or catches by a sudden glance of his eye, an assurance of grace, or a promise of eternal life, and he is transported

with ecstasy. Another by the same means, lights upon a threatening or a curse, and he is broken with terrours, as if an angel of God had written before his eyes a sentence of reprobation. That which has happened already, may happen again; and Christians should be on their guard against such delusion. Delusion it undoubtedly is, if words of truth and soberness are intitled to our regard.

“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, throughly furnished unto every good work.” But in order to reap this excellent fruit from the holy writings, they must be studied, searched, compared. They are addressed to us as rational beings, whose faculties are to be exercised in discovering their sense, that we may understand what is the revealed will of God; and what opinion we are to form of our own character. Serious inquiry into these matters, with an ardent desire for the guidance of the Spirit of truth, will, for the most part, enable us to determine, with tolerable precision, every question affecting our substantial interests. They who are the most devoted to it, are not only the most intelligent Christians, but, ordinarily, enjoy the most settled peace, and are most abundant in the “fruits of righteousness which are by Jesus Christ to the praise and glory of God.” But now all this use of the scriptures, and all the blessed effects accruing from diligent and holy investigation of them, are completely set aside by converting them into a lottery. The greatest and the least acquaintance with them are exactly on a level. Progress in the knowledge of their doc-

trines, precepts, promises, is of no avail. All comparing of things spiritual with spiritual, is at an end. There is no more room for self examination. The trial of tempers, affections, habits, principles, corruptions, graces, declensions, revivals, by the word of God, is superseded. The bible ceases to be a rule of faith and conduct; for every judgment is made to rest upon an *immediate revelation obtained by lot*. They who resort to such a summary method of getting at spiritual results, ought, in all consistency, to pursue it in temporal things. It would prevent the trouble of much circuitous industry; it would engender no sloth more ignoble than what it creates in the concerns of the soul; and it is obviously as proper to decide by the turn of a shilling, whether we shall plow or not, as to interrogate the point of a pin, whether we shall be saved or perish.

It is surprising that they who are addicted to this unhallowed use of the scriptures, do not perceive their self-contradiction: and what is infinitely worse, their endeavour to draw into self-contradiction, the God with whom they have to do. They either lay some stress on the issue of their lottery speculations in the scripture, or none. If none, the contradiction lies in their attempting to produce *something* by means which, according to their own concession, can produce *nothing*. If, on the other hand, any stress be laid on them, the contradiction lies in attempting to make these very means destroy their own result; which is always done by *repeating* the experiment. And when the issues differ, as in most cases they will, one conclusion is set off against the other, and yet *both* are valid. Thus if a man shall draw a blessing this moment, and a curse the next, he

is bound to believe himself both blessed and accursed; for the reason of his believing the one is equally strong for his believing the other, or else for not believing either; which would be as gross a contradiction as the former.

If this, however, were all; if in these their liberties with the bible, men of vain, irregular minds, merely displayed their own folly, they might expose themselves at their leisure. But they actually endeavour to draw the Most High God into self-contradiction. For if they view those passages of his word which are assigned to them by lot, as expressing *his* decision, they ought never to *try again*, because *his* "counsel shall stand." Whereas, by the very fact of "trying again," they ask him to reverse his own judgment. And thus, *their characters remaining the same*, should they happen, as in the example above, to get now a curse, and then a blessing, they ascribe to him two opposite judgments, in one of which he must necessarily certify a falsehood. These are daring freedoms indeed. The very thought of perverting his book of life into a book of gambling, should fill us with horror.

But let not our reprehension of such profaneness, for by no softer name may we call it, be misunderstood. Let us not be suspected of denying, that portions of divine truth, suddenly and unexpectedly presented to the mind, have, in many instances, been accompanied with extraordinary effects. A careless man has unintentionally opened the bible at a place which arrested his notice, and flashed light in upon his conscience. It was an arrow from the quiver of the Eternal, shot into his very heart, and it stuck there, drinking up

VOL. I.—N^o. IV. 3 F

his spirit, till it was extracted by the healing hand of mercy.

So, likewise, many of those who "fear the Lord," and yet "walk in darkness, and have no light," proceeding in the path of duty, mourning and depressed, have taken up their bible, hardly knowing whether they should read it or not; and have been directed to some unlooked for passage, which being powerfully applied to their hearts, has dispelled their fears, and filled them with "peace and joy in believing." We know that all this is exploded by many, and even by some who are called, and who ought to be, ministers of the gospel, as blind fanaticism. If the reader be of that class, we have, at present, no dispute with him. He is welcome to the consolation of laughing at that which multitudes of believers, now in the church, and multitudes more among the "spirits of just men made perfect," can attest to be a divine reality. He has much higher reason to doubt his own Christianity, than the sobriety of their experience.

But while we allow, in the amplest manner, for such cases as these—while we are far from "limiting the Holy One of Israel," we cannot forget that his sovereignty is not our rule of action; nor concede that its interposition in such instances as we have mentioned, affords the smallest countenance to the practice we have condemned. "To the law and to the testimony; if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them." But the sentence of "the law and the testimony," is not to be procured by cutting it up into lottery tickets; nor to be used as if the promises of life, and the denunciations of death, were pasted among its leaves, to be distri-

buted by lot. As well might the divine promises and threatenings be parcelled out on a back-gammon board, and the *dice* be rattled for a *chance* of heaven or of hell. If every man, whose soul is not lost to seriousness, shudders at this idea, let him also shudder at the other, which is equally profane. It is a gross abuse of the lot, and therefore, a prostitution of an ordinance, by the proper use of which the name of God is glorified.

FOR THE CHRISTIAN'S MAGAZINE.

Elucidation of Mark, ix. 47—50.

And if thine eye offend thee, pluck it out: it is better for thee to enter into the kingdom of God with one eye, than having two eyes to be cast into hell fire; where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched. For every one shall be salted with fire, and every sacrifice shall be salted with salt. Salt is good: but if the salt have lost his saltness, wherewith will ye season it? Have salt in yourselves, and have peace one with another.

GOD tells us by the prophet Hosea, that "he has used similitudes." It is customary with the scriptures to employ the relations of social life, and the analogies of the material world, to instruct us in the knowledge of saving truth. Of this the passage before us contains a striking exemplification. Let us in the first place, fix the meaning of its terms.

The word "*offence*" has acquired a signification quite different from that in which it was used by our translators. Now, it expresses that which displeases. But in scriptural style, it is any thing which, being in our way, causes us to stumble or fall. The word is not only used, but explained, in a prophecy of Isaiah, concerning the Messiah. "He shall be for a stone of stumbling, and a rock

of *offence*, to both the houses of Israel; and many among them shall stumble, and fall, and be broken." This is its true meaning, however different the subjects to which it may be applied. Believers are "offended" by whatever impedes their spiritual progress. Thus the apostle advises to eat or drink nothing whereby our brother is *stumbled*, or *offended*, or made *weak*. A false professor is "offended" by any thing which causes him to relinquish his profession. "When tribulation or persecution cometh," says the scripture, "by-and-by he is *offended*." Those who never were even professors of religion, are said to be "offended" by that which prevents them from entering the paths of wisdom. Thus was the cross of Christ an "offence" to both Jews and Greeks. But in all these different applications of the word, there prevails that generic idea which we have mentioned.

"Kingdom of God," and "Kingdom of Heaven," are phrases which, in the New Testament, commonly signify the church under the Gospel dispensation. But they are not to be confined to this meaning, as many things are predicted concerning that kingdom, which do not and cannot receive their ultimate fulfilment in the present world: and therefore the expressions must extend themselves to the heavenly state. Nor is it without the greatest reasonableness that they may be said to include both. For the gospel dispensation is a partial introduction of the joys and privileges which belong to heaven. In this passage, the heavenly state appears to be primarily intended; for "the kingdom of God" is opposed to the future condition of the damned.

The description of this terrible state, in the words

“ fire of hell, where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched,” cannot be well understood, without a reference to ancient history. It appears to be taken from the valley of Hinnom ; and a reason for this opinion is, that from the words “ valley of Hinnom,” in the Hebrew, is derived the Greek word which we have translated “ HELL.” This valley lay near Jerusalem, was once remarkable for its fertility and pleasantness, and was converted by many of the Jewish kings into a place of idolatrous worship. *Manasseh* rendered it particularly infamous, by setting up the image of Moloch, and sacrificing children to this idol, by burning them to death within its arms. *Josiah* afterwards destroyed the images ; and to render the place everlastingly detestable, converted it into a receptacle for all the filth which was carried from Jerusalem. Carcasses of men and beasts, and every thing hurtful and offensive, were deposited there, and either consumed by fire, or left as a prey to the worms. So great was the quantity of vile materials, that the fire might always be found burning in one part, and the worms rioting in another. From such a spectacle, is the punishment of hell set before us. It warrants, at least, the following conclusions :

1. That the damned shall be given up to the uncontrolled dominion of corruption. Even here we may often see the wretchedness of men who are enslaved to their own sins. But in hell, when they shall be separated from the righteous, depravity shall be allowed to take its course. For one great reason why the corruptions of the wicked are now restrained, is, that they would otherwise render the world completely uninhabitable by righteous men. But when those who are the

salt of the earth shall be removed, nothing will remain to counteract the wickedness which will produce and spread around it every thing horrible, and from which the wicked themselves would desire to flee.

2. God will add to their misery, by inflicting upon them the severity of his wrath. He will not only give them up to their corruptions, but he will make a vessel of every faculty of their souls, and every member of their bodies, into which he will pour the stream of vengeance which his righteousness hath kindled.

3. Their torments shall be unceasing. It is impossible to get, from limited duration, an emblem which shall rightly represent eternity. But in the picture before us, there is enough to justify our conclusion. The fire burned, and the worm lived in Hinnom, while there was any thing to consume or corrupt. And if there is any analogy at all to be found in the representation, wrath must be endured in hell while sinners exist to feel it, and that shall be for ever. One hand of Omnipotence will inflict their punishment, and the other will uphold them in existence.

But how obdurate is sin! There are some, who, with this picture before their eyes, have dared to turn round, and scoffingly to answer—"a reasonable demand truly! as if that God who created us, should require us to cut off our right hands, or pluck out our right eyes! A fine proposal for that religion which professes to be all consistency and truth, and yet declares that no man ever yet hated his own flesh, but loveth and cherisheth it!" The scoff proceeds from a wicked heart, and the objection from a mistake as to the nature of those sacrifices which we are required

to make, and from a total misconstruction of this passage.

Every thing which, from its own nature, tends to evil, it is our duty either to destroy or to abandon. Association with wicked company naturally leads to their practices, and, accordingly, it is absolutely forbidden. But we are not to destroy or to abandon every thing which is capable of being so *perverted* as to become the instrument of evil. Was this the case, we should count it our duty, at once, to destroy every member of our bodies. We must try to destroy every work of God which is upon earth. Nay, we must go further yet, we must renounce and try to destroy every doctrine of the Gospel; for there cannot one be mentioned, which the sinful passions of men, instigated by the malice of the devil, have not perverted to some bad end

We, however, are very far from denying that God requires us to sacrifice, in certain circumstances, the members of our bodies, and even our very lives. Take the words of the text. Raise a balance. Place in one scale all the pain which we can suffer from cutting off a limb, or plucking out an eye; add to it all the pain of separating the soul from the body; place in the other scale the punishments of hell: Can we hesitate a moment which should preponderate? Is there the least equality between the two? Every martyr who "loved not his life unto the death," has written the answer in his blood; and his noble example looks back to rebuke our cowardice, if we refuse to imbibe his spirit, and to follow his steps.

But these phrases about the hand, the foot, and the eye, are *proverbial*. This is evident from

the manner in which the Evangelists apply them to quite different cases. Matthew uses them, in one instance, to dissuade from the sin of unchaste thoughts. Chap. 5. v. 29. He uses them again, to show the severity with which Judas should be punished for laying a stumbling block in the way of his brethren, by betraying his master. In the passage which we are considering, Mark has introduced them to show the propriety of self-denial, as contributing to the welfare of weaker brethren. Now a peculiar excellence of a proverb is, that it suggests to the mind more than it brings to the ear. Under a form of words which refer directly to some familiar object, it conveys a general truth adapted to a variety of cases. Now what is the general truth contained in this proverb? Evidently the following: That every thing which we enjoy on earth should be subordinate to our hopes of heaven—that every thing which we esteem valuable, though dear to us as our feet, our hands, or our eyes, we must be content to part with, if it endanger the salvation of our souls. Such an injunction strikes deep. It implies a self-crucifixion against which every evil passion of the heart rises up in rebellion and clamour. But it must be so, says our Saviour. “For,” (he adds in the 49 v.) “every one must be salted with fire,” &c.

Concerning these words there has been much dispute. It is, however, evident at first view, that they are highly figurative. For who ever heard of *salting* a man with *fire*? It is evident, too, that the words “and every sacrifice must be salted with salt,” refer to the ceremony of salting the sacrifices under the Jewish law—a ceremo-

ny most invariably required in its meat offerings. The point of difficulty is to settle the meaning of the words, "for every one must be salted with fire," and to show how they are to be suited to the subject of comparison. Some have interpreted them of the punishment of the damned; and, connecting therewith the preceding verse, "their worm dieth not," &c. have explained them in this way—"for you may be assured that that punishment is eternal; their fire will not consume; they shall live amidst their torments, as flesh is preserved by salt. For did not your ceremony of salting your sacrifices represent to you that keen, as well as that endless severity, with which the accursed shall be punished?"

Against this interpretation we have the following objections:

1. It attributes to the custom of salting the sacrifices a meaning which does not belong to it. That ceremony was not intended to exhibit the severity of the divine vengeance against those who should become its victims. But it reminded the worshippers of that freedom from all corruption; of that perfect purity which was to render a sacrifice well pleasing to God. To convey the same instructions, their sacrifices were to be without spot or blemish. And we accordingly find that immediately after this law, which requires the salting of the sacrifices, there is a prohibition against offering any thing fermented, or inclining to fermentation, which we know is a state proceeding towards corruption. The very same reasons forbade the one that demanded the other, viz. to show that the GREAT SACRIFICE, which God would accept, must be, as the apostle declares it has been, holy, undefiled, and separated from every thing sinful.

2. This interpretation militates with the accustomed application of these figures in other parts of scripture. "To be salted," never signifies the punishments of hell; but when applied to any thing which has life, always implies **PRESERVATION IN A STATE OF SAFETY**. The true use of salt is to preserve from corruption; and we have already shown that the uncontrolled corruption of human nature, is a part of the punishment of the wicked. Such is God's denunciation against the man of sin. The Lord, (says the prophet,) will corrupt those who corrupt the earth.

We therefore think that this verse is not to be connected merely with the preceding which respects future punishment. Its connexion runs further back into the context. It comes in as a reason to enforce the duty of sacrificing every thing to the salvation of our souls, which the redeemer inculcates from the 43d verse, under the proverbial phrases which we have been explaining. Now, to answer this purpose, what should be their import? "For every one must be salted," &c. To enforce our Saviour's exhortation, we imagine they require a paraphrase to this effect: "Be not startled at these high demands of mine, as something too severe for Christianity, which is all mildness, tenderness, and love; for every one of you who is my disciple in deed and in truth; whose heart is under the influence of grace, and who have yielded his members as instruments of righteousness unto holiness; must be pure as I also am pure; corruption must be expelled, and every principle of it as utterly consumed as chaff or stubble before the flame. For, to allude to your offerings, they are to be salted with salt. And what did this prefigure? What design can possibly be con-

nected with that ceremony? Did it not express that purity and sincerity; that freedom from sin and care to avoid the occasions of it, which are required in him who would present himself as a living sacrifice, holy and acceptable to God?"

Such an interpretation at least harmonizes with the context. And to our aid we might call in all those passages in which similar phraseology occurs. Ezra iv. 14, gives an instance. Literally translated, it would read, "Because we are salted with salt of the palace, it was not meet for us to see the King's dishonour." Our translators have very correctly rendered the sense—"Because we have maintenance from the King's palace," &c. When the form of expression is so far changed, as that the noun is used instead of the verb, to express the principles or the influence of men, the interpretation should always be in a favourable sense. Thus the disciples are called *the salt of the earth*; and in the verse immediately following, they are commanded *to have salt in themselves*, and to be at peace one with another.

But we have not yet reached the full force of this language. Every one must not only be *salted*, but he must be salted with *fire*. Fire is here mentioned to denote the *perfectness* of that purity which is required in the believer. "*To be salted*," expresses sanctification. "*To be salted with fire*," expresses that sanctification pervading every faculty of the soul, and every member of the body, searching out and consuming every principle of corruption. Such appears to be the use which Paul makes of this penetrating element, when he introduces it as an emblem of that strict scrutiny which the doctrines of teachers shall undergo at the bar of God. "Every man's work

shall be made manifest ; for the day shall declare it, because it shall be revealed by *fire*, and the *fire* shall try every man's work." Search it out, bring every part of it into view, to show of what sort it is. "To be salted with *fire*," denotes also the pain of that mortification which the believer undergoes.

But the immediate intention, in using this language, was to create an *antithesis* between this verse and the preceding. Fire was there used to denote the punishments of the damned. "Their worm dieth not," &c. And then is added, "for every one," i. e. every one of you my disciples, "must be *salted* with fire." The contrast is too evident to escape notice. Their fire, (says our Saviour,) is the punishment of an avenging judge—yours is the influence of the sanctifying Comforter. Their fire consumes their hopes, and destroys their peace, in its everlasting flames—yours prepares you for heaven, and will lose its painfulness when the last struggle with sin shall be finished.

But although the ultimate triumph of grace is as sure as the purpose of God, we must be diligent and watchful. The duty is urged by continuing the use of the emblem. *Salt is good, but if the salt have lost his saltness, &c.* Prize and watch over the grace of your hearts. Quench not the Spirit. Remember it is your life. If it be lost, all is gone. You are undone for ever. Should the light that is in you be darkness, how great must be that darkness! Never be satisfied until you can feel that grace is active; and when it lives and reigns, peace with God and man shall be yours. You shall be actuated by principles which flow from the same

fountain—shall exert yourselves in the same cause—and expect each other's communion as part of your incorruptible inheritance in the world to come.

Against the conclusion from this verse, that grace may be lost after it is communicated, since salt is supposed sometimes to lose its saltness; we are perfectly safe. From a mere supposition, we cannot infer that the thing supposed shall take place. Paul writes to the Galatians, "Though I, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel to you than that ye have received, let him be accursed." Does Paul suppose that an angel from heaven might or would preach another Gospel to his Galatian converts? Or, take the passage according to its literal meaning: Suppose that salt really does lose its saltness, and draw a conclusion by analogy from this fact, that grace may be lost after it is given; how does this conclusion arise? It must be because grace may be so really and essentially changed, as to be converted into corruption, i. e. the holy Spirit of God dwelling in believers, may, by their corruptions, be changed into the author of sin and pollution. A conclusion which no man but an open blasphemer can avow. And, therefore, the argument from this passage against the perseverance of the saints, by proving too much, proves nothing at all. If we choose to sever one part of the bible from another, and do not judge of its doctrines as a whole, examining their connexion and comparing their different aspects in different passages, we may build upon it a system of atheism. But let it interpret itself, and we find in it all that is true, all that is comfortable, all that is divine.

FOR THE CHRISTIAN'S MAGAZINE.

*Remarks on the accounts of the death of David Hume,
Esqr. and Samuel Finley, D. D. in the last No.*

THE common sense and feelings of mankind, have always taught them to consider death as a most awful and interesting event. If it were nothing more than a separation from all that we love in this world; the dissolution of our bodies; and the termination of our present mode of existence; there would be sufficient reason for approaching it with tender and solemn reflection. But when we add those anticipations of which very few, if any, can wholly divest themselves; that scene of "untried being," which lies before us; and especially *that* eternity which the Christian revelation unfolds, death becomes an object of unutterable moment; and every sober thought of it bears upon the heart with a weight of solicitude which it is not in the power of unaided reason to remove. The mere *possibility* of our living hereafter, is enough to engage the attention of a wise man: the *probability* of it is too grave and affecting to leave an excuse for indifference: and the *certainty* with which the scriptures speak of it, as of an immortality of blessedness or of wo, allows to light and ludicrous speculations concerning it, no other character than that of the insanity of wickedness.

When that hour draws nigh which shall close the business of life, and summon the spirit to the

bar of "God who gave it," all the motives to deception cease; and those false reasonings which blind the judgment, are dissipated. It is the hour of truth, and of sincerity. Such, at least, is the *general* fact, which cannot be invalidated by the concession that, in some instances, men have been found to cherish their infatuation, and practise their knavery, to the very last. Their number in places which enjoy the pure gospel, the only ones in our present view, is too small to make any perceptible difference in the amount; or to disparage that respectful credence with which the rustic and the sage listen to the testimony of a dying bed.

By this testimony, the "gospel of the grace of God," has obtained, among every people and in every age, such strong confirmation, and has carried into the human conscience, such irresistible appeals for its truth, its power, and its glorious excellency, that its enemies have laboured with all their might, to discredit these triumphs. They have attacked the principle upon which the testimony of a dying believer rests. They have said that the mind, being necessarily enfeebled by the ravages of mortal disease upon the body, is not a competent judge of its own operations—that the looks, the tears, the whole conduct of surrounding friends, excite artificial emotions in the dying—that superstition has a prodigious ascendancy over their imagination—that their joyful impressions of heaven, are the mere reveries of a disturbed brain—that their serenity, their steady hope, their placid faith, are only the natural consequence of long habit, which never operates more freely than when the faculty of reflection is impaired—All this, and more like this, do unhap-

py mortals who take, or pretend to take, pleasure in putting an extinguisher upon the light of life, detail with an air of superiority, as if they had fallen upon a discovery which merits the plaudits of the world. But were it even so—were the Christian victory over death only a dream, it is a dream so sweet and blessed, that with the scourger of lord Bolingbroke's philosophy, I should "ac-
" count that man a villain that awoke me—awoke
" me to truth and misery*." But I am not going to discuss this question. The poor infidel does not believe himself, and why should others believe him? With one breath he endeavours to cry down the argument to be derived in favour of their religion, from the peaceful death of Christians; and with the next to enlist it in his own service. He omits no opportunity of celebrating the intrepidity or composure displayed by sceptical brethren in their last moments. Let the letter of Dr. Adam Smith, concerning the death of *David Hume*, Esqr. reprinted in our last number, be a proof. Every sentence betrays his anxiety to set off his friend to the best advantage. The dullest observer cannot but perceive his design to compare Mr. Hume dying an infidel, with a Christian dying in the faith of Jesus. Let us draw out, at length, that comparison which he has only insinuated; and that the effect may be more decisive, let us remember, that the whole annals of unbelief do not furnish a more favourable example than he has selected. Mr. *Hume* was a man of undisputed genius. His versatile talent, his intense ap-

* Hunter's view of the philosophical character and writings of Lord Viscount Bolingbroke.

VOL. I.—No. IV. 3 H

plication, his large acquirements, and his uncommon acuteness, place him, perhaps, at the head of those enemies of revelation who attempt to *reason*; as Voltaire stands without a rival among those who only *scoff*. He had, besides, what rarely belongs to the ascertained infidel, a good moral reputation. We mean that he was not addicted to lewdness, to drunkenness, to knavery, to profane swearing*, or any of those grosser vices which are the natural and ordinary companions of enmity

* On further recollection, we are compelled to deduct from Mr. Hume's morality, his freedom from profane swearing. For, in an account of the life and writings of the *Rev. Dr. Robertson*, the great historian, drawn up by professor *Dugald Stewart*, there is a letter from Mr. Hume to the Dr. in which he descends to the coarse and vulgar profanity of the ale-house, and the main-deck. To ask his *reverend* correspondent, the principal of the University of Edinburgh; the ecclesiastical premier of the church of Scotland, "What *the devil* he had to do with that "old fashioned, dangling word, *wherewith?*" and to tell him, "I will see you d—d sooner," viz. than "swallow your *hath**"—are such gross violations of decency, that unless Mr. Hume had been *accustomed* to adorn his speech with similar expletives, they never could have found their way into a familiar letter; much less into a letter designed for the eye of a man to whom, considering his *profession* only, they were a direct insult. We do not wonder that Mr. Stewart should "hesitate about the propriety of subjecting to the criticisms of the world so careless an effusion." But, knowing as we do, the urbanity of that Gentleman's manners, the elegance of his mind, and his high sense of decorum, we much wonder that his hesitation had not a different issue. We fear that all men of sobriety, we are sure that all men of religion, will refuse to accept Mr. Hume's "gayety and affec-

* An account of the Life and writings of *William Robertson*, D. D. prefixed to his works, p. 80, 81.

to the Gospel. For otherwise, as he laboured to unsettle all fixed principles of belief; to overturn the whole system of moral obligation; to obliterate a sense of God's authority from the conscience; and positively to inculcate the innocence of the greatest crimes, he must be accounted one of the most flagitiously immoral men that ever lived.

His panegyrist, too, was a man of superiour parts and profound erudition. The name of *Adam Smith* will always rank high in the republic of letters; and will never be pronounced, but with respect, by the political economist. Mr. *Hume* can have lost nothing; has possibly gained much, by the pen of his friend. Taking him, therefore, as the letter to Mr. *Strahan* represents him, let us contrast him with that servant of the Lord Jesus Christ, *Dr. Samuel Finley*.

Whatever be a man's opinions, one of his most rational occupations in the prospect of leaving the world, is to look back upon the manner in which

tion," as an apology for his vileness; or to let it pass off under the mask of "playful and good-natured irony." If a philosopher's "affection" must vent itself in ribaldry; if he cannot be "playful and good-natured," without plundering the waterman and scavenger of their appropriate phraseology, we own, that his conversation has no attractions for us. Such a "glimpse" as this letter affords, of the "writer and his correspondent in the habits of private intercourse," is far from "suggesting not unpleasing pictures of the hours which they borrowed from business and study." But the most melancholy reflection is, that such intimacies and correspondences furnish an index of Dr. Robertson's own character. The infidels never allowed that he had any thing of the Christian minister but his canonicals and his sermons. With these exceptions they claimed him as their own, and their claim appears to have been too well founded.

he has passed through it: to compare his duties with his conduct, and to inquire how far he deserves the approbation or the reproach of his own conscience. With a Christian this admits not of dispute. Nor will it be disputed by a Deist, who professes his faith in the being and providence of God, and a state of rewards and punishments hereafter, proportioned to the degree of crime or of virtue here. To such a one it is, upon his own principles, a question of unspeakable importance, whether he shall commence his future existence with hopes of happiness, or with fears of misery? especially as he relies much upon the efficacy of penitence and prayer, in procuring forgiveness of his faults, indulgence to his infirmities, and a general mitigation of whatever is unfavourable. Nay, the mortal deist, or the atheist himself, for they are not worth the trouble of a distinction, ought, for their own sakes in this life, to be so employed. If, with the rejection of all religious constraint, they have not also uprooted every affection of their nature, nothing could afford them more gratification in the evening of their days, than the consciousness of their having contributed something to the mass of human comfort. In short, whether we argue upon christian, or unchristian grounds, it can be the interest of none but the worthless and the malignant, to shut their eyes upon their own history, and sink down in death, as a bullock drops under the knife of his executioner.

Yet strange as it may appear, and inconsistent as it certainly is with his high pretensions, there are few things so rare as a dying infidel taking a deliberate retrospect of life. We say a *deliberate retrospect*; for it is undeniable, that on many of

those who, like the apostate Julian, waged implacable war with the *Galilean*, conscience recovering from its slumbers, has, at the hour of death or the apprehension of it, forced an unwilling and tormenting recollection of their deeds. The point of honour in their philosophy seems to be, and their utmost attainment is, to keep completely out of view, both the past and the future. This was evidently the case with Mr. *Hume*. Read over again Dr. Smith's letter to Mr. Strahan, and you will not find a syllable from which you could gather that there is an hereafter, a providence, or a God—not a sentence to indicate that Mr. *Hume* believed he had ever committed a sin; or was, in any respect, an accountable being.

Turn now away from the philosopher, and hear what a believer in the Lord Jesus Christ has to say. Melting into gratitude for that mercy which he had received from his heavenly father, he goes back to the commencement of his Christian course, and desires his friend to pray, that God “would be pleased to let him feel just as he did at that time when he first closed with Christ,” and the rapture of his soul came near to the blessedness of heaven. With deep humility he owns his sinfulness: not a whisper of extenuation or apology does he utter—“I know not in what language to speak of my own unworthiness—I have been undutiful.” But with great tenderness, as in the presence of the Omniscient, he attests his satisfaction with time spent in his Christian duties and enjoyments. “I can truly say that I have loved the service of God—I have honestly endeavoured to act for God, but with much weakness and corruption—I have tried my master's yoke, and will never shrink my neck from it.” That he

had been useful to others, and instrumental in their salvation, was to him a source of pure and elevated joy. "The Lord has given me many souls as a crown of my rejoicing."

What think you, now, reader, of Mr. *Hume* and Dr. *Finley*, with regard to their retrospect of life? Who evinces most of the good and the virtuous man? Whose reflections, is it reasonable to conclude, were the more delightful? *His*, who let none of them escape his lips? or *his*, whose words were inadequate to express their abundance or their sweetness? No; the one had not delightful recollections to communicate. High happiness is never selfish. The overflowing heart pours off its exuberance into the bosom of a friend. And had Mr. H. had any thing of this sort to impart, his companions and encomiasts would have shared in his pleasure, and would not have forgotten to tell the world of its luxury. Their silence is a sufficient comment.

Let us extend our comparison to a particular which, more than almost any thing else, touches the pride of philosophy: We mean the *dignity* displayed by the infidel and by the Christian respectively.

Ask *Dr. Smith*. He will tell you that at the very time when he knew his dissolution was near, Mr. Hume continued to "divert himself as usual, with correcting his own works for a new edition; with reading books of amusement; with the conversation of his friends; and sometimes, in the evening, with a party at his favourite game of whist." Behold the dying occupation of a captain of infidelity! Of one who is eulogized "as approaching as nearly to the idea of a perfectly wise and virtuous man, as, per-

On the death of D. Hume and S. Finley. 427

“ haps, the nature of human frailty will admit”—his most serious employment is “ diverting himself.” Just about to yield up his last breath, and “ diverting himself!” *From* what? Let them answer who know that there are apt to be troublesome visitors to the imagination and the conscience of one who has prostituted his powers to the purpose of spreading rebellion against the God who made him! “ Diverting himself!” *With* what? *With* correcting his *own works* for a new edition! a considerable portion of which “ works” is destined to prove that justice, mercy, faith, and all the circle of both the duties and charities, are obligatory only because they are useful; and, by consequence, that their opposites shall be obligatory when they shall appear to be more useful—that the religion of the Lord Jesus, which has “ brought life and immortality to light,” is an imposture—that adultery is a bagatelle; and suicide a virtue! *With* what? *With* reading books of *amusement*. The adventures of Don Quixote; the tales of the genii; a novel, a tragedy, a farce, a collection of sonnets; any thing but those sober and searching treatises which are fit for one who “ considers his latter end.” *With* what? *With* the conversation of his friends; such as Dr. Smith, and Dr. Black, another famous infidel, who, as they had nothing inviting to discuss about futurity, and Mr. H. could not bear the fatigue of abstruse speculation, must have entertained him with all that jejune small talk which makes great wits look so very contemptible, when they have nothing to say. *With* what? *With* an evening party at his favourite game of whist! A card table! and all that nauseous gabble for which the card table is renowned!

The question is to be decided, whether such stupendous faculties as had been lavished upon Mr. Hume, were to be blasted into annihilation; or expanded to the vision and fruition of the INFINITE GOOD; or converted into inlets of endless pain, despair, and horror? A question which might convulse the abyss, and move the thrones of heaven—and while the decision is preparing, preparing for *him*, Mr. H. sits down to a gaming board, with gambling companions, to be “diverted” with the chances of the cards, and the edifying conversation to which they give rise! Such is the *dignity* of this almost “perfectly wise and “virtuous man”—Such a *philosopher's* preparation for death!

Let us leave him at the card-table, and pay a second visit to Dr. Finley. From his gracious lips, not a trifling word escapes. In his ardent soul, now ready to speed its flight to the spirits of the just, there is no room for “diversion,” for “correcting” compositions; for “books of amusement;” or for “games of whist.” The everlasting life of those around him—the spiritual prosperity of a congregation dear to him—the interests of his Redeemer among the nations—these, these are the themes which fill his thoughts and dwell upon his tongue. “Oh that each of you,” says he to the spectators of his pain, “may experience, “what, blessed be God, I do, when ye come to “die.”—“Give my love to the people of Princeton: tell them that I am going to die, and that “I am not afraid of death. The Lord Jesus take “care of his cause in the world.”

The manner in which Mr. H. and Dr. F. directly contemplated death, and the effects of death, presents another strong point of contrast. It is

evident from the whole of Dr. Smith's narrative, that the former confined, or wished to confine, his view to the mere *physical* event—to the bodily anguish which it might create, and its putting a period to earthly enjoyments. The whole of the philosopher's "magnanimity" centers here. Allowing to his composure under these views of death, as much as can reasonably be demanded, we do not perceive in it *all* that "magnanimity" which is perceived by Dr. S. Thousands who had no pretensions to philosophical pre-eminence, have been Mr. H's. equals on this ground. If he had succeeded in persuading himself, as his writings tend to persuade others, that the spirit of man, like the spirit of a beast, "goeth downwards;" that when the breath should leave his body, there would be an end of Mr. *Hume*—that the only change would be to "turn a few ounces of blood into a different channel"—to vary the form of a cluster of corpuscles, or to scatter a bundle of perceptions up and down through that huge collection of impressions and ideas—that stupendous mass of *nothings*, of which his philosophy had sagaciously discovered the whole material and intellectual world to be composed—If *this* were all, we cannot discern in what his magnanimity consisted. It is chiefly as a *moral* event, that death is interesting—as an event which, instead of putting an end to our existence, only introduces us to a mode of existence as much more interesting than the present, as eternity is more interesting than time.

It is this view that chiefly engaged the attention of Dr. Finley. In common with others, he was to undergo the pains of dissolution. But he rest-

ed not in these. He fixed his eye upon that new form which all his relations to God, to holiness, to sin, and the inhabitants of the future world, were shortly to assume. The reader, we doubt not, perceives the immense disparity between these cases. Mr. H. looks at death as it affects the affairs of this world. Dr. F. as it involves eternal issues. Mr. H. according to his own notions, had nothing to encounter but the struggles of nature ; and nothing to lose but a few temporal enjoyments. Before Dr. F. was the tribunal of God, and the stake at hazard was an immortal soul. An error here is irretrievable ; the very thought of its possibility is enough to shake every fibre of the frame ; and proportionably precious and certain must be that religion which can assure the believer of his safety, and convey him with peacefulness and pleasure to his father's house.

This being the case, let us weigh the consolations of the philosopher against those of the Christian.

Dr. Smith has made the most of them in behalf of the former ; but a very little scrutiny will show that they are light and meagre indeed. " I am " dying," they are the words of Mr. H. " as easily " and cheerfully as my best friends could desire." " When he became very weak," says Dr. Black, " it cost him an effort to speak ; and he died in such " a happy composure of mind, that nothing could " exceed it."

We are not without suspicion, that on the part of Mr. H. there is some affectation here ; and on the part of his friends, some pretty high colouring. In the mouth of a Christian, " composure," " cheerfulness," " complacency," " resignation," " happiness," in death, have an exquisite mean-

ing. But what meaning *can* they have in the mouth of one, the very best of whose expectations is the extinction of his being? Is there any "complacency" in the thought of perishing? any "happiness" in the dreary and dismal anticipation of being blotted out of life? It is a farce: It is a mockery of every human feeling: and every throbbing of the heart convicts it of a lie. But Mr. Hume expected a better state of existence—Nay, talk not of that. There is not, either in his own expressions, or those of his friends, the faintest allusion to futurity. That glorious light which shines through the grave upon the redeemed of the Lord, was the object of his derision. No comfort from this quarter. The accomplishment of his earthly wishes, and the prosperity of his near relatives, are the only reasons assigned for his cheerfulness. But these are insufficient. In thousands, and ten thousands, they have not availed to preclude the most alarming forebodings; and why should they do more for Mr. Hume?

In the next place, how shall we interpret his "resignation?" Resignation to what? To the divine will? O no! God was not in all his thoughts. But Death was at hand, and he could not escape; he submitted to a stroke which it was impossible to avoid. And all that is said of his "composure," and "cheerfulness," and "resignation," and "complacency," when measured by the scale of truth, amounts to no more than a sottish unconcern set off with a fictitious gayety. It is easy to work up a fine description; and it is often most fine, when most remote from the fact. Let any infidel between the poles produce, if he can, a reason that shall satisfy a child, why one who has lived without God, should find "complac-

cy" in death. Nothing but that "hope which maketh not ashamed," is a cause equal to such an effect. But "hope" beyond the grave, is a word which had no place in Mr. Hume's vocabulary, because the thing had no place in his soul. It is plain, however, that he

Felt his ruling passion strong in death.

Whatever his decay had weakened, his desire to see "the downfall of some of the prevailing systems of superstition;" which, with Mr. Hume, meant neither more nor less than the destruction of Christianity, in every modification, retained its whole vigour. And thus, while venting his spite at the only "system" which ever could render death comfortable; he goes to Lucian's dialogues, and edifies his friends with chattering nonsense about Charon and his boat! *O cæcas hominum mentes!* Nothing can be more blind and infatuated than the fanaticism of philosophy "falsely so called." With this puerile levity before our eyes; and this contemptible babbling sounding in our ears, we must listen to tales of Mr. Hume's magnanimity, complacency, and resignation!

From a barren exhibition of Atheism, let us repair once more to the servant of God. In Dr. Finley, we see a man dying not only with cheerfulness, but with ecstasy. Of his friends, his wife, his children, he takes a *joyful* leave: committing all that he held most dear in this world, not to the uncertainties of earthly fortune, but to the "promises of his God." Although his temporal circumstances were very moderate; although he *had* sons and daughters to provide for, and slender means of doing it, he felt not a moment's uneasiness—

Leave thy fatherless children with me ; I will preserve them alive ; and let thy widows trust in me, was, in his estimation, a better security for their support, than any inheritance in lands or lucre. And as to death itself—who but one “ filled with hopes full of immortality,” could use such language as this—“ A Christian’s death is the best “ part of his existence”—“ Blessed be God ! eternal rest is at hand.”—“ O I shall triumph over “ every foe,” (he meant sin, Satan, death, the grave,) “ the Lord hath given me the victory—I “ exult ; I triumph ! Now I know that it is *impossible* that faith should not triumph over earth “ and hell”—“ Lord Jesus, into thy hands I commit my spirit ; I do it with *confidence* ; I do it “ with *full assurance*. I know that thou wilt keep “ that which I have committed unto thee.” We appeal to all the world, whether any thing like this, any thing that deserves so much as to be named in comparison, ever fell from the lips of an infidel ? How poor, how mean, how miserable, does he look, when brought to the contrast ! Let the reader review again the situation of Dr. Finley, ponder his words, and mark their spirit ; and then let him go back to Mr. Hume’s “ diversion ”—to his correcting his atheistical writings for a new edition—to his “ books of amusement ”—to his “ game of whist ”—to his insipid raillery about Charon and his boat ! Truly the infidels have cause to look big, and despise the followers of Jesus Christ ! “ Pray, sir,” said a young man to the late Dr. Black, in the presence of a juvenile company, at the Dr’s. own table, “ Pray sir, how did Mr. Hume die ? ” “ Mr. Hume,” answered the sceptical chymist, with an air of great significance, “ Mr. Hume died, as he

lived, a *philosopher*." Dr. Black himself has aided Dr. Smith in telling us what the death of a *philosopher* is. It has taught us, if nothing before did, that the pathetic exclamation, "Let my soul be with the philosophers," belongs to one who is a stranger to truth and happiness. If they resemble Mr. Hume, we will most devoutly exclaim, "Furthest from them is best." Let *our* souls be with the Christians! with the humble believers in that Jesus who is "the resurrection and the life." Let them be with *Samuel Finley*; let them not be with *David Hume*!

We cannot close these strictures, without again reminding the reader, that no instance of composure in death is to be found more favourable to the infidel boast, than the instance of Mr. Hume. And yet, how jejune and forlorn does he appear, in comparison of Dr. Finley. The latter *longs* for his departure, "as the hireling pants for the evening shade;" and when it comes, he pours around him his kindly benedictions; his eye beams with celestial brilliancy; he shouts, Salvation! and is away to "the bosom of his Father and his God."

But in the other all is blank. No joy sparkles in his eye: no hope swells his bosom; an unmeaning smile is on his countenance, and frigid ridicule dishonours his lips. Be it never forgotten, that *no infidels die in triumph*! The utmost to which they pretend, is dying with calmness. Even this rarely happens; and, the scripture being judge, it is a part of their accursedness. It imparts the deeper horror to the *surprise* of the eternal world. But, if you reverse the picture, and ask how many infidels close their career in anguish, in distraction, in a *fearful looking-for of*

judgment and fiery indignation which shall devour the ADVERSARIES? how endless is the train of wretches, how piercing their cry! That arch blasphemer, *Voltaire*, left the world with hell anticipated: and we hear so frequently of his disciples "going to their own place" in a similar manner, that the dreadful narratives lose their effect by repetition. It was quite recently that a youth in the state of New-York, who had been debauched by the ribaldrous impiety of Paine, yielded up the ghost with dire imprecations on the hour when he first saw an infidel book, and on the murderer who first put it into his hand. But who ever heard of a dying man's cursing the day in which he believed in Jesus? While such an instance, we are bold to assert, never occurred, nothing is more common than the peaceful death of them who have "tasted that the Lord is gracious." They who see *practical* Christianity in those retreats which the eye of a profane philosopher seldom penetrates, could easily fill a long record of dying beds softened with that bland submission, and cheered with that victorious hope, which threw so heavenly a lustre round the bed of Dr. Finley.

These things carry with them their own recommendation to the conscience which is not yet "seared as with a hot iron." If our pages fall into the hands of the young, we affectionately entreat them to "remember their Creator in the days of *their youth*;" "to make their calling and their election sure," before they be "hardened by the deceitfulness of sin." Rich are the tints of that beauty, and sweet the fragrance of those blossoms, on which, in the morning of life, the Lord our God sheds down the dews of his blessing.

You would not wish to be associated with infidels in their death—shun the contagion of their principles while you are in spirits and in health. Your hearts cannot but sigh, “Let me die the death of the righteous, and let my last end be like his”—cast in then, your lot with him; choose for your own God, the God of Samuel Finley; and like him, you shall have “hope in your death;” like him, you shall “be had in everlasting remembrance,” when “the memory of the wicked shall rot.”

REVIEW.

ART. IX.

A collection of Essays on the subject of Episcopacy, which originally appeared in the Albany Centinel, and which are ascribed principally to the Rev. Dr. Linn, the Rev. Mr. Beasley, and Thomas Y. How, Esq. With additional notes and remarks. New-York, T. & J. Swords, 1806. 8vo. \$1.

(Continued from page 339.)

FACTS to justify the Episcopal claim, have been sought, without effect, in the constitution of the Jewish priesthood, and in that peculiar state of the church which existed during our Lord's personal ministry. These refuges have failed. The hierarchy has been dislodged from all her intrenchments in succession, and left without a resting place for the sole of her foot, in any part of the religious territory which was occupied by the church from the days of Abraham, till the day of pentecost. We acknowledge, however, that she

Vol. I.—No. IV. 3 K

will suffer little detriment from her defeat, if she can establish herself firmly upon New Testament ground. The strength of her positions here, is next to be tried. If, as she glories, the *facts* of the New Testament are on her side, we own ourselves vanquished, and have nothing to do but to hand her our swords. But we shall not take her word for it. Let the facts be produced. According to the writers whom we are reviewing, they are found in the pre-eminence of James at Jerusalem; of Timothy at Ephesus; of Titus in Crete; and of the seven angels in the Asiatic churches. Epaphroditus, too, has been occasionally added to the number. The ability and *learning* of *Cyprian*, had done him up into a bishop, and had dispatched him from Philippi, in Episcopal majesty, on a visit to Paul at Rome. Unfortunately the good man lost his mitre by the way, so that when he arrived, the apostle could not distinguish him from a simple messenger, who came on an errand from his Philippian friends, and sent him back again *in statu quo*, without a single mark of prelatical dignity. So we leave him to go in quest of the others. Before investigating the validity of their individual titles, we ask the reader's attention to some *general presumptions* against the existence of prelates in the apostolic church. Presumptions, in our view, so strong, as almost to supersede the necessity of further examination.

The first is this, that *no such order is mentioned, nor even alluded to, either in the salutations of Paul's epistles to the churches, or in his directions for the performance of relative duties.* Had prelacy been of apostolic origin; had Paul himself been distinguished for his zeal in establishing it, would there

not have been *something* in his epistles to the churches, appropriated to their chief officer? He gives very exact instructions to every other class of Christians; points out, minutely, their duties to each other; carefully distinguishes between presbyters and deacons; draws their respective characters, and assigns their functions; salutes individual ministers and private Christians, both men and women, by name; but no where says one syllable to the superiour grade of ministers! How is this fact to be explained? That Paul, who observed the most scrupulous propriety in all his addresses—who left no part of religious society any excuse for neglect of duty—who overlooked nothing which might tend to counsel, conciliate, or console—who carefully avoided every thing contemptuous or irritating—who was even solicitous, as we are told, to assert the dignity of prelates above that of presbyters—that this very Paul should take no manner of notice of them in his letters to their dioceses, should enjoin respect and obedience to their subalterns before their faces; and not so much as *hint* at the obedience which these subalterns owed to them, is past all belief! It would bespeak not a man of discretion; much less a wise man; less still, a great man; least of all an inspired apostle—but a downright idiot. He could not have fallen upon a more effectual method to disgrace them with their people; to encourage insubordination among their presbyters; and, by wantonly sporting with their feelings, to convert them into personal enemies. How then, we ask again, shall this omission be accounted for? It will not do to reply, that as the names of *bishop* and *presbyter* were promiscuously used, he joins them in

common directions, salutation, and honour. This answer relieves not the difficulty: for it cannot extend to the deacons, whom he expressly distinguishes from the presbyters. Well, then, he singles out the *lowest* order of clergy, pays them marked attention, and, by this very act, *insults* the prelates whom his silence had sufficiently mortified. Further, if one set of particular instructions suits different sets of officers, how can their *functions* be different? If the prerogative of the prelate consist in the power of ordination and government, how can his duties be comprised in a draught of instructions for officers who have no such power? It would be as rational to insist that the very same instructions would suit the governour of a province and the constable of a town. And did not every rule of decorum require, on the part of the apostle, a primary attention to that order which was emphatically to succeed him? that order, without which, we are taught the Christian church can have neither form nor government, nor ministry, nor sacraments, nor lawful assemblies; no, nor even existence? That *this* order should first be instituted by the apostle, and then passed over in absolute neglect when he is writing to their churches; or be lumped with their inferiours, while the grades of these inferiours are addressed in a manner which it is impossible to mistake, puts all credulity at defiance. The question, therefore, returns, How shall we solve this enigma in the conduct of Paul? The simple solution is, he takes no separate notice of *bishops* as superiour to *presbyters*, because no such bishops existed. Other solution there is none. For it is very certain that *after* their introduction they figured gloriously.

Whoever was left in the back ground, the bishop came conspicuously forward—whoever was thrown into the shade, the bishop was irradiated—whoever was treated with neglect, due homage to the bishop was never forgotten. Not such was the fact in the days of St. Paul; therefore, not such was the order which he had instituted.

2. Another presumption, if, indeed, it deserve not a higher name, against the episcopal construction of the New Testament facts, is, that one at least, of the two powers said to be vested exclusively in prelates, is clearly attributed to presbyters. We mean the power of *government*.

There are three terms employed in the New Testament to express the authority which is to be exercised in the Christian church, and they are *all* applied to presbyters. These terms are,

1. ἡγεσθαι—To take the lead.
2. προσημι—To stand before—to preside.
3. ποιμαίνει—To act the part, to fulfil the duties, of a shepherd.

Every power which Christ hath deputed to his officers, is conveyed by one or other of these terms.

For the greater precision we shall show, *first*, that they do express the power of government; and *then*, that each of them is applied to presbyters.

1. ΗΓΕΟΜΑΙ. To take the lead—signifies to “rule.” *Mat. ii. 6. Thou, Bethlehem, in the land of Judah, art not the least among the PRINCES (ἡγεμόσιν) of Judah; for out of thee shall come a GOVERNOUR (ἡγούμενος) that shall RULE my people Israel.* The force of the term, then, cannot be questioned. It is applied to presbyters.

Heb. xii. 7. Remember them which HAVE THE RULE OVER you. (ΤΙΣ ἡγούμενοι ὑμῶν your rulers). The apostle

is speaking of their deceased pastors; for he immediately adds, *who have spoken unto you the word of God; whose faith follow, considering the END, the issue or termination, of their conversation.*

Again,

V. 17. *Obey them that have the rule over you, (τοῖς ἡγουμένοις ὑμῶν) for they watch for your souls as they that must give account.*

That these "rulers" were presbyters, is evident from a single consideration; the apostle attributes the power of "ruling," to those deceased pastors who had preached the gospel to the Hebrew converts; and those living ones who "watched for their souls;" which are undeniably the functions of presbyters; therefore Paul recognizes in presbyters, all the power of government expressed by the first term—rulers.

2. ΠΡΟΙΣΤΗΜΙ, or ΠΡΟΙΣΤΑΜΑΙ. To stand or place before—to preside—to rule. 1. Tim. iii. 4. *A Bishop must be one that RULETH WELL (καλῶς προϊσταμενός) his own house.* The same in v. 5. 12*.

The power expressed by this term also, is applied to *Presbyters*.

1 Thess. v. 12. *We beseech you, brethren, to know them which labour among you, and ARE OVER YOU (προϊσταμένους) in the Lord.*

It is a description of ordinary faithful pastors; not of *prelates*, for there were *several* at Thessalonica; and diocesan Episcopacy admits of but *one* in a city. The whole description taken together, supposes the exercise of functions, and an intimacy of intercourse, among the people, which a prelate cannot possibly observe in his diocese; but

* For other references see *Raphelii Annot. Phil. in N. T. ad locum, & Schleusneri Novum Lexicon in N. T.*

which is exactly characteristic of the *Presbyter*. However, to put the matter out of all doubt, Paul charges Timothy, 1 Ep. v. 17. *Let the elders that RULE WELL (οἱ καλῶς προϊστάμενοι) be accounted worthy of double honour, &c.*

Presbyters they are, Episcopacy herself being judge: for this is one of the passages which she quotes to prove their inferiority in the church of Ephesus, to bishop Timothy. The Apostle, then, here formally attributes to presbyters the power of “ruling,” which we humbly conceive to be much the same with the power of “government.”

3. ΠΟΙΜΑΙΝΩ. To exercise the office of a shepherd; hence, to provide for the safety and comfort of any one—to direct, to control, to govern.

This term being more comprehensive than either of the former two, we crave the reader's indulgence to a minuter proof of the last mentioned acceptance, viz. to “govern.”

As early as the days of *Homer*, this word and its relatives were in familiar use, to designate not only authority, but the *highest* authority in the commonwealth. Thence that frequent Homeric phrase “the shepherd of the people,” for their “king.” No one who is in the least conversant with that pre-eminent poet will ask for examples; but lest we should be contradicted by such as are not, and yet wish to pass for “Greek scholars,” we subjoin a few; though at the hazard of being again reproved by Mr. *Hobart* for our “ostentation.”

————— Δρύατα τι ΠΟΙΜΕΝΑ λαόν.

II. A. 263.

“Dryas the SHEPHERD of the people”—which the

scholiast interprets by βασιλεὺς ὄχλων; "the KING of multitudes."

—πειθοῦντο τε ΠΟΙΜΕΝΙ λαῶν

Σκηπτουχοὶ βασιλεῖς.

II. B. 85.

"The sceptred kings yielded to the SHEPHERD of the people."—Where the scholiast again explains "shepherd" by "king." βασιλεῖς.

In the same poet, "shepherd" is used interchangeably with other terms descriptive of the military chiefs of Greece.

Αἰαν διογενεῖς, Τελαμωνεῖς, ΚΟΙΠΑΝΕ λαῶν.

II. I. 640.

Οἵτινες ΗΓΕΜΟΝΕΣ Δαναῶν καὶ ΚΟΙΠΑΝΟΙ ἦσαν. II. B. 487.

Those who are elsewhere called "shepherds," are here named "leaders" and "princes:" the former being interpreted "kings" by the scholiast, as he had already interpreted "shepherds." In the same way does he translate the latter, in his annotation upon v. 204, of the book last cited. So that by the great master of Grecian language and literature, the three terms, Ποιμῆν, Ἡγεμῶν, Κοιρανῶν, i. e. "shepherd," "leader," "prince," are interchangeably used of the same rank, and are all explained by the Greek commentator, βασιλεῖς, i. e. "king." Instances might easily be multiplied, but we forbear. We have the rather appealed to Homer, because he depicts that same state of society in which a great portion of the scriptures was written; and alludes to those same objects from which they have borrowed much of their imagery, and many of their terms.

Proceed we now to the septuagint version of the Old Testament, which was completed between two and three centuries before Christ. 2 Kings,

v. 2, in our version, 2 Sam. v. 2. *The Lord said unto thee, viz. David, thou shalt FEED (ποιμανεις, shalt act as a shepherd to) my people Israel, and thou shalt be a CAPTAIN (ηγουμενος) over Israel.*

Precisely the same sort of example is to be found in Ch. vii. 7, 1 Chron. ii. 2. xvii. 6; also Ps. xviii 14. *Death shall FEED upon (ποιμανι, shall have the rule over) them.*

The New Testament is equally decisive. *Mat. ii. 6. Thou, Bethlehem, in the land of Juda, art not the least among the princes of Juda; for out of thee shall come a GOVERNOUR (ηγουμενος) that shall RULE (ποιμανι, feed, superintend as a shepherd,) my people Israel.* The prophet speaks of our Lord Jesus Christ, who is the “good shepherd,” and the “chief shepherd;” and who had, and has, “the government upon his shoulder.” Is. ix. 6.

This term, likewise, is applied to Presbyters.

Acts xx. 17, 28. From Miletus, Paul sent to Ephesus, and called the PRESBYTERS of the church, and said unto them—Take heed unto yourselves, and to all the flock over which the Holy Ghost hath made you BISHOPS, to FEED (ποιμανεσθαι, like good shepherds, to provide for, watch over, and govern,) the church of God, &c.

1 Pet. v. 2, 3. The PRESBYTERS who are among you, I exhort, who am also a PRESBYTER. FEED (ποιμανιτε) the flock of God which is among you, taking the OVERSIGHT (επισκοπουσθε, discharging the duty of BISHOPS) thereof, not by constraint, but willingly; not for filthy lucre, but of a ready mind: Neither as being LORDS over God's heritage, but being ensamples to the flock.

It is obvious, upon the very face of the texts, that these presbyters of Ephesus, and of the dispersion,

are considered as vested with the pastoral care in all its extent; and they are commanded to be faithful to the trust reposed in them, by providing for the protection, nurture, and comfort of the flock of God. This "feeding" the flock, this discharge of the pastoral duty, is directly opposed by Peter, to being "lords over God's heritage," i. e. to rigorous and oppressive government; or, as we commonly say, to "lording it" over them. The contrast could have had no place, had not these presbyters been church governours; for it is idle to warn men against abusing a power which they do not possess. By instructing them *how* they were to govern the church, the Apostle has decided that the power of government was committed to them. No higher authority than he has recognized in them, can belong to the order of prelates. For the very same term by which he marks the power of the presbyters, is employed in scripture, to mark the authority of our Lord Jesus Christ himself*.

The reader cannot for a moment, suppose that we put any power left in the church, on a level with that of her divine master. Far from us be the thought of such blasphemy. But we contend for these two things.

1st. That the term which both Paul and Peter apply to the office of presbyters, undoubtedly expresses the power of *government*; seeing it is the term which expresses the office of Christ, as the *governour* of his people Israel.

2d. That as this term, applied to the office of Christ, expresses the highest power of government in him as the chief shepherd; so, when applied to

* Mat. ii. 6—*ἴγουμενος οστις ΠΟΙΜΑΝΕΙ τοῦ λαοῦ μου, &c.*

the office of the under shepherds, it expresses the highest power of government which he has delegated to be exercised in his name for the welfare of his church. But this power is vested, Paul and Peter being judges, in *presbyters*; therefore, *presbyters*, by the appointment of Jesus Christ, are invested with the highest power of government known in his church.

We go further: The authority conveyed by the charge to “*feed the flock of God,*” comprehends the ordering of *all things* necessary to her well being; and, therefore, the power of *ordination* likewise. An essential part of the Redeemer’s *pastoral* office, was, and is, to provide under-pastors for his sheep. This, at first, he did in person, by immediate vocation. But having “*ascended up far above all heavens, that he might fill all things,*” he performs the same office through the medium of the pastors whom he has left in the church. The question is to *what* pastors has he committed the trust of ordaining *other* pastors, and thus preserving the pastoral succession? We answer, to *presbyters*: for he has affixed to their office, that very term which designates his own right and care to furnish his church with pastors, or lawful ministers. Let our Episcopal brethren show as much for their prelates, if they can.

To sum up what has been said on this article: No expressions more clear and decisive than those we have considered, are used in the scripture to denote either the communication, or the possession, or the exercise, of the ordinary powers given by Christ for the well ordering of his church. And we have shown, that the New Testament has, in the most direct and ample manner, confided them *all* to *presbyters*.

Unless, therefore, we adopt the insane paradox of Hammond, viz. that the presbyters of the New Testament were all diocesan bishops, the passages quoted must bear one of two senses. Either they point out, under the denomination of presbyters, those officers who are strictly so called, in contradistinction from prelates and deacons; or they use the name with sufficient latitude to include the prelates too. If the former, our position is established. If the latter, then prelates and presbyters are *joined together* in the power of government, which the hierarchy maintains is confined to prelates alone. In either way, the argument is conclusive against her.

3d. At a very early period of the Christian church, presbyters did *actually exercise* the power of government: exercised it in conjunction with the apostles themselves; and that upon the principle of parity.

The important question concerning the obligation upon Christians to be circumcised and keep the law of Moses, in order to salvation, was referred by the church at Antioch, to the apostles and elders at Jerusalem. The historian does not mean apostles and elders who had a fixed and permanent charge at Jerusalem, which was essentially incompatible with their apostolic vocation. But as that city had been the cradle of the Christian church, and was the centre of religious communication from all parts of the world, the apostles returned thither from their excursions in preaching the gospel, accompanied with Elders or Presbyters from the churches which they had planted, and met together in ecclesiastical council to consult about their common interest. Herein they have set us the example, and left us the warrant,

of a *delegated body*, as the ultimate resort in all ecclesiastical affairs: for, such a body, to all intents and purposes, was the assemblage of the apostles and elders at Jerusalem. Of this most venerable primitive Synod, we treat no further at present than to ascertain what share the *presbyters* had in its proceedings. The following things appear indisputable.

1st. The apostles and presbyters met in common; that is, they formed but *one* assembly. Of a “house of bishops,” and a “house of clerical and lay delegates,” they had no idea. This improvement in church-government was reserved for discovery by those who have been trained in the school of the “judicious*” *Hooker*.

2d. The *right* of the presbyters to sit in judgment with the apostles upon all ecclesiastical concerns, which were not to be decided by special revelation, was well understood in the churches.

The proof of this proposition lies in the *very terms* of the reference from Antioch. For it is inconceivable, how the church there should think of submitting a question, so weighty in itself, and so extensive in its consequences, to the “elders,”

* This appellation was bestowed upon Hooker by James VI. who was delighted, beyond measure, with his famous work on *ecclesiastical polity*. And delighted with it for the same reason which, no doubt, ravished the heart of Cardinal *Allen*, and Pope *Clement* the VIII.* viz. that the *principle* of *Hooker's* book, and the scope of his argument, are to prove the right of the church to model her government as she shall judge for edification. We shall touch this subject again. Does not the reader suppose that this must be a truly *Protestant* work, which excited the admiration and rapture of the pope and his cardinals!

* *Hooker's* life, p. 78, 79. Works, vol. 1. 8vo.

conjointly with the "apostles," if they had not been taught that presbyters were the ordinary church governours, and were to continue such after the decease of the others. This explains why they went up with the apostles to Jerusalem. It was not only to give them opportunities of information; but also, if not chiefly, to learn the proper mode of dispatching the public business. Before this council or synod, composed of apostles and elders, was the interesting reference from Antioch laid; by them was it discussed, and by them decided.

3. The apostles, on this occasion, acted simply as members of the synod; they did nothing in virtue of their extraordinary, which was their apostolical, character, nor introduced into the deliberations of the assembly, any influence but that of *facts*; of the *written scripture*; and of *reasoning* founded on the comparison of both. All this is evident from the narrative in the fifteenth chapter of the Acts; and resulted from the nature of the case. Had the question been to be determined by *special revelation* or *apostolic authority*, one inspired man, or one apostle, would have answered as well as a dozen. The dispute might have been settled on the spot, and by Paul himself. Had there arisen any doubt of his power, or distrust of his integrity, a hundred miracles, if necessary, would instantly have removed the obstacle. In every view, the embassy to Jerusalem would have been an useless parade.

The truth is, that the apostles acted in a *double* capacity. They had that authority which was designed to be ordinary and perpetual, such as preaching the word, administering the sacraments, and governing the church. But superadded to

this, they had also the authority of special messengers for extraordinary and temporary purposes. If a new church was to be founded among the nations—if any part of the rule of faith was to be revealed—if a particular emergency required a particular interposition; in these and similar cases, their extraordinary character found its proper objects: they “spoke as they were moved by the Holy Ghost:” their judgment was infallible, and their authority paramount. But for the *ordinary* government of the church, or any part of it, they do not appear to have enjoyed these extraordinary communications of the divine spirit; nor to have exerted their extraordinary powers; nor to have claimed a particle of authority above the presbyters. Without such a distinction as we have now stated, their history is a tissue of inconsistencies, and their conduct in the synod of Jerusalem must be given up as a riddle that baffles solution.

Seeing, therefore, that in the apostolic epistles and salutations to the churches, there is no mention of prelates, although there is frequent mention of presbyters and deacons—that presbyters are formally addressed as possessing the power of government—and that they actually did exercise it in matters of the highest moment, the advocate for diocesan episcopacy must adduce *scriptural facts* to support him under the depressing weight of all these considerations. As he maintains that prelates are at least of apostolic origin; and that they *alone* succeeded the apostles in the powers of ordination and government, his *facts* must not only be *plausible* when detached from their place and bearings in the Christian history, and when decorated with appendages of his own imagina-

tion; but they must accord with the *language* of the New Testament, and with its *narrative*; they must be so *decisive* as to annihilate the foregoing difficulties; and must not admit of a fair and rational explanation upon Presbyterian principles. With such facts, he tells us, he is ready to confront us. Our curiosity is awake: let us look at them without further delay.

He refers us for one fact, to that same synod of Jerusalem which we have just left. We must go back again.

"If from Crete," says Cyprian, "we pass to Jerusalem, we shall there discover equally striking evidence* that St. James, the brother of our Lord, possessed in that place the pre-eminence of a bishop in the church. In the first council that was held there, in order to determine the controversy which had arisen in regard to the circumcision of Gentile converts, we find him pronouncing an authoritative sentence. His sentence, we remark also, determined the controversy. "Wherefore my sentence is, says he, that we trouble not those who from among the Gentiles are turned unto God." In Acts xxi. 17 and 18, we are told, "that when St. Paul and his company were come to Jerusalem, the brethren received him gladly; and that the next day following, Paul went in with them unto James, and all the Elders or Presbyters were present." Acts xii. 17, it is said, that "Peter, after he had declared to the Christians to whom he went, his miraculous deliverance, bade them go and show these things to James and to the brethren." In Galatians ii. 12, St. Paul says, "that certain came from James," that is, from

* What this "striking evidence" is, remains to be seen hereafter. We shall reduce the out-works of the hierarchy before we close in upon her citadel. This is the Episcopal character of Timothy and Titus, as her chieftains confess, and as their anxiety to defend it sufficiently indicates, even without their confession. In the mean time, we believe Cyprian to be pretty correct in making the evidence for the episcopate of James at Jerusalem, to be "*equally striking*" with that of Titus's at Crete. For we hope to prove that in both cases it amounts to just nothing at all!

the church of Jerusalem to the church of Antioch. Surely these passages strongly indicate that James held the highest dignity in the church of Jerusalem. The brethren carry Paul and his company to him as to a supreme officer. He has presbyters and deacons in subordination to him. When messengers are sent from Jerusalem to other churches, it is not done in the name of the presbyters and deacons, or of the church of this place; it is done in the name of James. Do not these considerations prove James was the supreme ruler of that church?"

The first argument of Cyprian for the episcopal pre-eminence of James, is, that he pronounced in the synod of Jerusalem, "an *authoritative sentence*;" and that "*his sentence determined the controversy.*" The proof is, that expression in his speech to the council, "Wherefore, *my sentence* is, that we trouble not those who from "among the Gentiles are turned unto God." *Acts xv. 19.*

We are under the necessity of objecting, for the *third* time, to these writers, that they put into the mouth of the person whom they quote, declarations which he never uttered. They will make James deliver an authoritative sentence as the bishop of Jerusalem. They, perhaps, could not help themselves, as they have only followed their file leaders. *Potter* had said the same thing; and they took it as they found it. But the editor of *Lycophron*, and author of the "*Antiquities of Greece*," was "a scholar, and a ripe and good one." He knew that he was standing on slippery ground; and so to save his own reputation, he slyly fathers his construction of James's words upon old *Hesychius**.

* *Discourse on Church Government*, p. 91. In a note, the learned prelate cites *Hesychius* as thus distinguishing—"Peter ad-
VOL. I.—N^o. IV. 3 M

But in opposition to Cyprian, and the Layman, and archbishop Potter, and Hesychius too, we shall show,

1. That there is nothing in the language of James, from which it can be inferred that he, as the superiour officer, pronounced an *authoritative sentence*, and,

2. That it was *impossible* for him to pronounce such a sentence.

The *first* point is to be settled by a critical examination of his phraseology. His words are, Διο εγω ΚΡΙΝΩ, which our translators have rendered “*Wherefore MY SENTENCE is.*”

The primitive meaning of the word is to *discriminate, to separate, to select, to arrange*. Thus Homer,

————— Διμητηρ

ΚΡΙΝΕΙ, επειγομενων ανεμων, ΚΑΡΙΟΝ τε και ΑΧΝΑΣ.

Il. E. 501.

“*Separates, by the winds, the chaff from the wheat.*”

————— ΚΡΙΝΑΣ τ' ανα δημον αρισους.

Od. Δ. 666.

“*Selecting the most valiant throughout the people.*”

ΚΡΙΝ' ανδρας κατα φυλα.

Il. B. 362.

“*Arrange the men according to their nations.*”

From this primitive notion, the word, by a very natural transition, came to signify the formation

dresses the council; but James enacts the law.” Πιτρο; δημηγορει, αλλ' Ιακωβος νομοθετει. Potter's precaution passed unobserved. The reason probably is, that it was locked up in the quotation from Hesychius. “*Gracum est; et non potest legi!*” said the Trojans of Oxford, whenever a line of Greek came in their way.

of an opinion, or judgment, and the expression of it when formed, because no opinion or judgment can exist without a previous process by which the mind *discriminates* between its own perceptions. And thus the word is familiarly used by writers both profane and sacred.

—μισου δε πλεον η δικη ΚΡΙΝΑΝΤΕΣ.

“*Forming their opinion* rather from hatred than justice,” says Thucydides of the Plataeans, with respect to their *judgment* of the Thebans*.

—την διακοσμησιν και ταξιν ΚΡΙΝΕΙΝ ου τυχης—ειγαι κασκευασματα.

“*To think* that the beautiful order of the universe is not the production of fortune †.”

—τη τουτο ΚΡΙΝΕΙΣ.

“*Why dost thou think* so? upon what ground art thou of *this opinion* †?”

In the speech of Hermocrates to the Syracusans; as recorded by Thucydides, there is a perfect parallel to the expression of James.

“*We shall consult*,” says he, “if we be in our right minds, not only our own immediate interests; but whether we shall be able still to preserve all Sicily, against which, *in my judgment*, the Athenians are plotting ‡.”

The same use of the word is so common in the New Testament, that examples are almost superfluous. We shall, however, subjoin a few, because they will bring our criticism more directly within the reach of the unlearned reader.

Luke vii. 43. Simon said—I suppose that he to whom he forgave most. And he said unto him,

* *Thucyd. III. 67. p. 209. ed Dukeri.* † *Diod. Sic. Lib. xii. 84. Tom. I. p. 491, ed Wessel.* ‡ *Aristoph. Plut. v. 48. p. 9. ed Kusteri.*

§ —ου περι των ιδιων μονον, ει σωφρονωμεν, η συτοδος εσται' αλλ' ει επιβουλευομενην την πασαν Σικελιαν, ΩΣ ΕΓΩ ΚΡΙΝΩ, υπ' Αθηναίων, δυνασομεθα επι διασωσαι. *Thucyd. iv. 60. p. 272. ed Dukeri.*

Thou hast *rightly judged* (ορθως ΕΚΡΙΝΑΣ.) Simon's judgment was surely not an *official* one. It was simply his *opinion*, or *conclusion*, from the case proposed to him.

John vii. 24. JUDGE *not* (ΜΗ ΚΡΙΝΕΤΕ) *according to the appearance*, but JUDGE *righteous* JUDGMENT (ΚΡΙΣΙΝ ΚΡΙΝΑΤΕ.) No "authoritative sentence" is contemplated here.

Acts xii. 46. *Seeing—ye* JUDGE *yourselves* (ΚΡΙΝΕΤΕ) *unworthy*, &c.

2 Cor. v. 14, 15. *The love of Christ constraineth us, because we thus* JUDGE (ΚΡΙΝΑΝΤΑΣ ταυτο) &c. "Concerning the love of Christ," saith Paul, "this is our *sentiment*, our *mode of reasoning*, that if one died for all," &c.

In every one of the preceding quotations, the very same word is used which occurs in the speech of James, and, in the very same sense. It is the plainest Greek imaginable to express the *result of one's reflections*. This is all that the words of James imply. He spoke among the last; he availed himself of the discussion which had already taken place: And when his opinion was matured, he submitted it to the council in the form of a temperate and conciliatory proposition. We ask any man of plain sense, to look over the chapter, and say whether this is not a natural and satisfactory account of the whole affair. Little did the guileless disciple suspect that his familiar and innocent expression, would be converted, in these latter days, into a certificate of his being a diocesan bishop! And had not the "proofs" of the hierarchy been, like lords' wits, rather "thinly sown," she would never have attempted to cull one from a form of speech which might have been adopted by the obscurest member of the coun-

cil, with as much propriety as by James himself.

We have neither interest nor disposition to conceal what is well known to even smatterers in Greek, that the term which we have shown to be familiarly used to signify the expression of *opinion generally*; is also used, and with equal familiarity, in a more *restricted* sense, of a *judicial* opinion; or, if you prefer it, an “authoritative sentence.” But then it always *presupposes the judicial or authoritative character* of the person to whom it is applied. Thus the senses of the word rank.

1. To discriminate—to select—to arrange.—Thence,

2. To form a judgment—to express an opinion,—and thence,

3. To pronounce an official judgment; or “an authoritative sentence.”

But who does not see that you must first know under *what circumstances* a person is represented as speaking or acting, before you can determine whether the writer intends, by the word we are considering, a mere *selection* of one thing from a number of others? or an *opinion* as expressed in conversation or debate? or a *solemn judicial sentence*? Had the prelatie dignity of James been *first established*; and had the synod at Jerusalem been a *convocation of his clergy*, there would have been a propriety in attributing to him an “authoritative” decision, and interpreting his words accordingly. But to argue from his “my sentence is,” that he *was* a prelate, is completely begging the question. The argument *assumes* that he was the bishop of Jerusalem; for this is indispensable to that “authority” which Cyprian ascribes

to his words ; and it is exactly taking for granted, the thing to be proved.

Another unfortunate circumstance for the Episcopal construction of James's speech is, that it contradicts the sacred historian. In the very next chapter he tells us, that Paul and Silas delivered to the cities through which they passed, " the decrees for to keep, that were *ordained* (ΚΕΚΡΙΜΕΝΑ) " of the *apostles and elders*." Ch. xvi. 4. *Cyprian* says that *James* pronounced the " authoritative sentence." The inspired historian says, that it was pronounced by the *apostles and elders*. Both cannot be true ; and we are inclined to think that the rector of the episcopal church in Albany, cannot stand in the judgment, even with Potter and Hesychius to back him. The affront put upon the narrative of Luke is the more conspicuous, as the term which, in the mouth of James, is tortured into an " authoritative sentence," here occurs in that sense most unequivocally : because the reference from Antioch was brought before the *tribunal* of the apostles and elders. They were recognized as *Judges having cognizance of the question* ; and theirs was, of course, an authoritative sentence. James was, indeed, *one* of the judges ; he acted in his judicial character, but that character was common to him with every other member of the council ; and like theirs, his only influence was that of his wisdom and his vote. The scripture, then, being judge, it is incontestible, that he did NOT pronounce an " authoritative sentence."

Our *second* position is, that it was *impossible* for James to exercise such a power as the advocates of Episcopacy attribute to him. Our proofs are these :

1. The cause was not referred to him ; and accordingly it was not tried in the court of “ St. James ;” but in the court of the “ apostles and elders,” as the representatives of the Christian church.

2. It could not be referred to him ; nor could he, as bishop of Jerusalem, have any cognizance of it ; Antioch being entirely without his jurisdiction.

3. The decision of the council was received and obeyed with alacrity through the churches of Asia. But had it been pronounced by an authority so limited and local as that of the bishop of Jerusalem, the effect must have been very different. Unless we should suppose, that all the Asiatic cities through which Paul and Silas passed, were subject to the see of Jerusalem ; and, then, we shall not only spoil the Episcopal argument from the seven angels of Asia ; but shall overturn the whole system of the hierarchy, as it is pretended to have been established by apostolic ordination : because we shall admit, that, instead of fixing bishops at proper distances for governing the church within convenient dioceses, the apostles put the immense regions of Asia under a spiritual head in the land of Judea. Indeed, we have always thought it hard, upon the Episcopal plan, that, considering the importance and the wealth of Antioch, not a bishop could be mustered for that distinguished city ; but she must go for direction all the way to the prelate of Jerusalem !

4. The assembly in which James delivered his speech was not composed of clergy belonging to his diocese ; and, therefore, he could not, even upon episcopal principles, pronounce an “ authoritative sentence. The reason is obvious : he could

not exercise authority over those who were not under his control. There were present at the council, not only "presbyters," but "apostles." Peter was there, Paul was there, and how many others, we do not know. Had James then pronounced an "authoritative sentence," he had been above not only all the presbyters of his own diocese, but above all the deputies from Antioch; above all the members of the council from whatever part of the world; above the apostles themselves! Look then, at this *fact* of the hierarchy. It turns the very apostles into mere make-weights of bishop James! It sets up an authority much more like that of a visible head of the church catholic, than the papists have ever been able to produce for their "St. Peter!" If this is *not* a "bold stroke" for a bishop, pray, gentlemen, what is? And if any of our readers can digest such a dish of absurdity, we wish him much comfort of his meal!

We shall not trespass long upon the patience of either our friends or our foes, in disposing of the "remains" of Cyprian's proofs. "When St. Paul and his company were come to Jerusalem, the brethren received him gladly, and the next day following, Paul went in with them unto James, and all the elders or presbyters were present." It was rather rustic in Paul not to pay his court to the bishop *first*. We have learnt, at the expense of some mortification, that in New-York any communication with the clergy, on ecclesiastical matters, except through the medium of the bishop, is an invasion of episcopal order. But Paul must be pardoned for committing an oversight, especially as Cyprian, to be even with him, has done so too. He has stopped at that part of the narrative which, in his eyes, holds

James forth in something of bishop-like majesty, and forgot to tell the rest of the story. The reader, no doubt, would expect to hear of a very pointed conference between James and the Apostle, all the presbyters listening with due humility to their superiours; but if he turn to the history, (Acts xxi.) he will find these same presbyters most uncivilly advising the apostle; and what is still worse, telling him that *they* had decided the reference from Antioch. Cyprian asserts that *James* made the decision. They, on the contrary, have the assurance to tell the apostle Paul, in the presence of James himself, that the *presbyters* had decided it. And all this while not a word of bishop James! In the following ages the presbyters were taught better manners.

But then, it seems, that after Peter's "miraculous deliverance, he bade the Christians go and show these things to James, and to the brethren"—Also, that "certain came from *James*, that is, from the church of Jerusalem to the church of Antioch." Therefore, James was bishop of Jerusalem! Very sagely and conclusively reasoned! As if such things did not happen every day in places where there are ministers of the gospel distinguished by their talent or standing. The writer of this review stepped the other evening into the the house of that venerable Christian veteran, the Reverend Dr. Rodgers, and found there "certain brethren" who had just come from one of their judicatories. It is quite common for people to talk of Dr. Rodgers' sending ministers to preach; and even to designate his denomination, as Dr. Rodgers' church! There-

VOL. I.—No. IV. 3 N

fore Dr. Rodgers is bishop of New-York; and primate of the Presbyterian church in North-America!!

“Thus endeth the first lesson,” which is concerning Cyprian’s “striking evidence” that James was bishop of Jerusalem.

(To be continued.)

ART X. “*An Apology for apostolic order and its advocates, occasioned by the strictures and denunciations of the Christian’s Magazine. In a series of letters addressed to the Rev. John M. Mason, D. D. editor of that work. By the Rev. John Henry Hobart, an assistant minister of Trinity Church.*” 8vo. pp. 273. New-York, T. & J. Swords, 1807. \$1 50.

THE purpose of these letters, as their title indicates, is to depress the credit, and resist the influence, of the *Christian’s Magazine*. That this work has claims to the dislike of high churchmen, we affect not to deny. One of its objects, although by no means the *primary* one, is to investigate, generally, the pretensions of the Episcopal hierarchy. As a means for accomplishing this particular end, it commenced a review of that “*Collection of Essays*,” which Dr. *Hobart* republished in a single volume, with comments of his own. The

reason of bringing his "collection" to a rigorous test, was not any thing original or peculiar in the "essays" themselves, but a conviction that when they should be fairly disposed of, neither Dr. H. nor *Cyprian*, nor the *Layman*, nor *Cornelius*, nor their friends, would have any more to say. Had these writers been shut up with their bibles, their "Lexicons," and the fathers to whom they are constantly referring, a very small part of their lucubrations would have seen the light. Not *they*, but Archbishop *Potter*, and other, the most powerful advocates of the Episcopal church, are the *real* authors, under the signatures of *Cyprian*, the *Layman*, &c. The gentlemen who own these papers, must put up with the humbler praise of amanuenses to their greater predecessors. This they know as well as we; and they know too, what we also know, that when their arguments in the aforesaid collection shall be expended, the stock, to use a mercantile phrase, *the stock in trade will be out*.

Considering, therefore, that in taking up these essayists, the C. M. is directing its fire not against straggling detachments of her light infantry, but against her heavy armed troops, against her picked veterans, it was determined to begin with the hierarchy, as they ought to do who intend to proceed, and never to stop till they have successively cut her columns in pieces. And to this determination, however it may be relished, the C. M. will most religiously adhere.

The cry which is already set up, sufficiently ascertains the nature of the first impression. Dr. H.'s letters do not surprise us. We were aware that a style of criticism more decisive than has been customary in our literary journals, would,

of itself, be in the eyes of many, an offence never to be expiated. But having counted the cost before we ventured upon the enterprise ; having met with no opposition which we did not anticipate ; and seeing no cause to repent of the steps which we have already taken, we shall continue to act upon the principle of reviewing authors, *as authors*, without regard to their party connexions ; of calling things by their proper names ; and of expressing ourselves as we think men ought to do who believe what they say ; and who believe it to be important as well as true.

The letters before us we do not profess to answer. It would be incompatible with the limits of our miscellany ; and we frankly acknowledge that, on some accounts, they are *unanswerable*. No man can refute rant, passion, or personal abuse. And if every thing composed of these items were expunged, Dr. H.'s pages would probably be, both in appearance and meaning, not very unlike the poem which the satirical critic amended by drawing his pen through every other line. Had the editor of the Christian's Magazine no other concern with these letters than is created by their effect on him as an individual and a presbyterian, he would have left them to their own operation, unmolested and unnoticed. But as the conductor of a periodical work to which the public has extended no common share of favour, and which more than Dr. H. have an interest in suppressing, he owes to his own responsibility, the compliment of a few strictures on that gentleman's volume.

The first number of the Christian's Magazine contains only *preliminary* remarks on the nature of the Episcopal pretensions. The second enters

no further into their merits, than to state and enforce the argument for ministerial parity, drawn from the official titles of the New Testament; and to show that the contempt which the advocates of the hierarchy always pour upon it, arises from their perceiving that it is fatal to their cause; and, therefore, *per fas per nefas*, by fair means or by foul, must be set aside. Dr. H. not content with endeavouring to avert this blow from his church, has thought proper to retread the *whole* of the controverted ground: and, in defending her from the "denunciations," as he terms them, of the *Christian's Magazine*, to expatiate, at great length, upon several material topics, which it had not so much as touched. We have no objection. But as he has said nothing relative to the main question, which, for substance, had not already been said in the "collection" under review, we shall not now follow him. All that we judge of sufficient moment shall be noticed as we come up with it, in the regular course of discussion. We only pledge ourselves to prove, in the proper place, that with regard to the *essential facts*, his book is a mass of misrepresentations; and such misrepresentations, that when they are corrected, his argument perishes. Neither shall we here survey the *caricatura* which he has drawn of the Calvinistic doctrines. We reserve this for a separate criticism. We only express our regret that he has permitted himself to assail them in that same style of invective in which the Socinians vent their rancour against the atonement; and the infidels theirs against revelation.

Our review, therefore, of Dr. H.'s letters shall be chiefly confined to his reflections on those points which are treated of in the first two

numbers of the Christian's Magazine. If our remarks ramble, the reader will remember, that Dr. H.'s being a desultory writer, is no fault of ours; and that we must take his works as he is pleased to publish them. But crude and rhapsodical as his letters are, they pursue, with undeviating consistency, two objects which continually force themselves upon the reader's attention. The first is to defeat the Christian's Magazine by rendering the Editor *personally odious*: and the second, to overthrow the *Presbyterians*, by inspiring a detestation of *Calvinism*. In the prosecution of this design, assertions and insinuations are huddled together with as little respect to facts, as if the principal business were not to write truth, but to *write*; and at the same time with an air of as great confidence as if the rev. writer really knew what he is saying. Merely to show how closely his pen is leagued with the genius of mistake, we shall adduce two or three instances, which are in themselves of little significance.

“ All the original productions in the number of the Magazine before me, with the exception of the essay on the Visible Church, point, with resistless evidence, to you as the author.” p. 2.

The fact is quite otherwise. But it is not uncommon for Dr. H. and his friends to find “ striking evidence,” and “ resistless evidence,” of things which do not exist. However, as he has happened to guess *right wrong*, he is at liberty to guess again in his next *octavo*.

“ During this period,” viz. more than two years, “ the plan of the Christian's Magazine has been arranging, materials collecting, and the matter preparing that was to enrich its pages. There has been full time for chastening the indignant and passionate review of *the Essays on Episcopacy*, by the gentle dictates of judgment and charity. The in-

temperate spirit which it breathes is left without even the excuse of precipitancy and rashness." p. 7, 8.

This paragraph requires no comment. Its undisguised purpose is to fix upon the editor the imputation of some of the worst passions that can rankle in the human heart. Dr. H. has forgotten his self-respect in alleging a false fact to justify a "railing accusation." His account of the Christian's Magazine, so far as we have quoted it, is a pure fabrication. But it is his unhappiness very often to deal out fiction, when he should be relating history.

Dr. H. derives consolation from defending the cause of Episcopacy in the same ranks with the

"Eminent and revered bishops HALL, ANDREWS, SANDERSON, TAYLOR, BEVERIDGE, POTTER, WAKE, WILSON, HORNE, HORSELEY; the learned and pious divines, CHILLINGWORTH, HAMMOND, LESLIE, JONES; and "a legion more," illustrious for talents, for learning, and *piety*." p. 11.

Our reason for quoting this paragraph is, its classing bishop *Horseley* with Hall and Beveridge, as a man of *piety*. "Illustrious for talents and learning" he certainly was: but "*piety*" is the last thing of which his memory will be accused by any one acquainted with public character in Britain. On this subject we shall not tell all we know; but hold ourselves responsible for the truth of our assertion, which we should very reluctantly verify by specifying authentic particulars. We have no pleasure in stating such a fact at all; but mention it only as a strong instance of Dr. H.'s haste and inaccuracy; as a proof that his readers are not safe in relying upon his representations. We do not say nor insinuate that they are *wilfully* inaccurate; but that he is incessantly falling into error in matters of fact. If an

inquirer be misled, it is the same to *him* whether his guide deceive him intentionally, carelessly, or ignorantly. Dr. H. has placed himself irretrievably in the predicament of those writers who "know a little, suppose much, and so jump to a conclusion"—which conclusion is generally wrong.

Dr. H. whether through oversight or design, we undertake not to decide, has coupled his subject as much as possible with personal feeling. By introducing the names of denominations and of individuals into the very heart of the argument in such a manner as to make them almost inseparable, he has reduced us to the dilemma of either saying nothing, and then our silence would be interpreted as it should suit the interpreter; or of exposing ourselves to the charge of personal rudeness. The C. M. scrupulously avoided all such references. It was not from want of power, but from a conviction of their impropriety, that it did not adopt them, with galling effect, on certain individuals who shall still be nameless. If therefore any thing that may be thought unceremonious shall drop from our pen, the displeased reader must hold Dr. H. accountable.

After a very grotesque, and, as we think, unseemly, parody on the official phraseology of the President of the United States, and a shrewd hint that *fear* was a principal cause of delaying the appearance of the C. M. Dr. H. thus explains the commencement of the discussions which are now taking place.

"A hero, however, no less renowned than the Rev. Dr. Linn, not taught wisdom by the salutary lessons which he had received some years ago from the "Right Rev. Prelate of New-York," in a theological contest, felt all the vi-

gour and ardour of his youthful days renewed. Indignant at this delay, and spurning the restraints of his compeers, he rushed forward to spread dismay among the Episcopalians, and, single-handed, cover them with defeat. In his numbers styled "Miscellanies," published in the Albany Centinel, he attacked the principles of the Episcopalians. He was instantly met—met, and vanquished, by *striplings* inferior to this venerable giant in literature and theology, in every thing but the goodness of their cause, and judgment in defending it." p. 3, 4.

The custom of leaping at Rhodes*, we perceive is still in fashion. It will be time enough for Dr. H. to boast of his stripling-friends having "vanquished" Dr. L. when the *fact* is ascertained. The testimony in evidence is not yet closed. The courteous manner of using Dr. Linn, as a foil not only to the "Right Rev. Prelate," but to the "striplings" who are his equals in "judgment," is entirely in the spirit of a system very prevalent among the sons of the hierarchy—the system of praising each other.

In this instance, however, the panegyrist has overshot his mark. Of all the human faculties judgment arrives the last at maturity; for it depends the most upon experience, and is, for that reason, the least cultivated in youth of the very best natural endowments. Had we put an Episcopal gentleman of acknowledged abilities and literature, on a level with any of our own "striplings" in the article of "judgment," we could hardly have hoped to escape with a rebuke for being merely indecorous. We refer observations like these to Dr. H's. less precipitate moments. In the mean time, as he has introduced his diocesan to our notice, in a manner which cannot but be flattering to his connexions, we shall embrace this occasion of present-

* Vide Esop's Fables, F. 14. ed. Oxon. 1718.

ing to our readers a sample of that "salutary" instruction which he bestowed, without effect, on Dr. Linn.

It was not our wish to say a word which might have an unfriendly aspect toward a prelate who is deservedly esteemed in society, and is distinguished for amiable manners, and polite literature. But as Dr. H. has employed his pencil in historical painting, we cannot refuse to look at his picture, and to supply what is lacking in its explanation. Yonder, in the back ground, lies a hapless wight; his head uncovered, his weapons shivered, his body transfixed. This, the painter informs us, is Dr. Linn, the presbyterian, who has just reaped the reward of his folly in not profiting by the "salutary lessons which he had received some years ago from the Right Rev. Prelate of New-York." Alas, my brother! More conspicuous on the canvas are two figures in an erect attitude; their backs are toward the prostrate presbyter, and their ruddy countenances express the triumph of conquerors. These, the painter tells us, are the "striplings," who have just avenged their *Alma Mater*, the hierarchy, by making the wicked presbyter aforesaid, who had breathed upon her good name, to "bite the dust."—Here,

Above the rest

In shape and gesture proudly eminent,

is portrayed a personage who, the painter lets us know, is the prelate already mentioned. We were somewhat anxious to learn the particulars of his prowess; but the painter stopped short, and we were obliged to repair to other sources of information. Having, in common with other people, a little memory, we recollected something very like

a "gigantic" feat, in the contest to which Dr. H. alludes in the extract quoted above. We turned to the pamphlets of the day, and in one of them met with the following sentences.

"There is a general propensity in men *to form gods unto themselves*; in contemplating the character of the Deity, to dwell chiefly on those attributes which are most congenial to the prevailing dispositions of their own hearts. The mild, the meek, the merciful, love to describe God as a being whose *tender mercies are over all his works*; the passionate, the arrogant, the tyrannical, take delight in speaking of him as an almighty sovereign, *who worketh all things according to the purpose of his own will*, and whose glory is as much displayed in the perdition of sinners, as it is in the salvation of the righteous*."

The reader will observe that the words in Italics are scriptural expressions. The last occurs in *Eph. i. 11*. "In whom also we have obtained an inheritance, being predestinated according to the purpose of him *who worketh all things after the counsel of his own will*."

Dr. Moore says, that they are the "passionate, the arrogant, and the tyrannical," who take delight in such a representation of God. Yet this is the representation given of him by the inspired apostle; and that, when he is celebrating in the fulness of gratitude, of tenderness, and of love, *the praise of the glory of God's grace wherein he hath made us accepted in the Beloved. v. 6*.

This is a representation on which the scriptures dwell as much as upon any other. Nor is there

* See *The doctrine of baptismal regeneration vindicated against the objections of Dr. Linn, and others: to which is added, Dr. Waterland's discourse on the same subject. By BENJAMIN MOORE, D D. New-York, Printed by Hugh Gaime, at the Bible, in Hanover-Square, 1793. p. 20.*

scarcely either a prophet or an apostle, but will have, by Dr. Moore's rule, the brand of passion, and arrogance, and tyranny, imprinted on him. Will he maintain that there is *any* attribute of God, which "the mild, the meek, the merciful," do not delight to contemplate? Then he will maintain that there are attributes of God at variance with mildness, and meekness, and mercy. Then, if we *rejoice* because *the Lord reigneth*—if we pray that *his will may be done in earth as it is done in heaven*, where it is never disputed, and must be absolute—if we join with the *nations of the saved*—with the *holy apostles and prophets*—with the very *heaven*, in *rejoicing* at the execution of the divine judgments*, we must be turned over among the "passionate, the arrogant, the tyrannical."

It would be well if this stroke of Dr. M. struck no deeper: but since the passage which he has pointed out as congenial with the prevailing dispositions of the "passionate, the arrogant, the tyrannical," together with innumerable passages of the same sort, were dictated by the Holy Spirit, the implication is very strong, that there are some of Jehovah's perfections in which he himself does not delight; or else he, too, must be smitten with the charge of passion, and arrogance, and tyranny!

We make these remarks with more pain than we wish our opponents ever to suffer. Dr. H. has compelled us.

(To be continued.)

* *Rev. xviii. 20. xix. 1—7.* The precise view under which the millennial church is represented as delighting in God; is that of an "Almighty sovereign." *Alleluia! for the LORD GOD OMNIPOTENT reigneth. v. 6.*

RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCE.

FOREIGN.

*SOUTH-SEA MISSION.**(Continued from p. 235.)*

AT Port Jackson, they found that their missionary brethren who had fled thither from Otaheite, had not enjoyed that security which was expected. Mr. Clode had been murdered by one of the soldiers, who was executed for the crime. Mr. Hassall had been robbed and dangerously wounded by six ruffians, who broke into the house where he lodged. So feeble were their hopes of usefulness in that situation, and so great were their fears for their own safety, that Mr. Cover and his wife thought it prudent to embark with Buchanan, Kelso, and Wilkinson, who sailed for England in September. Mr. Cooper followed them in the beginning of the next year; and Mr. Shelley sometime afterwards joined the missionaries at Otaheite*.

In this island, the period which had been so distressing at Tongataboo, produced little which is of importance to the mission, except the depart-

* *Trans. Miss. Soc.* vol. 1. p. 317—322.

ure of Mr. Harris to Port Jackson*, the return of Mr. Henry†, and the excommunication of Mr. Broomhall. This gentleman had for a considerable time entertained, and occasionally avowed, notions which were quite Deistical. He at last made an open and explicit declaration of his sentiments, and was known to be guilty of conduct equally inconsistent with his former profession. The event was, that the missionaries were forced to exclude from their communion, a second member of their society, who had once promised usefulness to their cause, and comfort to themselves. One afflicting circumstance was, that he was the only person among them who had any considerable medical skill‡.

The society of London having heard of the diminution which their number had suffered, determined to give them some assistance. They accordingly engaged twelve persons to embark from London, with the prospect of joining them. After sailing and being driven back, one of the men engaged was taken ill of a fever, and left. The others, viz. Messrs. Davies, Elder, Hayward, Mitchell, Morris, Read, Scott, Pessier, Waters, Wilson, and Youl, arrived safe at Port Jackson; where Mr. Morris died, and Mr. Mitchell, abandoning the mission, chose to settle. The rest arrived at Otaheite in July 1801, and much encouraged the hearts, and strengthened the hands of their brethren, who had found grace to be faithful§.

Still, however, nothing had occurred among the natives which they could call a token for good.

* *Trans. Miss. Soc.* p. 164, 165. † *Do.* p. 172. ‡ *Do.* p. 177—195. § *Do. Introd.* vol. 1. p. 16, 17, & p. 234—252.

Religious Intelligence.—South-Sea Mission. 475

They had embraced every opportunity of giving instruction ; while some stared with a stupid astonishment, and others, more shrewd, would ask, "How is it that Cook, Clarke, Vancouver, Bligh, and others, never told us any thing of what you tell us about Jesus Christ*." Mr Read did not choose to remain at Otaheite. He came away in the same vessel in which he had arrived. On his return he stopped at the Cape of Good Hope, and was engaged by the South African Missionary Society, with the expectation of being placed over a congregation in that country†.

It was about the beginning of the year 1802, that the missionaries became sufficiently acquainted with the language to be able to preach to the natives, with any prospect of being fully understood. After gaining an acquisition of so much importance, they suffered no time to be lost until they endeavoured to improve it to promote the object of their mission. On the 26th of February, Messrs. Nott and Elder commenced a tour through several parts of the Island, in which they continued until the 5th of April. They preached as often as they could collect hearers. In some places they met with an attention that pleased them. When it was declared that those were evil spirits which came and asked men and hogs to be sacrificed, the natives seemed to assent to it as a thing very probable. When it was declared, that no less an atonement than the death of God's own son, was sufficient to expiate sin, they gazed with astonishment and doubt. When it was declared, that through the depravity of their hearts, they were not willing to receive the true knowledge of

* *Trans. Miss. Soc.* p. 116.

† *Do.* vol. 1. p. 252.

God, they, like many others, were displeased with the charge, and would not admit it to be true. Some of them appeared so far affected by what they heard, as to be willing to pray to Jehovah, but said they were afraid their own god would kill them, if they should worship any other. The missionaries received their greatest encouragement from some young men who had accompanied them in their tour. Mr. Nott happened one day to hear them giving an account of what they had been told, with a clearness and an accuracy which surprised, no less than it pleased him. In a conversation which he had with them, he endeavoured to apprise them of the value of their opportunities, and warned them of the consequences of neglecting so great salvation. The answer of one of them was—"You sent the Duff last," (meaning the ships in which the missionaries arrived,) "if you had sent the Gospel by the first ship, our feather-gods would have been thrown away long ago*."

While the missionaries were thus employed in preaching the gospel of peace, an event took place which for a time interrupted their labours, and hastened that decrease of population, which they had now reviewed with much regret. In the last of March, a meeting of the natives was held in Attahooroo, in which Otoo demanded, and being refused, took by force from the Attahoorooans, a billet of wood which they called their God. This was the origin of a civil war. The Attahoorooans immediately took arms, either to recover their god, or avenge themselves for the robbery. Otoo and Pomarre expected an insurrection, and

* *Trans. Miss. Soc.* vol. 2. p. 57—66.

Religious Intelligence.—South-Sea Mission. 477

sent word to the missionaries to be prepared for an attack from the insurgents, as there was every probability that it would soon be made. But ten days had elapsed from the time of receiving this intelligence, when they actually did break into the adjoining districts of Fwhaa and Opane, killed those who were not able to make their escape, and plundered and burnt the houses of those who fled. The fugitives took refuge near the residence of the missionaries, and brought the report that the missionaries were next to be assaulted, themselves murdered, and their property plundered. But providence had provided for their safety, by an interposition as unexpected as it was seasonable. At the time of the meeting in Attahooroo, the Norfolk, a small armed colonial brig from Port Jackson, was forced on the beach by a gale of wind. The place where she was driven, was not far from the missionary residence. The hull was lost, but her crew, guns, stores, and cargo, were saved. By this unexpected event, seventeen of their countrymen were united to the missionaries. Previous to the loss of the Norfolk, a Capt. Bishop and six men had been left upon the island, to continue some time, for the purpose of procuring pork for the colony at New South Wales.

Thus strengthened, the missionaries thought themselves able to repel the rebels, if they should venture to make an attack. And their expectations from the activity of their countrymen, were fully answered. When the intelligence was received, that an attack was intended, Capt. House, of the Norfolk, and Capt. Bishop, displayed all their activity in preparing for it. Four small brass cannon saved from the Norfolk, were placed

VOL. I.—N^o. IV. 3 P

in the most advantageous situation, and all the seamen and missionaries were immediately embodied and taught the use of fire-arms. Guards were posted, and every precaution against a surprise strictly observed.

A few days after hostilities had been commenced by the rebels, a considerable number of the king's friends encamped not far from the missionary residence. The rebels attacked and defeated them. This defeat spread such confusion and fear among the king's friends, that they gave up all for lost. They declared that their God fought for the rebels, and that resistance was in vain. All appeared confident that the English would next feel their power, and be overcome by their numbers. The event was different. Instead of making an attack, they sent a messenger with the following terms:—

1. They offered to the English the peace (or government) of the districts, Mattavai, Opane, and Fwhaa.

2. If refused, they demanded a passage through Mattavai, to go to the eastward.

3. If denied, they would fight their way.

The path of duty was plain. To engage in a war was a step to which none of the English were inclined. They therefore immediately acceded to the first proposal. The Attahoorooans ratified the treaty, and retired to their own habitations. It was the strength of the English which procured for them such advantageous terms. If the missionaries had been alone, the Attahoorooans would, in all probability, have pursued their advantage, and either driven them from the island, or cut them off with that fury which regards neither age nor sex. At such a crisis, to have such strong

and unexpected assistance as was sufficient to prevent both these evils, was a dispensation which they noticed with gratitude, and which they wished to view as a proof that God had some wise end to answer by the continuance of their missionary labours. The king's friends, however, repeatedly assured them, that the treaty was a mere deception, and was designed to lull them into security, that they might become a more easy prey to an attack. They thought there was some reason to listen to these suggestions, and were so alarmed, from prevailing reports, that they were often obliged to sleep all night upon their arms; and sometimes to start up and prepare for action with the expectation that the enemy was at their doors.

During these transactions, Pomarre kept himself at a distance, shedding the blood of his subjects, in sacrifice to his god. So infatuated was he with this superstition, that all the alarming intelligence which could be sent to him, did not prevail upon him to stir a step towards checking the rebellion, although it was every day becoming stronger and stronger. The rebels took advantage of his folly, and having now gained large accessions to their strength, they marched to the district where Pomarre had kept himself, and where he had collected all his forces. This was done with so much secrecy and alertness, that Pomarre had but just time to bring his forces into any order, when the rebels attacked him. Pomarre's forces were the strongest, but in an assault which the rebels made, they killed a distinguished chief, who was the relation and friend of Pomarre. This threw his forces into confusion, they fled to their canoes with precipitation, leav-

ing the rebels masters of the field, and in possession of the god which had produced the war.

Pomarre with his routed army fled to Mattavai. The English, expecting that the rebels would pursue their success, waited to receive them. These expectations were disappointed. They continued some time in the district which had fallen under their power by their late success, and having there gratified their rapacity and cruelty, returned to their own habitations.

After this, the English remained some time in a very uncomfortable situation, as they were surrounded by the desponding friends of Pomarre, and were under incessant fear lest the rebels should attack them. At last a vessel, called the Nautilus, Capt. Simpson, anchored at the island. Pomarre soon prevailed with Capt. Simpson, through the mediation of Capt. Bishop, to grant him a boat manned and armed, to accompany him to Attahooroo. He accordingly proceeded to Attahooroo, with this boat and his own fleet; but instead of acting against his enemies, as the English expected, he contented himself with making an oblation on the beach, and immediately re-embarked, highly pleased that he had performed so great a service.

(To be concluded in our next.)

INDEX,

TO VOL. I.

- ABRAHAM**; God's covenant with, 141; not a covenant of works or of grace, 142; a covenant ecclesiastical, 144—148; how affirmed, 146; not annulled, 148—153; promises of, not fulfilled till the Christian dispensation, 149.
- Apocalypse*; a notable forgery concerning it, detected, 363.
- Apostles*; no proof of their superiority over the seventy, 334—339; acted simply as presbyters in the synod of Jerusalem, 450—451.
- Baptist, John the*; troubles the hierarchy, 325.
- Baptists*; their objection to infant baptism, that it makes the seal of God's covenant certify a lie, not valid, 399.
- Bartholomew-act*; what, 329, note.
- Beasley, Rev. F.* (under the signature of *Cyfrian*,) blunder of, in translating Paul's recommendation of Epaphroditus, 202.
- Bentley, Dr.*; his reason why the early prelates exchanged the title of Apostles for that of Bishops, 209.
- Bible*; how profaned by using it as a lottery, 402—405.
- Bibles*; scarcity of, and anxiety to obtain, in Wales, 344; in Switzerland, 345; in Alsace, *ib.*; in Austria, Karinthia, Stiria, and Hungary, 346; in Lithuania, 349; among the convicts; and among the French and Spanish prisoners in England, 355, 356.
- Bible-Society, the British and Foreign*; account of, 340—346; third report of their committee, 347—360.
- Bishop*; interchangeably used with *Presbyter*, in the N. T. 191, 193, 195; not so with *Deacon*, 201; why it became a title of superiour office, 209.
- Blhear, Rev. Mr.*; his answer to that question, How to live in this world so as to live in heaven? 154—158.
- Charity*; not the point of controversy with the hierarchy, 93.
- Christians*; never repent of believing in Christ, 435.
- Church of God*; meaning of the term, 55, 56; visible and catholic, 57—73; did exist once, 57; was not to cease, 58—62; actually in being, 63; phraseology concerning, borrowed from the Old Testament, 63—66; figurative description of, 66—69; consequence of denying the, 72; organization of, 138—153; founded in the covenant with Abraham, 141; how to be perpetuated, 273, &c. admission of adults, errors about the, 276—278; rule of, 278; absurdity of making the certainty of conversion the test of admission into, 279, 280; children of believers born members of, 282; initiating seal of, not abrogated by altering the form of application, 385; perpetuated by exchanging circumcision for baptism, 387;

- consequences of denying this, 387—389 ; direct proof of, 390.
- Church, Reformed Dutch* ; origin of, in the U. S. 365 ; how supplied with ministers, 366 ; effect of this, *Ib.* ; extension of, 368 ; situation of, changed by the surrender of the colony to the British, 369 ; &c.
- , *Episcopal* ; pretends to exclusive communion with Christ, 97—99 ; partially established in the province of New-York, 372 ; non-episcopalians taxed for her support, 373.
- Circumcision* ; use of, in the Abrahamic covenant, 147 ; essentially the same seal of the covenant as baptism, and succeeded by it, 390—398.
- Conscience* ; double error about, 41 ; two-fold agency of, 42 ; consequence from the doctrine of, 46 ; great error about the rule of, 130 ; variety in, and cause of that variety, 131 ; only safe rule of, 133 ; means of forming a good conscience, 135—137 ; effects of association upon, 268 ; dominion of to be established, 269 ; especially in youth, 270 ; necessity of its continual activity, 271 ; hurt to by sceptical speculations, *ib.*
- Conversion, reality of* ; not the ground of admission into the Christian church, 279, 280.
- Covenant, Abrahamic* ; an account of, 141—153.
- Covenant-God* ; meaning of that phrase, 144 ; note.
- David* ; his charge, 1 Kings, ii. 9, concerning Shimei explained, 172—180 ; unsatisfactory account of, 174 ; not governed by revenge, 175 ; not an injunction to destroy Shimei, 176—178 ; his words mistranslated, 179.
- Disputes* ; acrimony in trifling, causes of, 159—161 ; means of allaying, 162.
- Dodwell* ; a high church declaration of his, 97.
- Episcopacy* ; Essays on, reviewed, 85—104 ; question of to be tried by the scriptures alone, 188 ; three orders of, not proved from the Jewish priesthood, 309—324 ; nor from the state of the church during our Lord's ministry, 324—339 ; strong presumptions against its interpretations of the facts of the N. T. 438.
- Episcopalians* ; extravagant claims of some, 86 ; lay an unwarrantable stress upon the form of church government, 97 ; obliged to show more of real Christianity with them than with others, 101 ; very different from a multitude of evangelical men in their own church, 103.
- Faith* ; life of, 47—52 ; life of, in relation to conduct, 154—158.
- Fesch, Cardinal* ; uncle to Bonaparte, 362 ; his arbitrary measures towards the German Protestants, 362.
- Finley, Rev. Dr.* ; account of his last illness, 302—307 ; remarks on his death, contrasted with that of Hume, 419—436.

- Five-mile act* ; what, 328, note.
- Forgery* detected, 363.
- Franken*, professor ; his account of the life of faith, 47—52.
- Hammond*, Dr. ; his extravagant notion of Presbyters, 205 ; driven to it by the force of the argument from their identity with Bishops, 205, note.
- Hobart*, Rev. Dr. ; not far behind Dodwell, 97—99 ; his apology reviewed, 462—472 ; his inaccuracy, 466—467 ; his unlucky parallel, 469 ; his premature boast, 469.
- Hume*, David, Esqr. account of his behaviour in his last sickness, 294—301 ; best infidel example, 421 ; wretched picture of his death compared with Dr. Finley's, 423—436.
- Infants* of professing parents members of the church, 282 ; their right to baptism, 398.
- Infidels* ; without consolation in death, 401 ; never die in triumph, 434 ; often in horreur, 435.
- James* ; not bishop of Jerusalem, 452—462.
- Kingdom of God* ; what meant by it in the N. T. 409.
- Knowledge*, Tree of, why so called, 79, 80 ; design of prohibiting the use of it, 80—82 ; a sacramental pledge, 83, 84.
- Layman* ; (T. Y. Howe, Esq.) his mode of representing the presbyterian argument, 189 ; reasoning about the change of names, 208 ; hurts his own cause, 211 ; his absurd account of the Jewish priesthood, 309 ; blunder in quoting the apostle Paul, 316.
- Liberality in Religion*, fashionable ; 27, 28 ; indefinite, 30 ; dangerous, 31 ; inconsistent with love of truth, 32 ; with fidelity to Christ, 33 ; with real charity, 35 ; no proof of tolerance, 37 ; violent and bitter, 39.
- Lots*, Considerations on, 163, &c. appeals to God, 164 ; regulated by his providence, 165 ; analogous to the oath, 170 ; proof of the divine agency in, 285—289 ; objection discussed, 239—290 ; uses of, 290—292 ; mode of conducting them, 292 ; abuses of, 400—407.
- McLeod*, Rev. Alex. his ecclesiastical catechism reviewed, 105—111.
- Mark ix.* 47—50 ; elucidated, 400—418.
- Marshall*, Rev. Wm. worthless biography of, 119.
- Mission*, to the South-seas ; history of, 473, &c.
- , to South Africa, account of, 237.
- , China, intended one to, 239.
- , Gentoo, pleasing account of, 241, &c.
- , Surat, 246.
- of the New-York society, to the Tuscaroras, 249, &c.
- Missionaries* accepted by the Lon. Society since May, 1807, 248 ; arrival at New-York, of Morison, Lee, & Gordon, 258.
- Moore*, Rev. Dr. ; his disrespectful quotation of scripture, 471.

- Names official* ; argument from, for ministerial parity, 189, &c. ; scouted by the Episcopalians, and why, 189 ; precise and definite, 192—195 ; rule for interpreting terms which are sometimes official, and sometimes general, 197.
- N. York, Missionary Society* ; the meeting of, 249 ; report of the Directors, *ib.* ; account current of, 256.
- Nott, Rev. Dr.* ; review of his address, 112—119.
- Otaheite* ; state of society in, 225 ; fruitless attempts of the missionaries to meliorate, 226—229 ; misconduct of Mr. Lewis in, 229 ; proceedings of the London Society relative to, 236.
- Osgood, Samuel, Esq.* his letter on Episcopacy, obscure, 212 ; does not fairly represent the Episcopalians, 213 ; strikes at all regular ministrations, 215 ; makes a false criticism on Tit. i. 6.
- , letter to, from Philalethes, 217 ; rightly maintains the doctrine of ministerial succession ; misapplies the principle, 219 ; reasons falsely and dangerously on the ground of faith, 221.
- Priesthood, Jewish* ; not the model of the Christian ministry, 312, &c. ; impossibility of its being a type of the latter, 315, &c.
- , *of Christ* ; how injured by the Episcopal argument for their hierarchy, 321, &c.
- Presbyters* ; invested with the power of government, 441—446 ; and ordination, 447 ; did perform acts of government in the apostolic church, 448—451.
- Protestants* ; their deplorable state in Germany, 362.
- Providence, particular* ; a proof of, 165—168 ; objections against it refuted, 168—171.
- , a remarkable interposition of, 182—186.
- Redemption Universal* ; dilemma on, 74, 75.
- Sacrifices* ; origin of, 121—129 ; universally prevalent, 124 ; not a dictate of nature, 124 ; not the invention of Priestcraft, 125 ; not the effect of superstition, 127 ; but of divine institution, 189 ; scriptural account of, 262 ; uses of, 265—267, 374, &c.
- Salt* ; a scriptural symbol, 418.
- Salted with fire* ; what it means, 414—417.
- Seventy disciples* ; no proof of their inferiority to the apostles during our Lord's ministry, 324—339.
- South-Seas* ; mission to, 224 ; &c.
- Tongataboo* ; superiority of the natives over those of Otaheite, 229 ; civil discords in, 232, &c. ; distress of the missionaries, 234.
- Vesson, Mr.* ; missionary, his misconduct at Tongataboo.
- Wright, Mr.* ; account of his sermon on the serpent and the dove, 92, note.