

V 89008

UT AUSTIN - GEN LIBS WAREHOUSE



02444162

X

1101339260

285.05 C138 N.S. V.1 1846

A89008

285.05
C138
NS
V.1



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

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

Rufus P. Wells.

285.05
C135
m. 50
v. 1

Rufus P. Wells
THE

Calvinistic Magazine.

EDITED BY

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

.....

.....

“EARNESTLY CONTEND FOR THE FAITH WHICH WAS ONCE
DELIVERED UNTO THE SAINTS.”

—————

Vol. I. ——— (NEW SERIES.) ——— 1846.

—————

ABINGDON, VA:

COALE AND BARR.

146205

THE Calvinistic Magazine.

[NEW SERIES.]

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

ISAAC ANDERSON, D. D., } *Editors.* } Rev. JAMES KING,
REV. FRED. A. ROSS, } } Rev. JAMES McCHAIN,

Vol. I. Abingdon, Va., January, 1846. No. 1.

P R O S P E C T U S .

NINETEEN years ago, the interests of Presbyterianism in this region demanded the publication of "*The Calvinistic Magazine.*" We need not ask those who read this Prospectus, how that work was received, nor what it accomplished. Circumstances led to its discontinuance, at a time of ample patronage. Since then, years of exciting controversy have agitated the Presbyterian Church, and our venerable body has been divided. But another day is dawning. A day of peace and harmony, if not of re-union. In this repose from strife which the Presbyterian body, although divided, now enjoys, many have been led to ask whether a new series of the "*Calvinistic Magazine*" is not called for. The answer, we think, is affirmative.

We need this work to come every month into Presbyterian families, containing explanations of our Doctrines, Government and Discipline, in a style suitable to all. Religious weekly newspapers, valuable as they are, make slight impressions; and are not preserved. The heavy quarterly publications, such as the Princeton Repertory, the Biblical Repository, the New Englander, &c., high as is their value to the Minister of the Gospel, are not works for all members of the Church. Our people want a Magazine every month, which they can take up again and again, and which will be a book for the reading of their children, in years to come.

Such was the "Calvinistic Magazine;" and it is all-important that we have this work *now*. We need this *bond of union* in our Churches. We want just such a publication to present afresh to our people, the doctrines of the Bible as they are embodied in our Confession of Faith and Catechisms. And our members need to be told not only what Presbyterianism *is*, but what it is *not*. And we bless God the tendencies of the day are to the union of Churches which, in doctrine, are Calvinistic, and in government free. Amongst these signs of the times, we are grateful to the Master that He has startled us from sleep by the voice of Puseyism; and then given us to praise Him in the highest as we beheld how, with outstretched arm, he led forth the evangelical part of the Church of Scotland, emancipated from the State, and astonished the world by her Faith and Works. We wonder and rejoice, when we see D'Aubigne representing Geneva and Calvin, and Chalmers, worthy to speak for Scotland and Knox, side by side, on the rock of our common faith, lifting up the voice against Erastianism, and Popery, and Prelacy, as in the days when Monarchs trembled before the men who stood for liberty, sublime and pure as the mountain and the lake. We say amen! and bless His holy name, as we feel the spirit of that noble Free Church movement in Scotland, breathing tones of peace over the troubled waters of our Zion. And we take courage in the Lord, while we hail these tendencies to union and action, among denominations holding doctrines pure and governments free.

Having thus spoken, we are understood as offering this work to the patronage of both the great branches of the Presbyterian Church, in the most cordial manner. We design the "Calvinistic Magazine" as a voice of harmony to all Presbyterians in East Tennessee, and at large, even when both sides speak in its columns, of errors which may have been held, or wrong which was committed.

We say, as in the former series, the DESIGN of this PUBLICATION is,

I. To illustrate and defend the doctrines of the Bible as they are understood and maintained by the Presbyterian and other Calvinistic Churches.

II. To discuss the subject of *Church Government*; furnish important facts from Church History, in which we will lay before our readers, with other particulars, a narrative of the trials and

persecutions, which in ages past followed the labors and lives of Presbyterians; and as we owe deep gratitude to those virtuous men and women whose sufferings and death, under the management of God, have brought us so many blessings, we have no doubt this department of our paper will be highly interesting to all the members of our Church.

III. To exhibit Christian duty—Missionary, Literary and Political intelligence.

IV. To advocate revivals of religion, and to explain their character and importance. As intimately connected with them, Sabbath Schools and the Temperance cause will be honored topics.

And now will you, dear brethren of the Presbyterian family, aid us to revive the "Calvinistic Magazine," in its spirit and its power?

ISAAC ANDERSON,
FRED. A. ROSS,
JAMES KING,
JAMES McCHAIN.

Witchcraft.

BY FRED. A. ROSS.

Three views of the spiritual world prevail amongst men—the view of the Athiest, the notion of the Fanatic, and the faith of the sober Christian. The Athiest denies the being of God, and the existence of all spirits, as well as the soul of man. The Fanatic believes that there is a God, there are holy and fallen angels—that the soul of man is spiritual—and teaches there is now *direct intercourse*, in various ways, with *heaven and hell*. The sober Christian, denies that *sensible* acquaintance with his Maker, or with disembodied spirits, has been allowed to man in the flesh, *since the days of miracles which established the Scriptures*.

It is of immense importance, that we understand this ground occupied by the sober Christian, in contrast with that of others. The fanatical position in regard to intercourse with *heaven*, will be brought before our readers, in another form. In this opening number of the Calvinistic Magazine, we shall examine the idea of supernatural connection with *hell*, as exhibited in the doctrine of *Witchcraft*.

EXODUS, 22: 18—"Thou shalt not suffer a witch to live."

GALATIANS, 5:20—"The works of the flesh are these—Idolatry, Witchcraft," &c.

The Bible informs us there are holy and fallen angels. Paul declares, "by the Son of God were all things created that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers." Jude reveals to us, "The angels which kept not their first estate, but left their own habitation—reserved in everlasting chains under darkness, unto the judgment of the great day."

We need not multiply quotations. The Scriptures establish the existence of a spiritual world, and authorise us to believe that if the veil which hides it from the eye of flesh was withdrawn, we should be conscious of existences as numerous and varied as all we see in the world of sense—filling illimitable being with wonders not to be understood by the magnificence of the firmament above, or the earth beneath. Nor is it to be denied that this spiritual world *acts* upon man in *mind and body*, without impairing his free agency and accountability. This is the plain teaching of the word of inspiration, and reason with all her cavils has nothing worthy to object. For, we may observe, the existence of angels, is originally, less improbable than that of man, since God is a spirit, and it is more likely, reason must say, that he would create beings like himself, than creatures partly rational, and partly animal. Again, the idea that some angels fell from their estate of holiness, involves no more difficulty than the fall of man. And the supposition, that fallen spirits accomplish evil in the divine kingdom, is not more difficult to be reconciled with the attributes of God, than that he permits wicked men to work evil. Lastly, that angels, good and bad, should influence the mind and body of man, is as rational as that men thus act upon each other by *THEIR spiritual power*.

The *manner* of this spiritual ACTION upon man has been variously held and taught, and one of the views of such agency, is exhibited in the explanation given by some of the scripture doctrine of *witchcraft*.

We propose to examine the question—WHAT IS WITCHCRAFT, AS TAUGHT IN THE SCRIPTURES?

The *fact* that such a crime is declared, and sentenced, by God, is plainly seen, in passages like the texts at the head of this ar-

ticle. Again, in Leviticus, 20: 27, it is declared—"A man also or woman that hath a familiar spirit, or that is a wizard, shall surely be put to death: they shall stone them with stones; their blood shall be upon them." Also Deut., 18: 10, &c.; 1st Sam.; 15: 23; 2d Chron., 33: 6; 2d Kings, 9: 22; Micah, 5: 12; Nahum, 3: 4.

All who receive the Bible, in the evangelical sense, are agreed, that witchcraft, as exhibited, embraced various arts and practices, by which idolatry was sustained, and the heart turned from God.—*But what were these arts and practices?* THAT is the question to be considered.

There is a FALSE, and TRUE, interpretation of the word of God on this subject. The *false* idea of witchcraft, supposed to be taught in the Bible, is this:—that *fallen man* can be approached by Satan, so that there is *miraculous consciousness of his presence*—that he *imparts* POWER to suspend, or counteract the laws of nature, thus *to perform miracles*, or *marvels*—*communicates supernatural intelligence*—all which is done to sustain what is *false*, and do evil to mankind. It also maintains that this *intercourse* with Satan, and other spirits, is secured by mystic arts, practised by the enchanter, the soothsayer, the necromancer, the witch, the astrologer, the magician, the wizard, the exorcist, and others of the same class. The *true* idea of witchcraft, is, that, *PRETENDED intercourse with the spiritual world*, in the ways mentioned, and the performance of *lying wonders*, was claimed to sustain idolatry, and other forms of false religion. As akin to this, we may say, should be reckoned, *any tampering with the invisible world, tending to turn the mind from true religion*.

This, we conceive, is the witchcraft exhibited and sentenced in the Bible. We sustain this view by the following positions: 1st. The passages referred to, do not say, by any necessary interpretation of the language, that witchcraft embraced *conscious miraculous intercourse* with evil spirits, and the *exercise of miraculous powers* derived from them. 2dly. We affirm the meaning of scripture to be, that, God denounced as crime, the *PRETENDING* to such miraculous intercourse with, and power from, spirits, evil or good—*because such PRETENCE was great crime*, and *as* deserving of the displeasure of God as the actual intercourse, and miracles wrought thereby could have been; *AND GREATER CRIME*; since a *real miracle*, performed by *witchcraft*,

would have *established the true divinity* of the idol-god, or the false religion—while the PRETENCE to it, left those who practised *lying wonders* without excuse.

These positions, in all their parts, will be abundantly clear from the following *argument*, and *examination* of scriptural *facts*. Our *argument* is this:—A MIRACLE is the *suspension*, or *counteraction* of the LAW of nature. And by the LAW OF NATURE, we intend *those regular courses* of DIVINE AGENCY, *which we discern in the world around us*. [See Dwight on the miracles of Christ.] Now, if this be a true definition of the LAW OF NATURE, then, the suspension or counteraction of this DIVINE AGENCY, can be the work of God only—consequently *no creature can do a miracle but by* THE AGENCY OF GOD.

Once more. A MIRACLE is the *highest proof* TO FALLEN MAN, OF THE BEING and TRUTH of his Creator. God, then, must ever keep that testimony *sacred*, to establish and vindicate his NAME. Hence, the influence of a created spirit upon *fallen man*, must *always* be in accordance with the LAW OF NATURE, in mind and body, *except* when God gives to such created spirit miraculous power, to *establish* DIVINE TRUTH. Therefore, God never can permit a creature to *suspend* or *counteract* the LAW OF NATURE, to sustain what is FALSE. Furthermore, *as a necessary part of this position*, God never can permit a creature to act, *even in accordance with the law of nature*, so as to produce an *inexplicable marvel*. Hence, Satan is not allowed to *tell* ALL he could reveal of *natural things*, no more than to *do* ALL he could execute, *in harmony with the course of things*—because THAT would be *virtually a miracle*, to the mind of fallen man.

This argument is self-evident truth, and never would be questioned by the mind of a Christian, did he not think certain supposed *facts* in scripture seemed to require him to deny the correctness of this train of reasoning. Those who hold to witchcraft in the *miraculous sense*, contend that their view is sustained by the testimony of the Bible, by the wonders of the Egyptian magicians; the raising of Samuel by the Witch of Endor; the temptation of Christ; the demoniacal possessions in the New Testament, especially by the cases of Simon Magus; the possessed damsel, and Sceva's sons; also the predicted lying wonders of the *Man of Sin*, and the miracles of the *Beast*. To this list of Satanic miracles and marvels, some of the same class of inter-

preters add the wonders of Mormonism, Shakerism, Swedenborgianism, Mesmerism, &c., &c.

First, we will notice the case of the Egyptian magicians—Ex. chap. 7, &c., &c. The argument for miraculous witchcraft, founded upon this passage, may be thus fairly and briefly expressed:—Moses tells us, the magicians wrought miracles in the words—“*and they did so with their enchantments*”—also in the effects which he says followed those words—and lastly, by his silence, as to any deception being practiced by the sorcerers.

We reply, that the words—“*and they did so with their enchantments*”—do not prove the magicians wrought a miracle, either in the case of the serpents, the blood, or the frogs—because the same words are used when they failed to produce lice! For we are told, “*and the magicians did so with their enchantments, to bring forth lice, but they could not.*” It is clear, then, Moses has not taught us that the magicians wrought miracles by the words—“*and they did so by their enchantments.*” That proof, then, is worth nothing. And we might safely pass on. But if it be asked, what did Moses mean by those words? we reply, he intended us to understand that the magicians believed, or pretended to believe, Aaron was only a magician, working by human arts, like themselves, and that *his enchantment* consisted in the stretching out, and smiting with his rod.” When, therefore, Moses says the magicians “*did so,*” he meant, they substituted their forms of enchantment for Aaron’s supposed magical workings with his rod.

Here we shall be met, we know, by the second thing mentioned above, that Moses teaches us certain effects followed the “*enchantments*” of the necromancers, which effects were miracles in reality. We respond, that, if Moses’ words, as to these effects of the “*enchantments,*” must be taken, *without any abatement,* then THEY PROVE TOO MUCH, not only for us, but for the believer in miraculous witchcraft, and the Bible besides. For, the words of Moses, taken in the largest sense they will honestly bear, do prove, that, in the first encounter between the magicians and Aaron, *the magicians gained the victory;* and that, in the miracles of the blood and the frogs, *it was a drawn battle,* because the sorcerers wrought wonders *co-extensive* with those of Moses!! This position is easily sustained. For, we are told in the narrative of the first miracle, that “*Aaron cast down his rod before*

Pharaoh and his servants, and it became a serpent." But the wise men, and the sorcerers, "did in like manner with their enchantments, for they cast down every man his rod, and they became serpents." Evidently, then, up to this point, in the contest, the magicians had the advantage over Aaron and Moses: for "every man" of them had equalled Aaron, by turning his own rod into a serpent; and when *all* of them did the same thing, the necromancers were *triumphant*, in the *amount* of *creative power* called forth!

We are aware, that, in this place, we are told, by *Charlotte Elizabeth*, that we need not suppose the magicians had Satanic power to *create*. What then? Why, that Satan only *brought* the serpents from—*somewhere!* But how does that help the matter? Satan *brought* MORE serpents to the sorcerers than Aaron *created* or had *brought* to him. So that the contest was as virtually one of a miraculous character as if the magicians be allowed creative power; and it was a contest in which the magicians were as eminently conquerors.

How, we ask, could Pharaoh be required to hearken to Moses, speaking in behalf of the God of Israel, upon the evidence of his *one* miracle, when the magicians of Egypt had wrought many miracles of exactly the same kind and value? Will it be said—but "*Aaron's rod swallowed up their rods?*" This, we admit, was a *victory* for Aaron and Moses—but it could not retrieve *the former defeat*. For Moses had *rested his claim* to be regarded an ambassador from God, and by *express Divine authority*, upon *the miracle that Aaron's rod should become a serpent*. THAT evidence, then, given to Pharaoh by God himself, through Moses, was *overborne* and *destroyed* by the magicians, *if their rods were miraculously made to become serpents*. Pharaoh might justly have said to Moses—"You have failed in your evidence of a mission from God. You are only a great magician; but my wise men have surpassed you in producing serpents. I acknowledge you have an art, not yet attained by my sorcerers, whereby your rod has swallowed their rods. But this last work of your enchantment cannot retrieve the credit of your first overthrow. I reject your credential as a messenger from God." So Pharaoh must have felt, and all his servants, *if they believed the magicians wrought miracles*.

This course of reasoning seems to us irresistible, against the

idea that the magicians wrought this wonder by Satanic power. Nor does it help the matter in the least, to take another ground which is sometimes assumed—That the magicians worked this marvel (as well as their other wonders) by the power of God. The doctrine is, that God was pleased to concur with the enchantments of the sorcerers, and do *a real miracle!* For what, we ask? The answer is—that he might work *a greater miracle* on the part of Moses and Aaron, and thus show *the vast superiority of his power* over that of the sorcerers. This explanation makes the matter worse than the supposition that the wise men performed real miracles by Satanic agency. It exhibits God in an attitude at once *absurd* and *unjust*. *Absurd*, because it represents him giving power not expected by the sorcerers, or Satan himself, to establish a *lie*—and then to exert *more power* to build up the *truth*. What can be more *absurd*, than thus to represent the Almighty working miracles against himself? But this idea shows God in a position absolutely *unjust*. For, it exhibits him in the first encounter between his servants and the magi, as actually working a *greater miracle* in behalf of the sorcerers than he wrought for Moses and Aaron! and then to hold Pharaoh *guilty*, for rejecting the *miracle* which God himself had destroyed by *higher evidence* of the same kind! This is monstrous. It will not do. It is bad enough to be taught that God permits Satan to exhibit miracles to counteract his own work; but to hold that God himself shows a wonder to sustain Satan, and another, and sometimes a lesser one, to uphold *his own name*; and yet regards men *guilty* for not acknowledging *his name*, in the midst of such contradictory proof, is to teach what is an insult to the honor of the Almighty. It is perfectly clear, then, that to acknowledge the Egyptian magicians worked miracles in the case of the serpents, is *to prove too much*.

The same remark is equally conclusive applied to the wonders of the blood and the frogs. For, Aaron, we are told, “lifted up his rod and smote the waters that were in the river, in the sight of Pharaoh, and in the sight of all his servants: and all the waters that were in the river were turned into blood—and there was blood throughout all the land of Egypt”—“and the magicians did so with their enchantments.” There are the words—“*Did so.*” Did what? Why, *they turned all the waters that were in the rivers into blood, and produced blood throughout all*

the land of Egypt. That is what the words say, if we must take them just as they read! But we pass on to the last work of the magicians. "And Aaron stretched his hand over the waters of Egypt, and the frogs came up and covered the land of Egypt.— And the magicians did so with their enchantments, and brought up frogs upon the land of Egypt." *There it is*, perfectly plain—that the magicians wrought wonders *co-extensive* with those of Moses and Aaron in the two last displays of power, if the words are to stand *without abatement*. Nay, we must hold that the blood produced by Aaron was *existing at the same time and place* with that produced by the magi! and so as to the frogs! Will the believer in miraculous witchcraft hold to that? He may, if he can, believe transubstantiation, which teaches that a thing is *blood*, although to our senses it is *wine*! So the Nile, *at the same time*, was turned into blood, *by Aaron, and by the magicians*!! But this is nonsense. And, because the words of Moses *cannot mean just what they say*, the believer in miraculous witchcraft has to make them signify something else. Well, what does he make them teach? Why, that the magicians, by Satanic power, turned a *small quantity* of water, *obtained by digging*, into blood—and by the same agency brought up *some frogs*, in a *limited space*, made free from the intrusion of the frogs created by divine power!

This concession, which the believer in miraculous witchcraft is obliged to make, is fatal to him. Because if he can so interpret the passage, as to reduce the *quantity* of the miracles, we may be allowed to explain Moses so as to affect the *quality* of the wonders. Besides, Charlotte Elizabeth, as before remarked, teaches that Satan wrought *no creation of life*, but merely *brought up frogs from the recesses where they were hidden, &c. &c.* She thus represents Satan as a *mere juggler*. He *created* neither serpents, blood nor frogs: but by his *ingenuity*, substituted serpents for rods, blood for water, *in small quantities*, and brought up frogs *in limited numbers, from their recesses.*" Now, if *the same thing* could be done by the magicians themselves, then there was no necessity for Satanic agency. And, that such jugglery was practised by the sorcerers, no one need question, because such *wonders* are perfectly within reach of the art of the present day. All, then, that we are required to believe, (even on the admission of Charlotte Elizabeth, and those who agree with her,)

is, that the magicians, by jugglery, substituted some serpents for rods—just as the East Indian and Chinese sorcerers do now, with exquisite skill, and that by a similar trick the necromancer turned water into blood, in vessels prepared for the purpose, and made a few frogs, previously obtained, artfully to come up in a space selected for the trick. If some man should ask, “*how* did they do it?” we say, “to ask the Chinese Whang Too; or the Indian Brahmin; or even the Frenchman Monsieur Blitz.”

We may say, in this connection, that we have alluded to Charlotte Elizabeth, because her work, “*Principalities and Powers*,” is popular, and the most plausible defence of the supernatural agency of Satan we have met with.

We are now required to meet the third argument founded upon the *silence* of Moses as to any *deception* practised by the sorcerers. We meet it first, by asking the believer in miraculous witchcraft, if Moses is not *silent* as to *Satanic agency*? And if he is not *silent* as to any *agency of God* helping the magicians? The *silence* of Moses then, would have proved nothing against our view, more than the other side, had Moses really said nothing to explain the matter. *But, Moses is not silent.* The words he employs are just THE WORDS *proper*, according to *scripture usage*, had he designed to express mere jugglery. Thus he says, in Ezekiel 24: 13, “*I have purified thee, and thou wast not purged.*” That is—“*I have endeavoured to purify thee,*” &c. Again, in Cor. 10: 33, “*I please all men.*” That is, *I endeavour to please all men.* Once more, Gal. 5: 4, “*whosoever of you are justified by the law.*” That is, “*seek and endeavour to be justified.*” Now, apply this criticism to the passages before us—“*and they did so with their enchantments.*” That is, *and they endeavoured to do so with their enchantments.* This interpretation is confirmed by the passage which describes the failure of the magicians—“*and they did so with their enchantments and could not.*” That is, *they endeavoured to do so, and could not.*

Once more—*Moses is not silent* as to the *deception* practised by the sorcerers. For he tells us that the magicians acknowledged indirectly, they had not been aided by any supernatural power. For they said to Pharaoh when they failed to imitate the fourth miracle of Aaron, “*This is the finger of God.*” *This confession explains the whole matter.* It proves, that the magicians, while they doubtless made *the people* believe the super-

natural character of their wonders, yet set up no such claim among themselves; nor before Pharaoh. They here acknowledge their enchantments to have been mere human arts. For, the explanation is, the sorcerers believed, or pretended to think, that Aaron's work was human power, so long as they could imitate him in however insignificant a way. But when their jugglery failed, then to cover their retreat, they said, "*this is the finger of God.*" That is, this is supernatural power, of course confessing indirectly, that their own arts had not been aided by any Divine or Satanic influence. This inference is substantiated by another fact. *The magicians were prepared, by previous information, to imitate the first three miracles; but were taken by surprise in the fourth. Aaron, without warning, "smote the dust of Egypt and it became lice."* The magicians, being unprepared, made a show of "*doing so,*" with their enchantments, but "*could not.*" Now, had all been ready, *prepared upon previous warning,* we see not why some of these *creeping things* could not have been made to appear just as readily as *frogs*. Or, if Satan aided them, then we ask, in the name of wonder, could he not have brought the sorcerers as many *lice* as they wanted, to some place selected for the enchantment, as easily as he brought up *frogs* from "*their recesses?*" No, *the thing is plain.* The sorcerers were taken by surprise—they were not ready—they had no Satanic help. But they went through their enchantments as usual, and failed of course. How natural for them, then, to say just what they did; "*this is the finger of God.*" Not that they acknowledged now, the *power* of Jehovah, in contrast with that of the God of Egypt. No. But, they said this is *supernatural power*—this is the finger of A God; while all that went before was HUMAN ART.

The conclusion, we think, is fairly reached, that Moses has not taught us, the magicians wrought miracles, or marvels of a supernatural character, either by the *words* he has employed, his *facts,* or his *silence.*

We have another argument against the miraculous character of the work of the Egyptian magicians founded on the words of Paul, in 2 Tim. 3: 8, in which he says: "Jannes and Jambres (the princes of these sorcerers) *withstood* Moses." Paul, to illustrate the "*folly*" of those who pretended to apostolic authority, compares it to the case of Jannes and Jambres, when they

“withstood” Moses. But, where was the “*folly*,” if they wrought real miracles? Was it “*folly*” if they actually created, or produced miraculously, *more* serpents than Moses? Was it “*folly*” if they really turned water into blood, and brought up frogs supernaturally? Was it “*folly*” then in them to *believe* that their *divine power* was as *real*, as that of Moses, and only *less*, in *degree*? And was it “*folly*” in them to believe their power was *equal* to that of Moses, *until* the question was decided by the contest itself? Surely there was no “*folly*” at all, in Jannes and Jambres, if they wrought real miracles, or supernatural wonders. But it was “*folly*” if they “withstood Moses” in the *mimicking of tricks*.

My last argument against the position that the magicians wrought miracles, is, that such a supposition justifies Pharaoh in his idolatry, and resistance of the claims of Jehovah. Nay, *we must admire him as a noble victim of oppression*. For, let it be borne in mind, that the heathen were taught to believe in many Gods, possessing *power in various degrees*, and that these Gods each had their worship, *sustained by miracles*. But the heathen were also led to believe that these Gods contended *for power* with each other, or, *by mingling in the affairs of men*, and in that way the weaker divinities were often vanquished and oppressed, by the more powerful Gods. Every reader knows this. Now apply it. If the priests of Egypt wrought miracles, then they gave the highest proof *possible*, to *sustain* the claims of their Gods to worship and obedience. And Pharaoh and his people were as really bound to honor the divinities represented by the sun, the Nile, the crocodile, the ox, or the onion, as Israel to worship Jehovah. When, therefore, the God of Israel, by Moses, commanded Pharaoh to yield up *three millions of his subjects*, the monarch was under *no obligation to obey*; for if Moses performed *wonders* to sustain the authority of Jehovah, the magicians did *the same*, to vindicate the claim of the Gods of Egypt—and, if Moses wrought more and greater wonders than the sorcerers, *THAT FACT* only showed the greater power of Jehovah, but gave him no right, whatever, to demand, that Pharaoh should dishonor his divinities, by surrendering an immense part of his empire! Pharaoh, then, in his contest with Jehovah, was a *hero*, sublime in piety and patriotism. Ten times cursed, he rose ten times to sustain the honor of his Gods, and like his

own magnificent pyramids, to overshadow his land, and to preserve the integrity of his power. Truly the glory of this passive fortitude, in monarch and people, stains the honor of all the boasted valor of the world, for altars and country. But, if the magicians were *impostors*, then verily, Pharaoh hardened his heart against the *only God*, and his *right* to command him *when he would not acknowledge the miracles of Moses*.

(To be continued.)

Controversy.

BY JAMES KING.

Many have seemed to regard the revival of the Calvinistic Magazine, as a sort of belligerent movement. They have prophesied that the work was to be controversial both in its aims and ends; and upon this ground not a few have declined to patronize it. This opinion, however, is groundless. No threat has been thrown out, nor intimation given, that such would be its course. On the contrary, it has been distinctly stated that its object will be "To present afresh to our people, the doctrines of the Bible as they are embodied in our confession of faith and catechisms." "To illustrate and defend the doctrines of the Bible as they are understood and maintained by the Presbyterian and other Calvinistic Churches." How far this can be done without collisions with other churches, remains to be seen. Should they occur, (and we are hardly silly or credulous enough to suppose they will not,) we shall endeavour to meet them in a proper spirit.—It is under the apprehension that such might be the fact, that my thoughts have been turned to the subject at the head of this article.

4 Controversy is a name given indiscriminately to all discussions on religious subjects, though it is only applicable when such discussions degenerate into crimination and abuse—or a mere strife for victory; an evil to which, from our frailty, it is but too liable. But it is some consolation to know that it is the only evil, while all its other tendencies are for good—that though in the excitement of the conflict, feelings may be engendered and language used that will cause regret, yet the mind must be en-

lightened and our views of truth enlarged. It compels us to a better understanding of our own system, that we may the more ably defend and vindicate it; whilst on the other hand, it gives clearer views of that of our opponent—and may fill us with more or less charity for it, as its merits may demand. The opponent will not fail to shew us up in the most unfavourable light, so that between his prejudices and our own partialities we shall be the more likely to strike the proper medium.

I contend that the benefits resulting from religious discussions preponderate greatly over the solitary objection which lies against them; consequently that Christians are strictly within the line of their duty when engaging in them. Nay further, that they should desire it; and so far from assuming a hostile attitude the moment a brother proposes to examine their creed and test it by the word of truth, they should throw themselves open to his arguments, and thank him for what ought to be, and not unfrequently is, his labor of love, feeling that if in error, a greater service cannot be rendered them than to detect and expose it.—The rule of letting one another alone, good in most other cases, does not apply here. I for one do not want to be let alone. If I am building wood, hay and stubble, he is my friend who informs me of it. If my house is on the sand, for heaven's sake let me know it before the rain decends and the winds beat.

So far we are arguing whether these things ought so to be.—Perhaps a graver question is, can they be otherwise? How shall we avoid collisions? Shall we confine the pulpit and the press to subjects on which all agree? This were to silence both.—Shall we simply state our doctrines without referring to others? This is the most modest, but at the same time as effectual a mode of giving a challenge as any other, and the brother of another denomination, who has listened to your sermon, or read your dissertation—retires from the one, or rises from the other with the feeling that he has been attacked, and with the settled purpose of refuting you whenever opportunity offers. And in this feeling he is right, for let your opinions go unrefuted, and his must fall to the ground. In his reply he may pursue a similar course, and thus without names or reference, effectually controvert all your positions. The only difference is, that in the one case the discussion is open and direct—in the other it is masked. Still you have in it all the elements of discussion, if

not of controversy; and nothing is wanting to make it both the one and the other, but the formal notice that your remarks will be replied to.

I know "preach your own doctrines and let others alone," is the popular cry, but who will show me how it is to be done? Who does not know that whilst I am building up Presbytery and Calvinism, I am sapping the foundations of Prelacy and Arminianism? Surely the friends of those systems know it, and will show that they know it, by the countervailing influences they will set to work. And who shall blame them? Not I, assuredly. They would be acting faithlessly to their own cause, should they pursue a different course, and their sincerity might well be called in question. But they will not pursue a different course, as shall be seen in the sequel. Let this work progress, and you shall soon see similar ones issuing from the presses of other denominations. Already have we heard the note of preparation. Indeed in a sister church it has been so prompt, that there is danger that they will be in the field before us. Do we find fault? By no means. We admire their prudence and forecast. It was a thing to be expected. With them we are in contact; occupying the same ground; fishing in the same waters; drawing the materials for our churches from the same mass. We could not, therefore, expect them to look quietly on, whilst we were advocating principles so repugnant to them.

Since, then, the advocacy of our own views has the same effect upon other denominations that an attack upon theirs would have, how, I ask, shall we escape discussion? To be silent, and leave our churches in ignorance of their own doctrines would be criminal, equally so in us and in them.

But to go a step further. Ought we to avoid discussion?—Ought our opinions to be held so sacred that a brother Christian shall not presume to examine them? That were to claim an attribute that belongs not to man. Ought we not the rather to invite it, and say to every passing brother, come and see whether my materials are gold and silver and precious stones, or whether they are wood, hay and stubble? Ought we not to seek light?—And from whom shall we seek it? From those whose opinions coincide entirely with our own? Certainly not, for they can give us none. Let us go then to those whose views are different, and learn the grounds upon which they rest them, and the arguments

with which they sustain them. Again. Can we innocently avoid discussion? Shall the rule of "letting alone" extend to all who profess to have any religion at all, and if not, where shall it cease? Shall it be with the Mormons; the Roman Catholic; the Univarsalist; the Unitarians; or with whom? I answer; let it cease where error ceases. Let it be the mutual understanding with Christians, that for their mutual benefit, error is to be detected and exposed, find it where we may, and let us cherish towards each other while doing it, the feelings so happily and forcibly expressed by the Psalmist:

"Let the righteous smite me, it shall be a kindness, and let him reprove me, it shall be an excellent oil which shall not break my head, for yet my prayers also shall be in their calamities."

But, who has practised on this principle of letting alone?—Martin Luther did not, nor John Calvin, nor John Knox, and a host of others to whom, under God, we are indebted for the very existence of a Christian Church. Paul did not even let Peter alone, but "withstood him to the face."

It is not contention (I remind the reader) for which I contend, but the sober temperate investigation of truth as held by ourselves and others, a principle recognized in the Scriptures, and enjoined upon Christians, and not to be given up because the Devil has so often perverted it to his own purposes. Let him persuade us that we can't talk, nor preach, nor write upon religious subjects—and he knows full well what would follow—ignorance, bigotry, and error. Let him have his way, and all discussion will soon cease. We shall soon have a people without Bibles, and priests without religion. The Bible, he will tell us, is the fruitful source of all our divisions, so long as men are permitted to examine it for themselves; difference of opinion must be the result. Take it away, and adopt the maxim that "ignorance is the mother of devotion," and then we shall have peace and quietness—but it will be the peace and the quietness of death.

One word before we close, to those who mark our dissensions with so much severity. When Bishop Hughes and Dr. Breckenridge or Dr. Potts and Dr. Waneright engage in controversy, your first business is not with the temper in which it may be conducted, but with the merits of the question at issue. With the first you have much to do; with the second, nothing at all. It may be a matter of vital importance to you to know whether the Pope is Anti-Christ or the Vicegerant of Christ, or whether there can be a "Church without a Bishop." But it can be a matter of but little moment, whether the disputants conduct themselves towards each other with becoming courtesy. Even the total want of it, will form a poor apology for your ignorance.

I would say then, in conclusion, let us fear the evils of discussion, but not the thing itself—remembering that truth has

nothing to fear from it. It is error only that shuns it, and shrinks from the light. And when it comes, as come it will and ought, let it be conducted with the spirit, and the kindness, and the gentleness, and the meekness that become the lovers of truth, and the followers of the Prince of Peace. And though we may not all be in "blue and buff," nor all belong to company A. or company B., yet we are soldiers of the same grand army; under the same great Captain, contending for the same noble cause, against a common enemy.

Calvinism—its Doctrines and History.

BY JAMES M'CHAIN.

We now resume the publication of a work, the leading object of which, is the illustration and defence of Calvinism. It would seem proper and important, therefore, to state at the outset, what are the distinctive doctrines of this system, and give briefly their history. This is the design of the present article. The aim of the writer is not argument, the proof of the Calvinistic scheme, and the overthrow of its opposites. It is merely statement and history, explanation and narration. He will speak only for himself, in his own words and his own way. Those who hold the peculiar views of Calvin, and have thought much about them, have their own method of expressing and explaining them. The author will, therefore, without special reference to the language of the Bible, or the Confession of Faith, state to others his views on the points under consideration, as he states them to himself. In doing this, he will not discuss those nicer shades and differences of opinion which exist among sound Calvinists. He will simply endeavor to present definitely and concisely, the great doctrines and distinctive features of the system. Nor does he write for philosophers or ministers, but for *the people* to whom our work is mainly devoted.

What, then, we ask, is Calvinism? We answer, summarily, it is that scheme of religious belief which holds to the doctrine of God's sovereignty, decrees or purposes—the doctrine of God's providence, general and particular—the doctrine of election or predestination—the doctrine of the final perseverance of every saint. These doctrines we will notice separately in the order in which they are placed.

God's sovereignty, decrees or purposes, will first claim our attention. Calvinists maintain, that God is the supreme and absolute Sovereign of the universe—that he "doeth according to his will in the army of heaven, and among the inhabitants of the earth, and none can stay his hand, or say unto him, what doest

thou?"—that this will is governed in its choice and execution by infinite wisdom; justice, holiness, truth, mercy, and love; and that Jehovah makes known to his creatures or withholds from them *the reasons* of his acts just as he sees best. We farther hold, that this sovereignty of the Most High is carried out in accordance with a fixed plan formed from eternity. This plan, we call the Divine decrees or purposes. We prefer the latter word to the former, in setting forth the doctrine under consideration. Purposes is a softer term, and yet fully conveys all that we wish to express. The word decrees has a repulsive air of harshness and sternness about it; it sounds rather like the edicts of a self-willed tyrant, than the determinations of an infinitely perfect sovereign. We will use, therefore, the expression, Divine *purposes*, instead of Divine *decrees*.

Now, we will be asked, what do you mean by this language? I would answer, God's purposes are *that plan by which God determined from eternity whatsoever comes to pass, both the events themselves and the means of their accomplishment, of which means and events some are wholly or in part, efficiently caused by him, and others are permitted or suffered by him, to occur, yet so as not in any degree, to impair the free-agency of his moral creatures.*

Let us notice the several particulars involved in this general definition. The great Jehovah has a fixed and immutable plan in the government and control of the universe. That plan has been formed from eternity. It is this determination of the Divine mind which brings to pass whatsoever takes place. Our Sovereign *foreordained*, and *therefore foreknows* whatever has occurred, whatever is now occurring, and whatever will occur forever. He knew from eternity what was impossible, and could not take place. He also saw what was possible, and could take place. Out of these possible events he selected those which should become actual, those which he determined *should* take place. Thus his selection and determination are the *ground* of his foreknowledge of whatsoever will come to pass. We hold that he foreknows, *because* he foreordained. He did not foreknow, and *therefore* foreordain. His foreordination is *the ground and cause* of his foreknowledge.

This plan embraces whatsoever has or will come to pass from eternity through eternity, all things, all events, small and great. It includes *the means to the accomplishment* of the events as well as the events themselves; not the end without the means, or independent of them, but the means and the end in their proper connection. Thus the rise and fall of Rome were determined in the Divine plan, *the means* of bringing about the end, just as much as the events themselves. Some of these results are *efficiently caused* by God, others are suffered or permitted to occur. The distinction between *causing* a thing, and permitting or *suffering* it to occur, is of the utmost importance in rightly under-

standing the Calvinistic scheme. The Deity causes or produces many things directly and efficiently by his own agency. Therefore, he alone is responsible for the evil resulting in any such case, just so far as he is properly the cause of it. All the glory, all the guilt is his. He efficiently caused the creation of man and of the universe. He thus governs the heavenly bodies—he thus sometimes causes pestilence, famine and earthquakes. He also efficiently and directly, by his spirit and truth, produces all the holiness that there is in his creatures. To him therefore, belongs all the glory of all the holiness in the universe. If now, the Almighty *thus caused all things* to take place, which came to pass, the evil resulting might be laid to his charge. But he does not do this. There are many things which he efficiently causes in connection with the *agency of his moral creatures*. For example, revivals of religion are, and the final conversion of the world will be, the result of combined human and divine agency, the result of the prayers and labors of God's people, and the influence of God's spirit and truth. In such cases of course, God is responsible for what he does, and his creatures are accountable for what they do. There are other things which he *permits* us to do or not to do, just as we please. Thus, for instance, I may place my hand on my head or at my side; I may sit or stand as my feelings dictate, if there be neither right nor wrong in the doing or not doing the one or the other.

Many things he *suffers* to occur, doing all that he can consistently with the highest good of the universe, to prevent their occurrence. He did much, he did all he could consistently, with the best form of moral government, to keep our first parents from sin. He *suffered* them to eat the forbidden fruit—having done all this, he did not make or cause them to do it. He did much; he promised and he threatened; he went as far as he consistently could, to prevent their transgression. He did much—all that he could as an infinitely perfect sovereign, to lead Pharaoh to obey him, and let his people go. Through Moses, he promised and he threatened; he reasoned and he plead; he sent judgments, and he stayed his afflicting hand. After all, he *suffered* him to have his own way—harden his heart, and perish in the Red Sea. But, "*God hardened Pharaoh's heart.*" So he did. Just as a kind and faithful father hardens the heart of a rebellious son, when he endeavors to subdue him, and the son resists and stands it out, and will not bow. The father does all that he can consistently with his paternal dignity, and the good of his family, to bring the disobedient one to submission; then he leaves him to himself, to die an outcast and a felon. The parent *only* hardens his child's heart by his efforts to soften it, and by discontinuing or diminishing them, when he has gone as far as he could in reclaiming his wayward boy. The son hardens his own heart by his resistance to his father's endeavors to subdue and reclaim

him. The father *suffers* the son to go on and be ruined. So, the Almighty suffers sin to exist. He suffers his moral creatures to break his law, having done all that he can consistently with the best form of moral government, the best system of things, and the highest good of the universe, to prevent every one of these sins.

The sum of what I have just presented is this:—All things come to pass according to God's purposes. Of some of these things God is more or less the proper, efficient cause, or he either permits or *suffers* them to occur. He produces and preserves efficiently by his spirit and truth, all the holiness that there is in the universe. He suffers to occur all the sin which exists and its attending evils, doing all that he can consistently, (consistently as before expressed,) to prevent their occurrence. Whatever he efficiently causes, reflects upon him the highest glory. The blame and guilt of those things which he *suffers* to take place, must fall upon his creatures, not upon the Creator.

We must not overlook another particular in our definition. It is God's purpose, that his purposes should not infringe in the least, on the free-agency of intelligent beings. He made them free agents; he meant they should be free agents, and they are free agents, both in sinning and in loving, both in becoming Christians and going to heaven, and in continuing sinners and going to hell. It is God's *purpose* that his *purposes* should leave *free-agency* totally and eternally unimpaired.

I will now sum up, in a few words, the doctrine under consideration, as before defined and now explained. The divine purposes embrace all things whatsoever that come to pass. They include the means of bringing about the events, as well as the events themselves. These are the *ground*, the *cause of God's foreknowledge*. He foreknows all things, *because he foreordained* all things. These were formed from eternity. Those things which take place according to this plan, are properly and efficiently caused by God, wholly or in part, or permitted or suffered by him to occur. He causes holiness. He causes revivals in connection with his people. He suffers sin and misery, doing all that he can consistently with the best form of moral government, the best system of things and the highest good of the universe, to prevent their existence. Whatever he thus causes, is best, and honors him. Whatever blame there is in what he thus suffers, falls upon his creatures. God's purposes *make and keep* intelligent beings free agents.

PROVIDENCE.

We now come to a second great doctrine in the Calvinistic creed. If asked for a definition of Providence, we would give the following: Providence *is that upholding, superintending, governing, causing, permitting, suffering, and overruling agen-*

cy and influence which God exercises over the universe, extending to all men, all beings, and all things, in accordance with his eternal purposes, and in perfect consistency with the free-agency of his moral creatures.

Our belief is, that the Almighty upholds all things by the word of his power. The universe rests upon his hand. Should that be withdrawn an instant, all would sink into chaos or annihilation. He superintends all things. His eye never slumbers or sleeps. Not a whisper which he does not hear. Not a thought which he does not see. Not a planet rolls, not a hair falls, not a zephyr breathes, not a sand of the sea-shore moves, not a blade of grass grows, without his knowledge. He governs all things. He governs according to the counsel of his own will; he governs according to his eternal purposes; he governs every where, mind and matter; every thing, animate and inanimate. Some things in the dispensations of God's providence, he efficiently causes.— Thus he produces and preserves all the holiness that there is, by his spirit and his truth, and whatever he thus effects, is good and right. He permits us to do or not to do some things just as we please, the doing or not doing being neither right nor wrong.— Thus, while I am now in my study, I may suppose that he permits me to sit, or stand, or walk, just as my own pleasure or feelings may dictate, in so far as there is nothing sinful or holy in the one or the other. He suffers other things to take place: for example, the sin and misery that exist, doing all that he consistently can to prevent their occurrence. He overrules all things, bringing light out of darkness, order out of confusion, and good out of evil. He leaves man a free agent, amidst all the agency and influence which he thus exerts.

This is *our* God; and this our doctrine of his providence. We stand in awe of it, and we rejoice. This is our *Father's* eye and arm, which thus superintends and guards the universe. This is an infinitely perfect Being, in whose hands we thus place all things. We love to think that his agency and influence are concerned, in some of the ways described, in every thing and every where. We rejoice in the thought, that he not only superintends the rolling of the spheres and the fall and rise of empires, but numbers the hairs of our head; and notices the fall of the sparrow. We praise him for the assurance, that there is nothing too great for his supervision and control, nothing too small for his eye and his care.

ELECTION.

We now come to the doctrine so much misunderstood, so much misrepresented, and so much abused. Predestination and Election, Reprobation and Preterition, are the words generally used in speaking of it. I prefer, for the reasons before given for the preference of the expression "divine purposes" to "divine de-

crees," the terms election and preterition, to any others in use. I will employ them, therefore, in this explanation. Election means choosing, preterition signifies *passing by—not choosing*. God chooses the elect to salvation. He does *not* choose the non-elect to this. Neither does *he choose them to damnation*. They *choose themselves* to that, and he simply leaves them to their own choice. But let us have a definition.

Election is, *God's choice from eternity of a certain portion of mankind to salvation through repentance for sin, and faith in Christ, not on account of their foreseen good works, but of his own sovereign wisdom and pleasure.*

Preterition is, *God's purpose from eternity to leave the non-elect, having made their salvation possible, so that they can be saved if they will, to leave them to their own chosen course of sin, and perish.*

Our belief is, that the elect were chosen from *eternity*, "from the beginning, before the foundation of the world," and not in time, or at their conversion. They were elected to *eternal life*, not merely to repentance and faith, but were "chosen," in the words of Paul, "to salvation." God elected them to salvation *through repentance and faith*, "through sanctification of the spirit and belief of the truth." The elect were not chosen to salvation, whether they wanted to go to heaven or not, let them do what they might—let them be as bad as they could. They must repent and believe, else they will be lost. Repentance and faith are the necessary *means* of salvation, and they must use the means, else they will fail of the end. They are chosen both to the means and the end, and so they will certainly both repent, believe, and be saved. God chose the elect *not from their foreseen good works, but in his own sovereign wisdom and pleasure*. He called us, "not according to *our works*, but according to his own purpose and grace." He chose us "*that we should be holy and without blame before him in love.*" He did not choose us *because he foresaw* that we would be holy, but *in order to make us holy*. His choosing was the *cause* of our being holy. Our foreseen holiness was not *the cause* of his choosing. He chooses in his own sovereign wisdom and pleasure. He elects one and passes by another, in his infinite wisdom and absolute sovereignty. We believe that he has his reasons, the best of reasons, for his choice. God, of all beings, never acts without sufficient grounds. I think, too, there must be *special* reasons for taking one and leaving another, else there might be room for the charge of partiality. What are these reasons in the Divine mind for this preference? I know not. I feel assured they exist, and when God tells me what they are, I will make them known to others.

Preterition is the passing by the non-elect. God purposed from eternity, to do so. He provides an atonement for them, Christ dies for them as well as for the elect, he uses all the

means that he *consistently* can—consistently as before explained—to bring them to accept the proffered pardon, so that the salvation of the one class is just as *possible* as that of the other. He leaves them to pursue their own chosen course of sin and rebellion, and die forever. So he proposed to do from eternity. He does not create them, in order to damn them. He makes their salvation possible—he does all that he consistently can to get them to heaven. They choose perdition. He leaves them to their choice. This was his purpose from eternity.

PERSEVERANCE.

Our doctrine of the saints' perseverance is, that *God will keep all whom he regenerates, Christians through life, and save them at last.* We do not believe that any child of God is suffered to fall back into his former impenitence. We deny that any one truly converted, will ever be lost. We do not mean that all Christians will be saved, let them do what they will, and become as bad as they may. Nor do we mean that they will not sin and go astray. Neither do we hold that if left to themselves they would not fall away utterly and perish. But, we do mean that God will *keep every Christian a Christian unto the end.*—When he wanders, he will bring him back; when he sins, cause him to repent; when he desponds, give him hope; and when he is in darkness, show him light. Thus he will *cause him to persevere in holiness, keep him "faithful unto the end,"* and at last put upon his brow "the crown of life."

PERFECTION.

Perhaps we ought to say a word about another doctrine, respecting which, Arminians, and especially Methodists, and Calvinists differ. The Methodists, if I understand them, hold that perfect holiness, entire sanctification, entire freedom from sin, not only *can be attained in this life* by all, but that it *is actually* attained by some. Calvinists generally maintain that perfect holiness is possible and attainable in the present life, but that it never has been, and never will be, attained by any Christian upon earth.

We now close this article, already longer than the writer intended or wished, reserving for a future number, *the history* of our doctrines. Such is our scheme. We say not that it is unattended with difficulties. We pretend not that we can, or that any one can solve all the problems to which it gives rise. But, we do hold that it has fewer and weaker objections than any other system ever yet devised. We do affirm that we can prove its several parts, though we cannot fully show their consistency. We do maintain that it is the best belief for the development of *the mind and the heart.* We do contend that it is better calcu-

lated than any other to fill the soul with reverence for God, and draw it to him in love, to inspire it with awe and with hope, to raise us up to the most vigorous use of the means for growth in grace and the conversion of the world, and stay our souls on the rock of ages amidst moral darkness that may be felt, and moral convulsions that shake the world. We do believe that ours is the creed which best produces that piety which is deep and strong, zealous and enlightened, neither turbid and torrent-like, nor sickly sentimental and beautifully formal—that piety whose zeal is based upon knowledge, and is the joint offspring of the mind and the heart; whose light and heat are not those of the crackling flame which a breath kindles and a breath puts out, but those of the live bed of coals, which many waters cannot quench, nor floods drown.

Blame us not, then, if we do all that we can to explain and defend and build up Calvinism. Blame us not if we assail all opposite systems, be they those of Christian brethren or pretended Christians, not with the weapons of harsh invective and personal abuse, not with fine declamation and confident assertion, but with reason, and fact, and the Bible. We may love as brethren, we may agree as Christians, while we differ and contend earnestly and manfully as Arminians or Episcopalians and Calvinists. May we all be enabled thus to contend for “the faith once delivered to the saints.”

Publishers' Notice.

The publishers deem it due to themselves to state, that the irregularity of the type, which will at once be perceived by a glance at any one of these pages, is not attributable to any defect in the printing, but to an *amalgamation* of various founts of type at the Foundry. This circumstance is a very mortifying one, particularly as the best type were ordered, and the cash advanced. Steps will be taken to remedy this evil immediately, the reader, in the meantime, extending toward us patient indulgence.

THE
Calvinistic Magazine.

[NEW SERIES.]

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

ISAAC ANDERSON, D. D., }
REV. FRED. A. ROSS, } *Editors.* { REV. JAMES KING,
 } { REV. JAMES McCHAIN,

Vol I.

February, 1846.

No. 2.

Witchcraft.

BY FRED. A. ROSS.

(Continued from page 14.)

We believe the examination of the miracles, supposed to be wrought by the magicians of Egypt, to be unexceptionable. The next case, relied on by the believers in miraculous witchcraft, is that of the Witch of Endor, 1 Sam'l. 28th chap. In the examination of this remarkable history, we fully admit, *Samuel was raised from the dead.* The question to be solved is, WHO RAISED HIM? Some tell us, the witch brought him up by *Satanic power.* We believe *God raised Samuel.* It will be said, if we teach God raised Samuel, we admit what we before denied, viz: We denied the miraculous power of God was exerted in the enchantments of the magicians, and yet, here we admit his power was supernaturally displayed along with the arts of the witch; and thus subvert our fundamental position, *that God never can give his power to a creature to sustain what is false.* We reply, there is no inconsistency. The cases are different. If God had worked miracles for the Egyptian sorcerers when they made incantations, he would *thereby have directly sustained idolatry, and justified Pharaoh,* as we have shown. But, *there was no contest between God and the witch,* and the awful miracle was calculated to humble her before the Lord, in repentance for her sin, *in tampering with his power.*

No. God chose to meet the reprobate Saul in the very place of his most guilty rebellion. And there, even in the house of

witchcraft, to vindicate his insulted name. "*Ought not*" God to have done *this thing*? The witch did not raise Samuel, for the following reasons: 1. The Bible does not say so. 2. Her alarm when Samuel rose, is proof she was astonished by his appearance. But our main argument here, as in the former question, as to the character of the Egyptian wonders, is this: To admit the Witch of Endor raised Samuel by *Satanic power*, is, to PROVE TOO MUCH. Believe THAT, and we demolish the evidence of the Bible founded on miracles; and more perfectly than to believe the magicians worked wonders by the same power! For, if the witch raised Samuel by Satanic agency, then, we must believe she had the power to *oppose and defeat* the Almighty in the following particulars: First, that *she had power to bring Samuel from heaven in defiance of God*—and secondly, *to make Samuel reveal the future, contrary to the will of God*.

If this be true, then, wo! to the throne of the Almighty!—Almighty! There is no Almighty! A woman—a base woman—a witch, armed with a mite of the power of Satan, can summon Moses, David, Isaiah, Paul, yea, the Son of God himself, to earth, despite the Father, and compel them to reveal time and eternity! What miracle, we ask, greater than this—what wonder so great as this? Have we to vindicate the claims of Jesus Christ to be the Saviour of the world? Not one. Nay, all of his miracles combined, do not equal the stupendous raising of Samuel by the Witch of Endor, *in defiance of Almighty God*, and compelling him, *contrary to Divine will*, to disclose the future to Saul! The supposition is blasphemy, or, the Bible is builded on the sand.

Every consideration, then, of what is due to the honor of God and his word, compels us to reject the idea that the Witch of Endor raised Samuel by Satanic or any other power. *God raised Samuel*.

If it be said the Lord had refused to answer Saul, "by dream, by urim, or by prophet," and therefore it is inconsistent with *that fact*, to believe he sent Samuel to answer Saul under circumstances which have, in reality, countenanced the doctrine of miraculous witchcraft, we reply, Saul was rejected of God and doomed. The Lord then refused to answer him, *as an acceptable worshipper before the tabernacle*. But, God was not restrained thereby, from sending Samuel into the house of idolatry, to overwhelm the monarch in the very act of his sin, by the word of impending destruction—and, at the same time, to confound the witch, herself, by the terrible apparition she would have dared pretend to bring up from the grave and from heaven.

The Bible does not teach the raising of Samuel by the Witch of Endor, and it is to dishonor the Bible to make it teach that fact.

We will now consider the *temptation of Christ*. See Mark,

4th chap., Luke 4th chap: Miraculous power, we are told, was exerted on this occasion by Satan. He made himself *consciously* present to Christ. He conveyed Jesus to the pinnacle of the temple *through the air*, to the top of a mountain, and showed him *all the kingdoms of the world*.

We reply, that the attributes of the Son of God take this case entirely from the conditions of the question. Properly speaking, *miracle*, AS WE UNDERSTAND IT, had no existence in his mind.—He had Divine knowledge of all things, and power to create and to suspend all natural effects. He had also, at all times, direct consciousness of the presence of his Father, Holy Angels, Satan, and all spirits.

Of course, then, he was aware whenever Satan was near him. If he went to the pinnacle of the temple, or to the mountain *through the air*, he went by *his own agency*; for Satan could not have taken him contrary to his will, *inasmuch as he had power over spirits*. And if Satan showed him all the kingdoms of the world in the unlimited sense, *Christ certainly had them in his own mind*. This argument is perfect and conclusive in itself. But, we may add, there is no necessity, (even if we take lower ground than that above,) from the words of the narrative, to suppose any miracle in the temptation of Christ, *farther than that miracle* by which *Jesus himself*, was *conscious* of the presence of Satan. We may believe, without violating the scripture history, that Jesus went as usual, to the temple, also to the mountain, and that Satan appeared and tempted Jesus while on the pinnacle, and from the mountain showed him the kingdom of Canaan, or the countries over which David had reigned, and whose throne the Jews expected their Messiah to fill. The expression, kingdom of the world, was occasionally used for the land of Canaan. Besides, Satan need not have taken Jesus to *the top of a mountain* to show him, *miraculously*, all the kingdoms literally on earth. For, he could have made that display of glory to the ambition of Christ, just as perfectly, any where else, *if he made it miraculously*. So, we may take the first argument or the second, and in either case, miraculous witchcraft gains no help from the temptation of Christ.

We now come to the case of Simon Magus, in Acts 8: &c.—What is the evidence here, that Simon Magus worked miraculous witchcraft? Why, just in the word "*bewitched*." The book reads: "He *bewitched* them with sorceries." But this word proves nothing, for it is the *meaning* of the word we are looking for. And this history tells us what the word does *not* mean. It tells us, that to *bewitch*, does not mean the influence of Satanic power. For, the very word, translated "*bewitched*," in the 9th and 11th verses, is rendered "*wondered*" in the 13th verse. Thus Simon Magus is said to have "*bewitched* the people of Samaria." But, when Simon was baptized, "he contin-

ued with Philip and "*wondered*," (i. e. same word rendered bewitched) beholding the miracles and signs which were done." Now, if this *word*, of ITSELF, decides the question, that there was *Satanic agency*, for that is the point, then, if Simon "*bewitched*" (by Satanic influence) the Samaritans—then, by the same argument, Philip "*bewitched*" (by Satanic power) Simon Magus!! That will hardly do. But, the explanation is simple. Simon made the people of Samaria *wonder* by his *pretended* miracles, and Philip made him "*wonder*" by *real* miracles.

We next notice the possessed damsel, Acts 16, 16: The fact of demoniacal possession, I fully admit. But what was it? Was it miraculous? Was there *consciousness* of the presence of Satan, as *spirit discerns spirit*, or in any other *miraculous way*, by the possessed person? Was miraculous power *given*, or supernatural intelligence *imparted*? That is the point, and we think there was nothing in the case of the possessed damsel to establish the view of witchcraft we are opposing. She performed no miracle. We are not told she had consciousness of the presence of Satan, and had from him power or knowledge. She proclaimed that Paul and Silas were the servants of the most high God. But *that fact* was accessible to *all*, and *believed* by many around her. And, even if it be conceded, that the damsel was led to proclaim this, by the influences of Satan, there was no miracle nor any thing supernatural in that, any more than in *any other case* where *he* leads men, in his ordinary temptations, to act in accordance with the natural course of events. There *was* a miracle in this scene, but *Paul* DID that miracle. He *discerned and casted out* the vile spirit by the *power of Jesus*. And, he thus delivered the damsel from *those suggestions of Satan* which had turned her mind to work lying wonders by the tricks of real, or pretended science.

The Seven Sons of Sceva and the curious arts and books in Acts 19: 14, are the next in order. How does this case help the doctrine of miraculous witchcraft? We are told that "certain of the vagabond Jews, exorcists, took upon them, to call over them which had evil spirits the name of Jesus." "And the evil spirit answered and said, Jesus I know, and Paul I know, but who are ye? And *the man* in whom the evil spirit was, leaped on them and overcame them and prevailed against them, so that they fled out of that house naked and wounded. And this was known to all the Jews and Greeks also dwelling at Ephesus; and fear fell on them all, and the name of the Lord Jesus was magnified." There was a miracle, certainly. But who wrought it? Not the exorcists. Not Satan, except so far as he was compelled to act by Almighty power. No. The Lord Jesus made the spirit testify to his honor, and that of his servants. The demon would not have been allowed to speak, save to *bear witness to the truth*. Had the power of God not been exerted to make

him testify, he would not of his own accord, have borne witness for Christ! Nay, he would rather have given encouragement to the vagabond exorcists. This fact, then, is valuable. It shows not only that Satan performed no miracle, save that by command of Christ he was made to speak and establish *the truth*. But, it also proves that all exorcism, since the days of the Apostles, has been "*vagabond exorcism*."

The books and curious arts were valuable. Such books of pretended miraculous knowledge have been valuable since, and would be again, if believers in miraculous witchcraft could influence mankind once more to think that Satan can enable a wizard or witch, by charm and spell, to raise the dead and tell the future.

Having noticed the evidence adduced by the believer in miraculous witchcraft from scripture facts, we will drop a word only at present, in relation to the predicted miracles of the *man of sin*, the *false prophet*, and the *beast*. We understand the Bible itself to teach, these *miracles* were to be *wonders* that were LIES to sustain imposture in religion. If they were *lies*, they were not REAL *miracles*.

Before we dismiss Romanism, we have a question or two for the believer in miraculous witchcraft, supposing him to be a Protestant:

You hold, that many of the Roman Catholic wonders have been *truly supernatural* and the work of *witchcraft*. (See Charlotte Elizabeth and others.) Well, let us admit this for a moment. But, Roman Catholics claim the POWER to cast out devils, and give *as good proof* to sustain THAT POWER as *their ability to heal the sick, &c. &c. &c.* Now, we ask, do the Roman Catholics cast out devils, by the finger of God, or do they by Satan, cast out Satan? If you say, they cast out devils by the finger of God, then is not the Roman Catholic THE TRUE CHURCH? If you say, they "cast out Satan by Satan," then, has not Satan lost his *wisdom*, since the days of Jesus? Is not his house "*divided against itself*," and can it "*stand*?" Once more—If Romanists by miraculous witchcraft, cast out Satan, is not witchcraft, *for once*, A GOOD THING? and ought we not, all of us, to say to the Priest, "*God speed you*?"

One other question for the believer in miraculous witchcraft.—What will you do with the case of Rev. John Wesley? He affirmed that miracles had not ceased in the church. He claimed that supernatural cures were wrought on himself. And that, in answer to his prayers, the sick were healed and devils cast out! (See his letter to the Bishop of Gloucester, vol. 5, p. 462, his works, first Amer. Edition.) You will not deny, that Mr. Wesley's miracles were as good as Roman Catholic wonders. If they were as good, then we ask, as before, did Mr. Wesley heal the sick and cast out devils, by the finger of God, or by

diabolical agency? If by the finger of God, then is not the Methodist Church to be allowed *to share*, at least, with Romanism, the claim rightly to be considered THE TRUE CHURCH? And must not all other Protestant Churches *yield the question*? Or shall we say Mr. Wesley was a wizard, and by Belzebug cast out Belzebug? This would certainly be harsh measure to be meted out to Mr. Wesley. We think so. The solution of all these questions we believe easy enough.

The scriptures, as we have already said, decide the matter as to Popish miracles. They are *lying wonders*, and, they are *lies uttered in hypocrisy*. Mr. Wesley was merely *over-zealous*, and thought he was verily doing God service, *while he was only building up fanaticism*.

We are not *accurately* informed upon the subject of Mormon miracles, or the *wonders* of the Shakers. Swedenburg, we believe, tells his visions *himself*, and claims our faith on the ground of his *unimpeachable character*. Mesmerism is a little startling. But the jump of Galvani's dead frog when first seen, startled the philosopher, and the magnetic needle pointing its trembling finger to the pole, astonished the world. The Mexicans, when Cortes invaded them, thought the Spanish cavalier and his horse was a God armed with thunder. The Indian, on the upper Missouri, ran away from the steamboat, as from Satan in person.—These, and many other wonders, have been explained. For, Galvani soon settled the mystery of his frog, and he taught us beside, how to make dead men *seem* alive, by bits of copper and zinc, an acid, and a wire. The magnetic needle is yet a mystery, but not thought to be from Satan. The Mexicans found out, some time ago, that Spaniards were men of like passions with themselves, and the poor Indian smokes his pipe on the deck of the steamboat, while he wonders and says that the *power* of the white man is more formidable than all he ever dreamed of in his witchcraft.

We will close this part of the subject by the remark, that, from the fall of man, to the final confirmation of the New Testament, was, *the time of miracles*. God, in order to make disclosures beyond what man could see in *nature*, had to manifest himself by *miracles*. This he did in various ways. He appeared in person, and by holy angels and men gifted with supernatural power, under the Old Dispensation. Christ and his Apostles, by miracles, established the New Testament. During this time, God revealed to man the existence of fallen spirits, and disclosed the fact, that he permitted them to act in the affairs of this world *at his pleasure*. Christ and his Apostles went farther, and by miracles, revealed the malignant influences of these spirits, to *the senses* of men, and showed his power over them. But God, *no where* in scripture, gives us to understand that he ever employed Satan or any other evil spirit, *to do a miracle to establish*

his word, or ever permitted them to work wonders against his name, other than *lying wonders*. Whatever power Satan has ever been allowed to exercise over mankind, has been ALWAYS, *only* in accordance with the LAW OF NATURE. And *law of nature*, too, as it was understood AT THE TIME, by those amongst men, who had knowledge, so far as then possessed, of the law of nature.

This is THE POSITION with which we set out, and in conformity with it, we may, and we do fully subscribe to Satanic influences in this world. God, we believe, empowered Satan to raise the storm—to send down the lightning—to instigate the Sabeans and the Chaldeans, and to afflict with disease, in the trial of Job. God, on another occasion, allowed a lying spirit to be in all Ahab's prophets. But there was nothing miraculous in any of this agency. *Job regarded all as the natural work of God*—and Ahab's prophets had no intimations of Satanic presence; they predicted a *lie* to please the King, and made him believe it was from the spirit of the Lord.

And so God might *now* permit Satan to raise the tempest, but we would only behold *the natural storm*. God might allow Satan to send down the lightning, but we would only gaze upon *the natural blaze of the sky*. And God might now permit all demoniacal possessions and influences, as in the day of Christ, and yet, unless they were exposed to our senses, as they were then *by God himself*, we should see *only* natural effects. Thus, God might allow Satan to breathe forth pestilence, but we would *only inhale the malaria*, and sicken or die. God might allow Satan to afflict us with palsy and dumbness and madness, but we would *only see the withered hand, or pine in silence, or rave in fury*. God, we know, permits Satan now, to tempt, to lead captive the soul—but we *only know we are drawn astray by lusts and enticed*. So, then, whether we believe in the "*possessions*" of the day of Christ, or the *temptations* which Christians admit to exist now, we hold that the influences of evil spirits have been always *in accordance with the law of nature*. Hence, we believe Satanic presence was *only* known to exist *then*, because the Lord revealed the fact by his word. And, that the fact of such presence was made apparent *then*, to the senses of man, because God was pleased to *vindicate his word and power*, by EXHIBITING such presence of evil spirits and casting them out. God, in doing *this miraculous work*, was pleased to vindicate his *truth* in regard to *evil spirits*, just as he, in the same way, *established his other revelations*.

But the word of the Lord was then *perfectly and finally CONFIRMED*, by *signs and wonders*. There is, therefore, *now*, NO NECESSITY that God should make us conscious of *his presence or power by miracles*. This presence *now*, is UNSEEN, UNFELT.—When he influences us, we know it, and *only know it by the*

fruits of the spirit, as declared in his *word*. And, angels *now*, in their ministry to the heirs of salvation, come and go, unknown to our *conscious senses*. In like manner, evil spirits *now*, tempt us as ever, and *may* influence us in all respects, as ever. But we know them to be present *only* by the *word* of the Lord, teaching us, that they are enemies in our way to heaven, ever active to give *greater sinfulness* to sin, and to *direct to wider mischief*, individual depravity, and the general apostacy of the world. But we see them not; we hear them not; we come not in contact with them, through any consciousness of our spirit.

It is proper to remark in this connection, that there is an important difference between our *knowledge* of the presence of the Holy Spirit, and our *knowledge* of Satanic influences on the soul. We *know* the presence of the Holy Spirit *by the* "FRUITS" which are *the evidences of the new nature*. On the other hand, we know the presence of Satan *only as a fact taught in the Bible*. We cannot say what are *his fruits*, as *distinguishable from the workings of the carnal nature*, because his AGENCY, being only *in conformity* with that *carnal nature*, we cannot in our *consciousness*, distinguish it *from* the natural evil of our hearts.— This fact, we can see, is just what it ought to be. For, as God has commanded us to honor HIM *in the fruits of the spirit*, he tells us EXACTLY *what they are*, that we may cherish their growth. But, he has not told us the indications by which we can ascertain the *things*, the *times*, and the *places* of Satan's temptations, because, *we would lay all the blame of such sins on Satan, if we knew when he was present*. We here close our *argument* and examination of Scripture *facts*.

(To be continued.)

Reflections on the 8th Chapter of Leviticus.*

Look into almost any commentator, and you will see that they explain this chapter as restricting marriage between relations from the 6th verse to the 18th, inclusive. Dr. Clarke says, "Marriage with those near of kin prohibited, 6; none to marry with his mother or step mother, 7, 8; with his sister or step sister, 9; with his grand-daughter, 10; nor with the daughter of his step-mother, 11; nor with his aunt by father or mother, 12, 13; nor with his uncle's wife, 14; nor with his daughter-in-law, 15;

*I have prepared these reflections for our forthcoming Magazine. I know more than one case of a man marrying his wife's sister, and more than one case of a man marrying his uncle's wife. If the views we have given, are correct, the Church ought to have them.

nor sister-in-law, 16; nor with a woman and her daughter, son's daughter, or daughter's daughter, 17; nor with two sisters at the same time, 18; several abominations prohibited, 19—23; of which the Canaanites, &c., were guilty, and for which they were cast out of the land, 24, 25. In this view of the object, of these laws, he does not differ from most other commentators.

To the above hypothesis, there are unanswerable objections: The language used by the sacred writer cannot be reconciled with this hypothesis; moreover, it makes some of the laws in this chapter conflict with other laws given by the divine law-giver.

1st. The language used by the sacred writer—"None of you shall approach;" the Hebrew verb, *karabh*, Gesnius' Heb. Lexicon translated by Gibbs, gives as one meaning of this verb, "to draw near a woman, i. e. to lie with her," and refers to Genesis, 20: 4; Isaiah, 8: 3. But there is no instance of this word being used in the Hebrew Scriptures, to mean marriage, directly or indirectly.

2nd. "To uncover their nakedness," the Hebrew verb is *galah*, and the noun *ervah*, (*ishah*.) these words are translated by Gibbs, to uncover the nakedness of a woman, applied to sexual intercourse, particularly that which is incestuous—Lev. 18: 6, &c., and 20: 11, &c., Hos. 2: 10. This language does not necessarily imply marriage. The crimes here prohibited by God, have been committed thousands of times by persons who were not married.

3rd. We have in these laws, the phrases, "father's wife—thy son's wife—brother's wife." A woman, whose husband is dead, is not the wife of a man who has long since returned to the dust from which he was taken; she is his widow, and every bond that made her a wife is unloosed. She is now, as if the union had never existed. According to the apostle: "The woman which hath an husband is bound by the law to her husband, so long as he liveth; but if the husband be dead, she is loosed from the law of her husband; so then, if while her husband liveth, she be married to another man, she shall be called an adulteress; but if her husband be dead, she is free from that law, so that she is no adulteress, though she be married to another man," Rom. 7: 2, 3. 2nd. The hypothesis makes some of the laws in this chapter conflict with other laws given by the divine law-giver.

In the 16th verse we read, "thou shalt not uncover the nakedness of thy brother's wife; it is thy brother's nakedness."—Now if the brother was living, whose wife another brother approached, the crime would have been incestuous adultery. But if he was dead, and the woman was still his wife, then the brother of the deceased could not marry her according to the obvious meaning of the terms of the law, whether she had or had not children, without being guilty of incest; and it would fairly follow

that the law found in Deut. 25: 5, would legalize incest. The law reads, "If brethren dwell together, and one of them die and have no child, the wife of the dead shall not marry without unto a stranger; her husband's brother shall go in unto her and take her to him to wife." Now, if the 16th verse of our chapter forbids the marrying a sister-in-law, then the law in Deuteronomy conflicts with it, and the two laws are irreconcilable. But, the whole difficulty is removed by making the crime forbidden in the 16th verse, incestuous adultery, and making the woman the wife of a husband still living; and the principles of just interpretation compel us to take this view of the 16th verse.

In the 18th verse, we have the following law: "Neither shalt thou take a wife to her sister to vex her, to uncover her nakedness beside the other, in her lifetime." This law forbids marrying a wife's sister, as Jacob had done, while the one first married lives; but the prohibition to marry the sister-in-law, extended only to the death of her married sister; after her death, the man may marry the sister-in-law according to the obvious meaning of the words of the law. This law cannot be reconciled with the opinion of those who make the 16th verse prohibit the marrying of a wife's sister, although the wife may be dead.

For these reasons, we are compelled to reject the hypothesis as the basis of interpreting these laws. We admit, that marriage is forbidden between blood relations, as near akin as those mentioned in this chapter, yet this is not the principal design of these laws; and the prohibition of marriage cannot be got in this chapter, only by inference. In the 18th verse, a man is prohibited to take to wife, his wife's sister during the life-time of his wife, but if the wife dies, the prohibition dies with her, and he may marry her who had been his sister-in-law; for he is bound by the law of his wife only as long as she lives; and in one case he is bound by law to marry a deceased brother's widow—then it follows, that the following doctrine is unscriptural, namely:—"The man may not marry any of his wife's kindred nearer in blood than he may of his own, nor the woman of her husband's kindred nearer in blood than of her own." This doctrine is supposed to be proved from Leviticus 20: 19, 20, 21, yet in this scripture we have the words, "If a man shall take his brother's wife, it is an unclean thing; he hath uncovered his brother's nakedness—they shall die childless." The meaning is, he shall not take, i. e. marry his brother's wife while the brother lives, which was the crime of Herod, while his brother Philip was living; and for reproving him, John the Baptist was beheaded.—"Herod had bound John in prison for Herodias' sake, his brother Philip's wife, for he had married her—for John had said unto Herod, it is not lawful for thee to have thy brother's wife," Mark 6: 17, 18. Herod had transgressed the law, we recited above from Levit. 20: 21, and no doubt Herod and Herodias died

childless. If this is not the meaning, then if a man take the widow of a deceased brother because the brother had no child, such a marriage is uncleanness according to the words of this law, although he was commanded to take her to raise seed for the deceased brother. Some interpretation of God's word ought to be sought that would not make scripture oppose scripture, and one divine law conflict with another. The other texts in Leviticus, no more support the sentiment, that "a man may not marry any of his wife's kindred nearer of blood than of his own," &c., as we will show in the sequel; yet some ecclesiastical bodies have inflicted the highest penalties known to the church, on a member and on Ministers, for marrying the sister of a deceased wife. This is exalting human creeds above the laws of God himself.

We have now shewn that the hypothesis, according to which these laws have been interpreted, is a mere imaginary theory assumed to account for what was either not understood or not investigated on the proper principles of interpretation. In order to explain these laws, we must take into consideration the declared object of the law-giver, which he has stated in the following words: "After the doings of the land of Egypt, shall ye not do—and after the doings of the land of Canaan, shall ye not do." The writer then brings to view these doings, beginning with the 6th verse, and on to the end of the 23rd verse. In the 24th and 25th verses he tells the Israelites: "In all these the nations are defiled, which I cast out before you, and the land is defiled; therefore do I visit the iniquity thereof upon it; and the land itself vomiteth out her inhabitants." In the 26th verse: "Ye shall not commit any of these abominations, neither any of your own nation; nor any stranger that sojourneth among you."

The declared object of the laws is one of the best means to enable the interpreter to explain the law; so also are the circumstances and conditions of the people for whose benefit the laws are enacted. The Egyptians and Canaanites were the slaves of a most degrading and corrupting idolatry; an idolatry that restrained almost no crime, while it was the fruitful parent of some of the basest malpractices, and fostered the vilest passions.—The Israelites, in consequence of their long bondage, were to a great extent, as much sunk in ignorance, lust and crime, as the Egyptians. God warned his people against these doings, and surrounded these warnings with the most solemn legislative acts. We learn from the Bible and other sources, what were many of these doings, namely: incestuous fornication; incestuous adultery; mere or simple fornication, that did not include the idea of incest; and two other vices almost nameless—man lying with man, and both man and woman with beasts; to these may be added, incestuous marriages. These facts bring to view, the true basis on which the explanation of each law must be founded. One of

the laws is to be explained according to one of the facts, another law by a different fact, &c.

The law in the 7th and 8th verses forbids incestuous adultery; adultery whether with a mother or a father's wife, which last was the sin of both Reuben and Absalom. But the thing directly forbidden, is not marriage with a mother or a father's wife; for Paul tells us, "such fornication is not so much as named among the Gentiles, that one should have his father's wife," 1 Cor., 5: 1,—yea, not even the Egyptians or Canaanites; this is not one of their doings—then this law is not to be considered as a prohibition of their marriage, except by a fair inference, but it is not the direct object of the law; marriage indeed would be an aggravation of the crime. The sacred writer is warning against the "doings" of Egypt and Canaan; but this was not one of their doings according to Paul—but the crime without marriage, doubtless, was not uncommon. We have shown that the *usus loquendi* of *approach* and *uncover*, is not to express marriage—particularly *approach*.

The 9th and 11th verses forbid "approach" to a sister or half sister. Ammon, the son of David, was guilty of this crime with his half sister Tamar; and it was not uncommon among the Egyptians, Canaanites and other pagans. Cambyeses, the son of Cyrus, and Emperor of Persia, married his own sister. The crime is detestable in the sight of heaven, and marriage would not be a palliation, yet the language does not imply marriage. The crime, then, is incestuous fornication.

10th verse forbids an approach to a grand daughter—they are the remainder of thy flesh; thy own nakedness. The crime does not suppose marriage, it is incestuous fornication, and intermarriage would be unnatural wickedness; but the language of the law does not suppose marriage.

13th verse forbids approach to an aunt, whether the sister of a father or a mother; either of them would be the *remainder of thy flesh*. The language of the law does not suppose the aunts to be wives—the crime is incestuous fornication.

14th verse: "Thou shalt not uncover the nakedness of thy father's brother—thou shalt not approach to his wife, she is thy aunt." On this text we remark,

1st. It is evident the uncle is supposed to be alive—"Thou shalt not approach his wife." But a dead man has no wife, she is a widow. Nor can a living woman have a husband who has gone to the grave; death dissolved the connection that made husband and wife.

2nd. The aunt in this verse, cannot mean a blood relation, unless the uncle had married his own sister, or the sister of the nephew's mother; or some one so much the remainder of the blood of the nephew, that an approach to her would be incestuous, had the uncle never been married to her. But an approach

of this kind had been forbidden in the preceding laws. Yet if the uncle were alive, on the supposition he was the husband of his own sister or the sister of the nephew's mother, the approach of the nephew would be incestuous adultery of a most aggravated kind.

3rd. If the uncle's wife was no blood relation of his own, nor of the nephew, then when death dissolved the relation that made her an aunt, she ceased to be an aunt in any sense, that would hinder her from marrying any nephew that was not the remainder of her flesh; as this is the only kind of relation that she is forbidden to marry, even if the laws respected marriage, as has been gratuitously supposed. But if the relationship depended entirely on the uncle's marriage, then death dissolved the relationship of the nephew, as it did dissolve the relationship between the living widow and the dead husband, and the nephew is not forbidden to marry the widow in any place in the book of God. We are supported in this view by the language of the apostle: "The woman which hath an husband, is bound by the law to her husband, so long as he liveth; but if the husband be dead, she is loosed from the law of her husband; so then, if while her husband liveth, she be married to another man, she shall be called an adulteress; but if her husband be dead she is free from law, so that she is no adulteress, though she be married to another man," Rom. 7: 2, 3. This explanation of the 14th verse is confirmed by the 20th verse of the 20th chapter—"If a man shall lie with his uncle's wife, he hath uncovered his uncle's nakedness; they shall bear their sin; they shall die childless." This is the same law repeated, with a little variation of the words, which determines the meaning of the 14th verse of the 18th chapter; and here we have a penalty annexed:—In the one, the words are, "thou shalt not approach;" in the other, "thou shalt not lie;" the Heb. verb used is *shakabh*. The reader will be at no loss to understand the import of this word by turning to, and reading the following texts: Gen. 26: 10 and 30: 15—16, and 39: 7—12. Exo. 22: 19. Deut. 22: 23, 25—28, 29. The meaning of this word is decided beyond dispute by these passages, and shews how we are to understand the word "approach." Then the crime forbidden in both places is incestuous adultery; and the uncle is supposed to be living.—Surely no word can be more distant from the idea of marriage than the word *shakabh*.

The interpretation we have given of the 14th verse, we believe, is sustained by reason; by the established rules of interpretation; by the inspired apostle, and by analogy. According to the 18th verse, a brother may marry a wife's sister, provided the wife be dead. But a sister by mere law, sustains a nearer relation than an aunt by mere law; then, if a man may marry a deceased wife's sister, much more may he marry a deceased uncle's

wife; his aunt only by mere law. The relation of husband and wife is terminated at death; and also all the relations that depended on that marriage relation. In the 17th, 20th, 21st, 22nd, 23rd verses, crimes are prohibited which need no comment.

In the 20th chapter, these laws are repeated with very little variation, beginning with the 10th and including the 21st verse. But the change of the terms mutually throws light on the meaning of the laws in both chapters. The terms used in the 20th chapter remove all obscurity or doubt as to the meaning of the terms used in the 18th chapter. The terms used in the 18th, are *karabh* to approach, and *galah* to uncover; but in the 20th, one of the terms used is *shakabt*; the meaning of this term cannot be misunderstood by any body that will take pains to turn to the texts referred to and read them; yet this term is used about the very cases that *karabh* to approach, and *galah* to uncover, are used in the 18th chapter. And in the 16th verse, *karabh* is used where marriage is out of the question. In this chapter, (20th,) *lakah*, to take, is used several times; this term needs no explanation.

We have now shewn, that *near of kin* relates to those only, who are near of kin as blood relations, and does not include those who are relatives only by marriage—of course, does not include a sister-in-law or an aunt, who is an aunt only by being married to an uncle who is a near blood relation.

But it is said, Naomi had a near kinsman of her husband. Ruth 2: 1. And Naomi says, "Is not Boaz of our kindred?" Ruth 3: 2. It is evident that Boaz was no blood relation of Ruth or Naomi; it was only by Naomi's marriage with a blood relative of Boaz, that he could be a near kinsman to them. In both these texts the word rendered *kinsman* and *kindred* is in Hebrew *modha*, which means *an acquaintance*, of course has not the least bearing on the subject.

But does not Ruth claim Boaz as her near kinsman, Ruth 3: 9; and does not Boaz acknowledge that he is her near kinsman, verse 12th?—yet she was not a blood relation, but only the widow of a deceased blood relation.

In both these instances the Hebrew word is *goel*. This word is derived from the verb *gaal*, which means to demand back one's property—to repurchase an estate that has been sold—to redeem—to revenge the blood of one that had been slain. And because the right of repurchase, and of redemption as well as the revenging of blood pertained to the nearest of kin; and because the nearest of kin was under obligation to marry the widow of his deceased relative, the verb is used to express this idea, Ruth 3: 13. This verse is translated by Gibbs' Hebrew Lexicon: "If he will take thee to wife, well; let him do so; but if he will not take thee to wife, then I will take thee to wife." The verb *gaal* is used four times in this text. And in Ruth 4: 4, 6,

7, this verb is translated by the word *redeem*. Then Ruth was not the *remainder of the flesh* of Boaz; he was her *goel* bound to redeem her former husband's property, and marry her as the blood relation of the deceased husband. Then, the views we have given in explaining the 18th and 20th chapters of Leviticus, are not in the least affected by any thing contained in the book of Ruth. Any biblical critic who will shew by the established rules of interpretation, that we are in an error, will have the thanks of the writer.

C. N.

Extract.

“We must know that *all* are not elected and chosen of God the Father. Some will say, there is nothing but holiness in them; but this is a mistake; for it is evident that they never had any fear of God before their eyes; but are hypocrites. Therefore we must not be dismayed, if we see rebellion in men; for all are not planted by the hand of God. Thus we see how we must make our profit of this doctrine. We must know, first of all, that faith is given us from above: God having lightened us by his holy spirit, we receive the gospel; yet not by our own wit and virtue.

God giveth us this grace, because he had chosen us for his children, and adopted us before the beginning of the world: which is a singular and inestimable blessing, bestowed upon us, while others are left to perish. He was at liberty to choose whom he would: therefore it behooveth us to know that we are so much the more bound to him, because he hath delivered us out of the general destruction of mankind. Let us consider that it is very profitable for us to understand this free election of God, which maketh a difference between his children and the castaways.

When we see troubles and offences in the church, when we see those who had begun well turn aside from the true way, we must remember that men are frail; yet notwithstanding, we shall find sufficient sureness in our God; because he hath been graciously pleased to adopt us for his children; therefore he will keep us through Jesus Christ according to his promise. Let us resort to the election of God, whenever we become dismayed or cast down: if we see men fall away, if the whole church should seem to come to nought, we must remember that God hath his foundation; that is, the church is not grounded upon the will of men, for they did not make themselves, neither can they reform themselves: but this proceedeth from the pure goodness and mercy of God.

Although the upper part of the building be as it were overthrown, though we see no pillars, though the form and shape of it appear no more, yet God will keep the foundation sure, which never can be shaken. Thus the world may see whether the doctrine of God's election which we preach, be needless or not. We must not presume to enter into the secret counsel of God, to thoroughly comprehend his wonderful secrets; but if this be hid from us, to know that God chose us before the world was made, is it not to deprive us of a comfort which is not only profitable for us, but even necessary? The devil can find no better means to destroy our faith, than to hide this article from our view.

What case should we be in, and especially now-a-days, when there are so many rebels and hypocrites in the world? yea, and such, as men are looking for wonders at their hands. Might we not fear the same would befall us? How can we rest ourselves with constancy upon God, and commit ourselves to him with settled hearts, not doubting but that he will take care of us to the end, unless we flee to this election as our only refuge? If this is not true, it seemeth that God hath broken his promise, which was given us respecting his gospel; and that Jesus Christ is banished out of the world.

This is the principal cause, and the best means that satan can devise, to destroy our love for the gospel. Therefore, let us hold fast these weapons, in despite of satan and all his imps: for these must be our defence. Let us be confirmed in the election of our God, and make it available; and see that it be not taken from us; if we love the salvation of our own souls, let us attend well to these things. We must consider those who would hide such a doctrine from us our mortal enemies: the devil stirreth them up to deprive us of a comfort, which if we do not enjoy, we cannot be assured of our salvation. However, we must remember this exhortation of the Apostle Paul; *let every one that nameth the name of Christ depart from iniquity.*

As the election of God is to give us a sure constancy, to make us happy in the midst of trouble, which otherwise might disquiet us, we must not cease to call upon him, to run to him, and to walk diligently in the way wherein he hath called us. There is a great difference between the assurance of the faithful, who are thoroughly persuaded of the surety of their salvation, and those who are negligent and careless, and think no harm can overtake them: these are as blocks; they know not the danger that surroundeth them, which should induce them to flee to God for protection: but on the contrary, after they have been once instructed, they never pay any more attention to doctrine.

But the faithful cease not to fear, although they are grounded upon the goodness of God, and are persuaded that no storm nor tempest whatsoever can carry them away: yet notwithstanding, they continue to watch against the assaults of satan. They

know their frailty, which causes them to put their trust in God, and pray to him, that he would not forsake them in time of need; but that he would put forth his hand and preserve them: they consider whereunto they are called; they repent, and call upon God to increase the graces of his holy spirit in them, and take from them their afflictions.”—*Calvin's Sermons.*

Particular Providence proved by Fact.

“But Mr. Williams contemplated the circumstances which prepared for the introduction of the Gospel into Samoa, not merely as propitious, but as providential. Throughout his life, the doctrine of Divine superintendence was one of his firmest supports and most powerful stimulus. His philosophy on this subject was drawn from the word of God. There was no passage of the sacred volume upon which, when in England, he dilated with more frequency and copiousness, or to the illustration of which he could bring a greater variety of striking facts from his own eventful history, than Mark xvi. 20, “And they went forth and preached everywhere, *the Lord working with them.*” “Is it possible,” he asks, “to reflect upon the manner in which Mrs. Williams gave her consent to this enterprise,—to our meeting with the chief at Tongatabu,—to the death of Tamafaigna,—and to other striking particulars, without exclaiming, ‘Here is something more than accident? *This is the finger of God.*’” These first impressions were not merely confirmed, but deepened, by Mr. Williams’ second visit to Samoa. At the conclusion of the journal of that voyage, he thus writes:—

“It is impossible to reflect upon our first voyage to Samoa, and not discover the hand of God. At that time, we were entirely ignorant of the state of the islands, the character of the people, the influence of the chiefs, the feelings of different parties, the relative importance of the various districts, and other points of great moment to a missionary, about to commence a mission, and upon a knowledge of which his success materially depends. Our deficiency, however, was remarkably supplied by our meeting with Fauea, at Tongatabu; and the result was, that had we then possessed the knowledge we have since obtained, we could not have selected a better place for the commencement of the mission, than that to which we were undesignedly conducted. Looking back upon the circumstances, it appears to me that, with my present information, out of the numerous stations where the mission might have been commenced, there was one which possessed advantages far above all

“the rest; and it was *that* to which we were directed. This was “not the result of any wisdom or foresight of our own.”

To what cause, then, it may be asked, must this be ascribed? Was it a mere casual coincidence? Is it possible to question the fact that this was the Lord's doing? Some, indeed, may answer, “It is possible;” for it is a favorite dogma with many, that while it is consistent with all proper conceptions of the character and supremacy of the Creator, to suppose that he exercises a *general* superintendence over human affairs, the doctrine of a *particular* Providence derogates from his dignity, and cannot be made to harmonize with the undeviating uniformity of the established laws of matter and mind. This is not the place for lengthy discussions, or it might be easily shown that this theory is most inconsistent with Divine revelation,—that it is opposed to all correct views of God's natural and moral perfections,—that, when sifted, it will be found to exclude “the Creator of the ends of the earth” from the world which he has made,—that it gives an independent power to matter and mind, which it is, in the very nature of things, impossible for any created thing to possess,—that by denying the possibility of Divine influence upon the heart, it excludes the hope of renovation and recovery from their present degradation to the whole race of Adam; and, moreover, that it most unphilosophically maintains the self-destructive doctrine that communities can be governed except through the agency of individuals. But we must waive the general question.—There is, however, one topic connected with the subject, which the history of Mr. Williams will not permit us to pass over. That history illustrates, in a very clear and interesting form, the manner in which Divine regard to a community, and the particular and providential guidance of an individual, may act consentaneously; and shows how vitally the one is sometimes interwoven with the other. Surely it is impossible to conceive of any event within the ordinary range of human affairs, by which the beneficent Creator could have more signally discovered his kindness to the long-benighted inhabitants of Samoa, than by making them partakers of his own revelation. And, if there be such a thing as Providence at all, this change in the condition of a people, the most important which could be experienced, must have been providential. Nothing, therefore, had occurred to the Samoans, or to their ancestors, so momentous as that visit of the man of God which has just been described; and he who admits that the introduction of the Gospel amongst them was an evidence of general Divine superintendence, cannot surely deny that the movements which preceded, the circumstance which promoted, and the agency which accomplished this object, must also have been under the same control. Now, as it is evident that all the blessed changes which date their origin to this me-

morable period may be traced to Mr. Williams, it becomes equally evident that the well-being of a nation for ages to come became closely connected with the mental state, and voluntary movements of one man. If, then, an unseen hand had not influenced his mind, and guided his steps, there was nothing extraordinary, nothing providential, in the evangelization of Samoa; but, if it be allowed that this change, so vast in itself, so interesting in its character, so momentous and even infinite in its results, was a part of God's general providence, (and to deny this consistently, the doctrine of Divine superintendence should be denied altogether,) then it must follow, that he whose human agency effected it, was the child, the care, the instrument of that providence, and, consequently, that its special and general operations so concur and co-operate, that the one doctrine cannot be maintained, apart from the other."—*Life of Rev. J. Williams.*

From the New York Evangelist.

Look out for a Robber!

A very daring robbery was committed last Sabbath in one of the churches in New York. The Rev. Mr. ——— preached a capital sermon, and more than five hundred impressions were distributed about in the house. But a large number were stolen almost immediately after coming into possession of the hearers. Others were robbed of theirs before the benediction was pronounced, and others still before they reached home. It is believed that of the large number of the impressions of that sermon, the greater portion have been irrecoverably lost. This is most deeply to be regretted, as the discourse was one of great value, and might have been of greater advantage to the owners, if retained, than any other species of property in their possession.

And, what is more strange, there was no commotion made on the occasion. The thief managed the thing so adroitly, that he got clear with his spoils without any "hue and cry" being raised after him. The police, so far as I can find, have had no notice of the robbery, and the papers say nothing about it. Indeed, I have learned that the people robbed, have said nothing to one another about their losses; and it seems doubtful whether many are aware yet of the greatness of their loss.

But I have thought best to make some stir about it, and to put people upon their guard. I have collected some facts, which I submit for their consideration.

1. The thief is *well known*. That is a comfort. To be in a quandary about who it was that did us an injury, to be stirring

up the depths of one's soul to find out, it is a sorry business. It is worth while to know who the villian is, if we cannot lay hands on him; and so much of comfort there is about the above-named robbery. There is no mistake about the thief, for his name is in print, and a good deal about him in print too. I quote for public information. "When any one heareth the word and understandeth it not, then cometh the *Wicked One* and catcheth away that which was sown in his heart."

2. He is an *old and notorious thief*. That is on record too.— He began his career as far back as when there was only a couple of people upon the earth. And it is well-ascertained that there has not been a soul in any generation since but has suffered from his villainy. He has got his name up for as big a villain as there is at large.

3. And that he is a *cunning* villain, is as plain as his notoriety. One that knew him well, more than a thousand years ago, and had suffered much from him, affirmed that "he transformed himself into an angel of light," when necessary to effect his purposes. He had the cunning of a serpent when he began, and every generation of men can testify to the truth of an old record, that "he deceiveth the whole world."

4. He is a very *malignant* robber. He rifies people of the *very best* things in their possession. If he took only worldly property, like some thieves, he might ease some people of their burdens, and be no more than a tolerable villain. But if he sees a man in possession for instance of peace of conscience, or on happy terms with his Maker, or enjoying the pleasure of doing good, or in possession of spiritual blessings of any kind, he will rob him of this kind of comfort if he can. No human being shall be happy, in the best sense of that word, if he can despoil him. And the more of a reprobate is he from the fact that he can make no use, for his own good, of those things that he robs people of. Not one of his thefts ever brought him the slightest advantage. And, moreover, while some villains will leave their victims some comforts, this one will not leave, if he can succeed in his mischief, a single shred of the robe of righteousness on any man's back, nor a spiritual sixpence of all his riches.

5. He is a good deal of a *coward* too, for so great a villain.— That is strange, for one that has had the impudence, and the skill, and the wickedness to injure so many people. Though as "a roaring lion he seeks whom he may devour," yet I have heard that if you "resist him he will flee from you." Though I have not learned, and therefore I have my doubts as to whether he has any conscience or sense of shame, yet I have known many cases where very weak persons, whom he came to rob, have put on a bold face, and he has no sooner seen them resolute and determined, than he has made off with great precipitation.

6. More about him. He contrives to throw dust in the peo-

ple's eyes he does rob, most strangely. For while he filches the most precious things in their possession, they either do not seem to be aware of it at all, or are strangely backward to admit the Old Robber has had anything to do with them. It shall be as plain as the noonday that they have been most grievously robbed by him, but your intimation of such fact, would change the calm to the scowling sky. They robbed? Not they!

7. That this old thief is a *kidnapper* of the worst kind, is all I can farther say about him. He has made victims of more people than I can tell of, and he is most desperately determined not to let them go. He has lost a good many, at one time and another, that he greatly triumphed over; and those who have once escaped out of his grasp, annoy him sorely by their efforts to get more victims away, and to prevent his making new captives.—He has a bitter grudge against the most active of these.

I have thought it well to give the above account of this famous villain, inasmuch as the robbery, spoken of at the head of this article, seems to have failed of stirring any body else up.—People had better look out for him. He will get locked up by and by, and an end will come to his depredations. But that is a good while ahead, and he will drive a desperate game of mischief-making while he is at large.

PASCAL.

From the New York Observer.

Brief Hints to Parishioners.

Hint 7. See that your minister receives that support which is promised to him. Some congregations are extremely negligent in this matter, embarrassing their minister and injuring themselves, to say nothing of their disregard of a divine ordinance thus written in the statute-book of the Christian church. "Even so hath the Lord ORDAINED, that they who *preach* the gospel should *live* of the gospel." So in that kind of question which can receive but one answer, Paul asks: "If we have sown unto spiritual things, is it a great thing if we shall reap your carnal things?" This is a kind of dishonesty, not to say indirect robbery, which is too common. There are noble exceptions, especially in men who in middling circumstances pay \$50 or \$100 a year or even more, when others, more able, will contribute but little. I now think of a minister whose salary, though it came from a poor people, was punctually paid every quarter day, chiefly in consequence of the benevolent energy of one man, who was determined that the promises of the people should be kept, and who kept them to their promise. *Certainty* in this matter is very important. A salary of \$400, certainly and regularly paid, is

better than one of \$600 that is uncertain. Hence there is as much truth as humor in the anecdote of the minister who entreated his parishioners to desist when they threatened to raise his salary, until in the first and most important sense they had *raised it*, and paid what they promised.

8. Be not niggardly of presents to your pastor; I mean such as are fitted to satisfy his real wants, but not such as minister to pride, vanity or sin, in himself or his family: such as are rather substantial than ornamental. Dr. Wilson, of Philadelphia, would not take a gift, either in secret or otherwise, not even a bottle of cream, nor "from a thread even to a shoe-latchet," as Abraham said to the King of Sodom, though I did once succeed in smuggling a bottle of Pennsylvania cream into the pocket of the carriage in which, with that venerable man, I rode out one summer's morning to the country seat of a parishioner, but I was obliged to consign it to Mrs. Wilson, who had fewer scruples, as the Chinese astutely give those presents to Mrs. Parker, which the Doctor declines. It must be said, however, in Dr. Wilson's case, that besides a large salary, he was "easy" in his circumstances. Presents ought to be general, not isolated, lest partial feelings be created. It is a small thing for you to give something to your pastor, but the collective somethings are much for him. A cord of wood, a barrel of flour, a brace of fowls, a gobbler, a dozen of butter, a quarter of beef—these and the like are necessaries and substantials, for his fires must be kept going, and his mouths must be fed. The little olive plants must be nourished. I have heard of some recent notable instances of parochial donations in New Jersey and elsewhere. It is an honor to them. Go ye and do likewise.

9. Cultivate the proprieties of public worship. "Keep thy foot when thou goest to the house of God." The papists have gone to one extreme in attaching a kind of physical and material sanctity to their houses of worship; the Puritans have advanced towards the other in throwing open God's house for town meetings, political celebrations, cattle shows, and such like, till one would suppose all sacred associations would be utterly destroyed. Now there is a safe and reverent medium. There are individual and general proprieties to be observed. Linger not about the porch of the sanctuary without necessity. Go directly to your seat, saluting none by the way, and being seated, gaze not around to see who and what are there and are coming. Enter by a solemn act of the soul into a state of spiritual abstraction, for which you will have been prepared by cleansing out the chambers of your soul before you leave the closet. If you have children, they ought to sit with you. What an absurdity to thrust them away into the gallery. If there be no room below, then make family pews in the gallery, but let not your children be playing up stairs while you are praying below. If you have occasion to leave the house,

do it as if in your "stocking feet," but never leave until you find it absolutely necessary. Let little children be trained to silence and quietude. If you are of the choir, remember your solemn station and employment—directly opposite the sacred desk, as if to echo its holy doctrines with the voice of melody, and repeat its glorious message in strains like those that charmed the ears of the shepherds of Bethlehem. Sorry I am to say it, the greatest *singers* are sometimes the greatest *sinner*s in the congregation. The conduct of some young ladies is at times as *ugly* as their persons and voices are *lovely*, so that they seem to realize the fable of the metamorphose of Beauty into Deformity. Then, too, even the leader, perhaps a decent and dignified man, but without interest in the preached gospel, will spend much of his time during the sermon in turning over the leaves of the music book, all which is a grief and trouble to the preacher, and an offence to God. Be not thou a partaker in any of these sins.

Religious Gems.

ROBBING GOD.—He that robs God of time, defrauds himself both of time and eternity.

PLEASURE.—The seeds of repentance are sown in youth by what is called pleasure, but the harvest is reaped in age, by pain.

RELIGION.—Men will wrangle for religion, write for it, fight for it, die for it, any thing but live for it.

THIS WORLD AND THE NEXT.—He that will often put this world and the next before him, and look steadfastly at both, will find the latter growing greater, and the former less.

CONTRAST.—The death of Judas is as strong a confirmation of Christianity as the life of Paul.

THE WISE COURSE.—We should embrace Christianity; for a just and benevolent being will never punish us for believing what there is so much reason to believe; so that we run no risk by believing it, even if it has been but a dreadful one by rejecting it if it be true.

TIME FOR REFLECTION.—When the multitude applaud you, seriously ask what evil you have done; when they censure you, what good.

ILLUSTRATIONS.—God's children are like stars, that shine brightest in the darkest night; like gold, that is brighter for the furnace; like incense, that becomes fragrant by burning; like the camomile plant, that grows fastest when trampled on.

TEMPTATIONS.—Satan's fiercest temptations are usually directed against the most gracious hearts; he is too crafty a pirate to attack an empty vessel.

THE DEVIL'S PROPERTY.—The sinner is the devil's mill, always grinding; and Satan is careful ever to keep the hopper full.

PROFANENESS.—Most sinners seem to serve the devil for pay; but profane swearers are a sort of volunteers; who get nothing for their pains.

THE THINGS THAT MAKE DEATH TERRIBLE.—When Garrick with great self-gratulation showed Johnson his fine house, gardens and paintings, expecting some flattering compliment, the only reply was, "Ah, David, David, these are the things that make death terrible."

THE DIFFERENCE.—Wisdom prepares for the worst, but folly leaves the worst for the day when it comes.

THE BETTER COURSE.—It is better to go with the few to heaven, than with the multitude to hell, and so be lost for the sake of company.

GOD'S WAY.—God never makes us what we should be, without first making us know what we are.

A LOSS.—A lost affliction is an immense loss.

A HYPOCRITE.—A hypocrite neither *is* what he *seems*, nor *seems* what he *is*. He is hated by the *world* for *seeming* a Christian, and by God for not being one. On earth he is the picture of a saint, but in eternity the paint shall all be washed off, and he shall appear at the Judgment in his own colours and deformity.—*New England Puritan.*

CONSCIENCE.

Conscience has no temptation to be otherwise than faithful.—It may be abused; it may be loaded down with weight, but cannot be crushed. You may shut your eyes, but it will whisper in your ears; you may stop your ears, but it will tremble in your nerves. When it cannot thunder, it will whisper; and when it cannot whisper, its silence is often more terrible than its utterance. It has a most tenacious memory, as well as a most tender sensibility. The testimony of a good conscience, therefore, is more to be desired than mountains of gold.

SAVING TIME.

Madame de Genlis, a companion of the Queen of France, was compelled to be at the table fifteen minutes before her mistress, which she employed in reading, and in this way mastered several volumes! Thus, we see what may be accomplished by a systematic distribution of time.

TITLÉ
Calvinistic Magazine.
[NEW SERIES.]

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

Vol I.

March, 1846.

No. 3.

Witchcraft.

BY FRED. A. ROSS.

(Continued from page 32.)

The doctrine of supernatural witchcraft, has been fairly shown, we think, to be FALSE, from the *argument* founded on the nature and importance of miracles, and from an *examination* of the scripture facts relied on to sustain satanic marvels. The TRUE view of witchcraft, then, comes before us for acceptance—that it was PRETENDED *intercourse with the spiritual world* through mystic arts practised by the enchanter, the soothsayer, the necromancer, the witch, the astrologer, the magician, the wizard, the exorcist, &c. &c.; and the performance of *lying wonders*,—to sustain idolatry and other forms of false religion. As akin to this, we have said, should be reckoned, *any tampering with the invisible world, tending to turn the mind from true religion.*

This view meets all the demands of the subject. It shows, that such *pretended* intercourse with the invisible world, *deserved the Divine displeasure.* It relieves the question from the *absurdity* of giving Satan *power*, which accomplishes *too much or nothing.* It will never *conflict* with the *progress* of human knowledge. It saves us from *superstitious fear*—while it allows to Satan a real and awful influence in our fallen world.

Let us notice these points. Witchcraft, in the sense affirmed, *deserved* the Divine displeasure, because it was the very *power of Idolatry.* The sin, first in the law given at Sinai, is Idolatry. It was the GREAT SIN, from which Israel was to be delivered and preserved. It was *the sin*, into which Israel fell again and again, until the captivity in Babylon. If so, PRETENDING to supernatural intercourse with, and power from *other Gods*, was *the very thing* to perpetuate idolatry, and all forms of false religion. *It merited then, the wrath of heaven.* But, witchcraft, in the sense

denied, would have *established* the claims of idolatry upon *the same foundation* precisely, as we have shown, on which God himself relied—that of *miracles*. We must confess, we cannot see how he could have commanded Israel to have no other Gods besides him, upon the ground of his works, if Baal and other divinities had miracles to sustain their names also. *Pretending* to intercourse, supernatural with the spiritual world, was *the very thing* and *the only thing*, which could justly call forth the anger of the Almighty.

An important question here comes before us: Could this *pretended* intercourse with the spiritual world have been so widely practised and so long continued, for the delusion of the world, *without some real supernatural power*? We answer promptly, *yes*. *For, man has a heart willing to be deceived, and that continually*. If he could cover his nakedness with a fig leaf, and hide from God amongst the trees of the garden, then he evinced a heart willing to turn from his Creator into every refuge of lies. If he has never desired the knowledge of the Almighty, but sought to have a God like himself, then, *any pretence* was strong enough to lead him to the service of such a God. Yet man has aspired after immortality. He has sought to be happy in time and eternity. He has ever been saying, who will show me any good—and willing to find it ANY WHERE *but in the service of the Holy One of Israel*.

There is, then, in the heart of man, a foundation on which to build a work of deception, deep as hell and high as heaven. There has always been knowledge enough to rear and sustain *pretended* miraculous witchcraft, when man has not yet emerged from the savage to the civilized state. Adam was endowed for enlightened society. The Antediluvians must have made great progress in science. The ark of Noah was a stupendous work. The farther back we go in the history of Egypt, the more we admire that wonder of the world. Cursed as she has been, and is, of God and man, we are even now compelled to stand in the shadows of her pyramids, and gaze in awe upon piles of granite, heaved up by power unknown to us, and speculate in mystery upon the departed glory of the sand covered sphynx, and silent memnon, if indeed, his sun-rise tones be hushed to the listening ear.

But, the knowledge of ancient times was possessed by the few.

The few wielded it to acquire and maintain power over the many. What so potent to enslave the people, as KNOWLEDGE *claiming intercourse with the spiritual world?* The man who studied the stars seemed to possess supernatural information when he predicted eclipses of the sun and moon. The chemist produced results which astonished the ignorant. The magicians and priests, armed with knowledge from these sources, and from the science of *sound*, of *water*, of the *mechanical powers*, and especially of *sight*, were able to accomplish every thing we read of in sacred or profane history, of a marvellous character, which they did.—We must remember that the wealth of empires, heaped up by this deception, was ever poured out to sustain it. Well might the priests have *thunder and lightning* in immense subterranean temples. Well might they seem to exhibit *the heads of dead men*, uttering oracular responses. Well might they construct *fountains* to discharge *wine* seven days, and *water* the rest of the year. Well might they have weeping statues, perpetual lamps, and walking figures endowed with apparent life. Well might they make the *floors* of halls of mystery seem like *a waving sea* on which the victims of their lust or blood were hurried away. Well might they bring likenesses of Gods to speak to men, and make images of the dead come forth and tell the future, in words meaning anything or nothing. All this, and more, they could do. All this, and more, we can bring to pass. Science can now accomplish results which are full of the supernatural to the mass of mankind. Give money enough to fit up a theatre with darkness, and light, and caverns, and graves, and let there be fire, and incense, and mirrors, and magic lanterns, and ventriloquism—and any *Cornelius Agrippa* amongst our magicians, will bring you, seemingly, a skeleton from the tomb, clothe it with flesh, robe it in light, and make it speak to your startled ear.

But again, the rulers of the world, not only employed science to produce imposition upon mankind, they also turned to the same deception, natural phenomena of a strange or *startling* character. Well they might. For many appearances of nature, until explained, are truly marvellous. Let a few illustrations suffice.—If we had stood with Mr. Haue one morning at *sun-rise*, and seen gigantic figures on the summit of the *Brocken mountain*, pulling off their hats and bowing to us, we might have thought it was *Satanic*. But the appearance was occasioned by the mist,

which, under peculiar circumstances, had become a great looking-glass that day, on the top of the mountain in which our shadows were reflected. Had we been with Humboldt at Cumana, in South America, and seen boats swimming in the air, and hills, and palm trees up there, with cows and horses grazing, we would have believed it was witchcraft, had we been as ignorant as that priest-ridden Indian who stood beside the traveller. Mr. Latham once saw from the English shore, the French coast and the ships at anchor, where the distance across was beyond the reach of the eye or the spy-glass. We would have counted it sorcery in Mr. Latham, had we believed old wives fables. If we had been up that morning, when Scoresby saw *the enchanted coast of Greenland*, and beheld ships in the clouds, some of them bottom up, and distinguished his father's vessel amongst them, when there were no ships above the horizon, we might have considered it all supernatural, had we known no more about the matter than the Greenlander yonder in his boat watching a seal. If we had been sitting one summer evening at the door of the Hall, with Daniel Stricket, servant of John Irven, near Souterfel in England, and had seen a man with his dog pursuing some horses along the face of a precipice where no man nor dog could run—and then a troop of horsemen riding along that same brink, and then again many troops in succession—we might have been excused, had we looked to another world to find the explanation. And yet Humboldt, and Latham, and Scoresby, to say nothing of Dan. Stricket, would have explained the whole upon principles as intelligible as that by which every Tennessee rifleman understands that a fish which he is about to shoot, is not where *it seems to be* in the water.

The ear, we are told, has a drum in it, and when that drum is struck by vibrations of air, we hear sounds. *How* we hear, *because* that drum is *thus struck*, no body can tell. But so it is. Very well. If then, the imagination, or disease, or any other thing besides external air, strikes that drum, *in the same way* then, we hear the *same sound* which vibrations of air would have produced. Hence, we often have familiar tunes as distinctly in the ear, as if music was floating around us, and voices of the living or the dead, to startle us in fever or in reverie. In similar explanations science informs us that sight is the perception of a *picture* of the external object which light paints on an ex-

pansion of the optic nerve called the *retina*. But *how* that *picture* gives SIGHT, *because* that optic nerve communicates certain *vibrations* to the brain, is a question no one has yet answered. But the *fact* we know, that sight of a *particular* THING depends upon the *particular* VIBRATIONS of that optic nerve. Very well. Then, as before, it is true if that nerve, by sickness, by our thoughts, or other cause, be affected *just as it is* when there is *an external object*, why we see *the same thing*. The drunkard sees "*the man with a poker,*" and serpents or fiends as horrid as his imagination. He who has his nervous system disordered in any other way, beholds spectres as various as the changes in his disease. In other words, *the mind*, in all such cases, *paints* the PICTURE on the retina, *as really* as the light from an external object *depicts it there*. (See Sir David Brewster on natural magic)

Now, when ignorant persons have these delusions, they believe them supernatural. But well instructed people talk about them as mere illusions from disordered health, and *take physic*. Yet, some of these apparitions are sufficiently startling.—Dr. Wallaston, the philosopher, had his sight for a time, in such a state that he could see only half of a word; then, just half of a man—sometimes only one eye moving about and glaring upon him. Mrs. A——, a lady of highest rank in Edinburgh, Scotland, was afflicted in this way; but she perfectly understood her condition and was not alarmed, although sometimes greatly astonished, as you will presently see, her situation was unavoidable. She often heard her husband call her name when he was not at home and listened to his voice mingling in the conversation of other persons. This lady would see her husband walking in the parlour, when he was away. Once she saw an absent friend looking at her in the glass, dressed in grave clothes, the shroud pinned under the chin. This was 11 o'clock at night, while Mrs. A—— was dressing her hair. It must have startled her; and we can excuse her looking over the shoulder to see the corpse. Another time she saw a carriage drive up to the door; when lo! as the wheels stopped, the coachman became a skeleton—and the company inside, turned to dead bodies, when all vanished. Many such apparitions appeared to this person; but, as we have said, she knew what was the matter—and the last time we heard, her health was improving, and the spectral illusions *were yielding to medical treatment*.

If, then, the *heart* of man is willing to be deceived by *pretended* intercourse with the spiritual world, we reach our conclusion, that the knowledge and wealth of the rulers of the world, aided by the really strange phenomena in nature, have been influences deep, and wide, and lasting enough for the deception of the race, for all time that is past without any aid from supernatural Satanic power.

This argument we deem unanswerable, because the believer in supernatural witchcraft is obliged to admit, that upon his own principles, for *ONE real miracle* wrought by Satanic power, there have been *MANY deceptions*. Very good. Then we ask, how many *real miracles* have there been *in proportion* to the *deceptions*? Has there been *one* in *TEN THOUSAND* cases since the world began? If he says *yes*, then he must believe a *greater number of miracles* have been wrought to sustain *Satan*, than we can find to vindicate the *name of Jehovah!* If he says *no*, then he admits that the world *has* been held in bondage by *pretended* supernatural influences in the ratio of *TEN THOUSAND false*, to *ONE real miracle*. The conclusion is irresistible, that *pretended* intercourse with Satan, *without miracle or supernatueal marvel or wonder at all*, was *ALL-SUFFICIENT* to originate and sustain the claim of the magicians, sorcerers, and witches of the world; and that *such witchcraft* *DESERVED* the wrath of God.

Our next position is, that the view of witchcraft we advocate, relieves the subject from the *absurdity* of the other doctrine.—*That notion* teaches, that Satan imparts miraculous power. But, when examined, it proves *too much*, or it proves *nothing*. For, do his miracles equal those of God? That is saying too much. Or, are they *so few*, and so in a *corner*, and so *equivocal*, that they accomplish nothing which could not have been secured, as we have seen, without them? The idea, then, of such miracles is an *absurdity*. Let us illustrate this. Suppose we set the believer in miraculous witchcraft, to find Satanic miracles! He goes to the Bible. But, those cases as we have seen, *prove too much*—or they are *explained away*. Let him try again. Well. He catches glimpses of the Satanic wonders, as he thinks, in the poetical histories of Egypt, Persia, Greece, and the legends of heathen and Catholic Rome, to which we have alluded; and he shows the blood of St. Januarius and the Holy Coat of Treves. But we examine them, and they vanish away as evident decep-

tions. Now, the argument is this: *If all these wonders be regarded as deceptions of mere human art, then Satan has managed with consummate cunning, and infernal wisdom to hold his authority over mankind by such lying wonders. But, if he has the power to work real miracles, then he has done his work in a manner most bungling and absurd. He ought to have done better with his power. If he can work a real, unequivocal miracle, why has he not performed one at least, so clearly as to compel all to say, of a truth, "a notable miracle hath been done by Satan?"* If he can tell the future, why has he not told it so that there could be no question? Nay, if he can tell what is doing in China or England, why don't he tell it? Does the Devil not know that there are men in New York, who will make a bargain with him to-day, on his own terms, if he will just tell them how the Oregon question will be settled?—Or if he will give them constantly, the earliest news of the London money market, or the Liverpool cotton trade? Why don't Satan tell them? If the believer in miraculous witchcraft answers these questions by saying, that God interferes and permits Satan *only to do a half-way wonder*—or to tamper with us *supernaturally* in a double sense, then he makes ridiculous the whole subject of Satanic influence, and throws contempt on God himself. It throws contempt on God, because it exhibits him as trifling with the very *highest proof*—MIRACLES, upon which he has founded his own claim to our knowledge of him and obedience to his will. Just as well might we say, that God allows the Roman Catholic Priest to convert the bread and wine into flesh and blood, and then makes us see only bread and wine. Now, if God *allowed the priest to do THAT*, God would himself prostrate the whole evidence for the Bible founded upon miracles, because he would thereby destroy the EVIDENCES OF OUR SENSES, upon which we have to rely to *prove* a miracle. But, the doctrine of supernatural witchcraft does *the same thing* just as effectually, by teaching that God permits Satan to work wonders. And it does this just as perfectly by admitting that Satan can work a *half-miracle* as if he be said to perform a *whole one*. If Satan works a perfect miracle, he puts in a valid claim against the authority of God—if he does a half-miracle, it gives every sceptic room to *doubt* the obedience we owe to the Lord. The whole thing is then rank absurdity.

In the third place, the true view of witchcraft will never interfere with the *progress of human knowledge*, while the belief in miraculous intercourse with Satan, though necromantic arts *puts an arrest on the mind of man*. It has been so. It would be so again. In days past when the astronomer saw, with his telescope, more stars than the naked eye could count, *it was witchcraft*. If he discovered the ring of Saturn, and the Satellites of Jupiter, *it was witchcraft*. If the philosopher with his microscope, saw monsters in the dust of figs, and serpents in a drop of water, *it was witchcraft*. If the chemist could walk through fire and swallow poison, harmless, *it was witchcraft*. If the printer *printed the BIBLE*, *it was witchcraft*. If the electrician made iron hang in the air, *it was witchcraft*. If the physiologist discovered laws of mind or body in new relations, *it was witchcraft*. Hence, examination into nature, was full of peril—and to find out her secrets, was sin to be punished. The greatest man was liable to be "*cried out upon*" as a sorcerer, by the meanest and most malignant of his neighbors; and to be dragged before an ignorant magistrate, who has been taught by his priest, he would verily do God service in putting him to death by fire.

How grateful we should be, that we may discard such an interpretation of the Bible! How thankful, that genius is no longer in thick darkness, but in the light, may go abroad over the universe, free as air, to learn the works of God!

In conclusion, the views we advocate, save us from the horrid consequences of this superstition. Teach the false notion of witchcraft, and you encourage men to attempt the very crime you profess to abhor. Tell man he may have visions and intercourse with heaven and hell, he will believe you, and will attempt to realize what you proclaim as Bible truth. The fanatic, in one mood of mind, will find himself within the gates of heaven and filled with the light of God, while he hears music of angels. In another frame of spirit, he has unfastened hell. "He opens. But to shut excels his power. The gates wide open stand—and like a furnace mouth, cast forth redounding smoke and ruddy flame, through which the spirits perverse with easy intercourse pass to and fro." Once out, in that illimitable expanse, what visions of glory and horror, the imagination finds.—Alas! man, full of sin and fear, if he "in a cloudy chair ascending, rides audacious, how soon borne through the hollow dark,

from what spirit shall he ask which way the nearest coast of darkness lies, bordering on light." *O! there is no peace to the soul from superstitious horrors, but to deny flatly and broadly, all miraculous intercourse with either heaven or hell, and to hold, that God has dropped a veil over the wonders of the spiritual world, through which nothing now is allowed to come but to the ear of faith and the eye of hope.* Tell man to believe in miraculous witchcraft, and we have got back where we started. We have skirted the verge of twilight and turned again to the utter night *that was* a thousand years ago. What we thought poetry, becomes awful history. What we read to amuse our children, or to warn them against past ignorance, is changed into real agency, dark, terrible, and potent, to spread death around every fire-side in the land—literally, in the words of scripture, "setting a man at variance with his father, and the daughter against her mother, and the daughter-in-law against the mother-in-law, and making a man's foes they of his own household."

We may believe every thing we ever heard—indeed we may believe all the mind ever imagined, if miraculous witchcraft be true. *Reason has nothing to say.* If the Bible sanctions the doctrine, we can only fold our arms and tremblingly wait to see. We may believe Satan has horns and hoofs and a tail—or, that he comes as a black cat—or, like Tom Thumb in red breeches and a cocked hat—or, robed in white with wings, winnowing fragrance—or, sheeted in sulphur, in horrid puff—we may say, he gives the eye of envy, or allows the touch of Royalty to spell away *the evil.* We may tell, he gives a charm to cure a cow, or the Sesame to open the cavern of Aladdin. We may teach, he gave the zone of gold, now fine as a thread, now broad as the baldrick of an East, to the white Lady of Avenel—and makes the song of the mermaid float over the sea. We may see the Glendoveer ascending the countless rounds of the ladder, and hear him strike the silver bell of Seeva, which hung self-suspended over the mystic rose—or, gaze through the gloom on the vampire as he glides to the grave, and digs and gorges himself on the corpse. We may look in awe, upon the open tomb of Michael Scott, and the lamp light, and the book—and say, Gilpin horned was no fiction, and Wesley's old Jeffrey was a veritable personage. We may believe Richard the third, when he said his arm was withered by witchcraft—and reckon as true.

that Macbeth found the hags on the moor, around the cauldron with its eye of newt, and toe of frog, and finger of strangled babe, and hear him curse the pernicious hour as he gazed at the never-ending line of Banquos. We may say, Tam O' Shanter was not so drunk as people have thought—that he did see auld Nick, and that poor Maggie test her tail. We may hear the shriek of Southey's old woman of Brentford, and believe every word of Hogg when he says how the "*witch of Fife*" told the good man the *word* that would take them to the Bishop's wine—and how,

He set his foot on the black cruik shell,
 With ane fixit and ane waulyng ee;
 And he said the word that I dare na say,
 And out at the lum flew he.

And how,

They flew to the vaults of merry Carlisle,
 Quhan they enter'd free as air.
 And they drank and they drank of the Bishop's wine,
 Quhill they could drink ne mair.
 And aze he perc'd the tither butt,
 And he suck'd and he suck'd se lang,
 Quhill his een they clos'd, and his voice grew low,
 And his tongue wald hardly gang.

How amusing this is to us! But once it was supposed to be awful, every-day *truth*. And what atrocities did men commit, in the name of God, when they were roused by the cry of witchcraft to shed blood—when they believed the sorcerer in cavern of mountain, or under the roots of the ocean, met Satan, and in ceremonies of blasphemy and words of hell, exchanged the soul for power to torment mankind! Behold! A child is sick. The quack, to conceal ignorance, says it is witchcraft. Suspicion fastens upon the poor Indian, Lituba. Marks and moles are found upon her person, which are the pretended signs of Satan. She is tortured into confession of guilt. Another and another, poor, degraded, miserable woman dies. The appetite for blood is whetted. Mere terror has now tremendous auxiliaries in envy, malice, revenge—suspicion whispers against the young, the beautiful, the venerable, and the good. All safeguards of law are crushed to dust. Witnesses are allowed to swear away life falsely. Children five years old rise up to testify against father

and mother. The purest blood cries to God. The interesting Mary Easty condemned to certain death, thus writes in vain to her judges: "I petition your honors, not for mine own sake, for I know I must die—but the Lord knows it, I do it, that, if it be possible, no more innocent blood be shed." Then the parting scene, between this wife, her husband and her children—She dies, "a lovely embodiment of the charities of the New Testament." At last, a still more noble victim of spotless reputation, the very wife of the minister of God, is "*cried out upon.*"—Society before alarmed, is now rocked to its foundation. But reactions must come—men begin to say, the witch finders "*lie!*" We breathe again—the spell is broken—the plague is staid.—"Then New England men did what no other People ever did.—They made such atonement as they could, by asking forgiveness of the sufferers, and by humbling themselves in fasting and prayer, at the feet of that Providence whom they had so unwillingly offended." But alas! how many died in the phrensy of that Salem murder?—And yet *that* was a drop to the blood which went up to God from England, France, Germany, Sweden, Spain, in the delirium and epidemic of witchcraft.

How thankful to God we should be, that we know better than they, *the limits of Satan's power over fallen man!*

The sentiments we have defended, banish forever, all superstitious fear,—while they leave upon the soul the wholesome dread of the real spiritual power which is arrayed against our life in Christ. Fanaticism has degraded the whole subject of the spiritual world—and made it *earthly*, and *sensual*, by teaching, that *we see God, and angels, and friends in dream and vision, and have every day personal intercourse with them.* God, angels, and devils, are thus mingled together, and practically made such as our distorted fears or miserable imagination can make them. And the result is, first terror, then pity, then contempt.

But, deny this fanaticism, and we have *left* the true spiritual influence—*sublime* as the fruits of the Holy Ghost, and *deep and terrible* as the lusts of the flesh, and deeds of darkness, controlled by the malignant energy of a fallen angel.

For the Calvinistic Magazine.

Presbyterianism.

MESSRS. EDITORS:—

In the present and any succeeding numbers connected with the present, which I may furnish for your columns, I propose presenting what I understand to be the distinctive features of genuine Presbyterianism, on the points upon which I shall treat. Should any one question the correctness of my positions or strength of any arguments he will be likely to furnish you with what he understands to be a true bill in the case; and the result will be, that light will be elicited, and a love for truth and order and superior excellence inspired. Upon the importance, especially to Presbyterians themselves, of having correct and definite ideas of the "length and bounds" of Presbyterianism, I need not here insist.

Without intending any intimation as to how far I may proceed, I will commence, where the Westminster Assembly of Divines commenced their investigations—upon the government of the Church. Presbyterians, it is perhaps pretty generally known, take their name, not from any peculiar doctrines which they hold, but from their form of church government, being governed essentially by *Presbyteries*. What then is a Presbytery? I answer, a Presbytery is an *associated* body of Presbyters. When convened for business, it is an *assemblage* of Presbyters, but it is a *perpetual* body existing as entire during the intervals between its sessions as when convened for business. Its officers are as much the officers of Presbytery during these intervals as when officiating in the progress of its sessions. The term in the Greek is *Presbyterion*. It occurs but once in the Eng. N. T.—in 1 Tim. 4: 14, where the apostle says to Tim. "Neglect not the gift that is in thee, which was given thee by prophecy, with the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery." Here it evidently means an associated body of Presbyters, convened for ecclesiastic purposes. In two other instances it occurs in the Greek; in one (Lu. 22: 66,) it is translated, "The elders of the people;" in the other, (Ac. 22: 5,) "The estate of the elders." In these places it refers to the members of the Jewish Sanhedrim—the *civil* officers of the Jews. Jno. (18: 12,) referring to the same persons, calls them "The *officers* of the Jews." And in this sense, had the phrase been used all through the O. T. (See

Ex. 3: 16. 4: 29, 24: 9. Nu. 11: 16 Josh. 24: 31 Jude. 21: Ruth 4: 2 Ezr. 10: 14 Neh. 11: 1.) These civil officers were of course not ecclesiastically ordained. There were not *two* orders among them. They were neither preachers nor ruling elders, as Presbyterians understand these terms. And in this sense, doubtless the translators understood the passages, otherwise they would have translated them as they did the same word in Timothy.

If, then, a *Presbytery* is an associated body, an assemblage, or a college of *Presbyters*, Who are Presbyters? I answer, the term in the Greek is *Presbuteros*. This term, when applied to ecclesiastic officers, means Ministers. It is so applied some dozen of times in the N. T., and is always translated by the term *Elder*. Let the English reader remember this as we proceed to examine the passages. They are Ac. 11: 30. 14: 23. 15: 4, 6, 23. 16: 4. 20: 17. 21: 18. 1 Tim. 5: 17. Tit. 1: 5. Jas. 5: 14. 1 Pet. 5: 1. 2d & 3d, Jno. 1. That ministers are intended in all these passages, will appear on the slightest examination.

1. Two of them (Peter and John) refer to these apostles themselves.

2. The *Jewish* Presbyters, mentioned Ac. 11: 30. 15: 2—16. 4: 21: 18. were ministers. An interpretation of the passage, which I will leave the reader to make for himself, will show this. Moreover St. James (5: 14) referring to the same Presbyters leaves no room to doubt that they were ministers. The same is clear from Heb. 13: 7, 17, (which read.)

3. The *Gentile* Presbyters were ministers.

1. Those of Ephesus were, Ac. 20: 17: 28. "From Miletus, Paul sent to Ephesus and called the Presbyters of the church." To these Presbyters he said, "Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the church of God." Now "*to feed the church of God*" is the exclusive and appropriate business of ministers.

2. The Presbyters of Crete were ministers. Paul says, (Tit. 1: 5.) he left Titus in Crete "to ordain Presbyters in every city." These Presbyters he calls *bishops*, and these bishops he says, "must hold fast the *faithful* word, that they may be able, by sound doctrine, both to exhort and to convince the gainsayers," (v. 7, 9.) The Cretan Presbyters therefore, were ministers—they were bishops, preachers, and exhorters.

3. The Presbyters of Lycaonia were ministers, Ac. 14: 23. If these Presbyters were not ministers, then we have no evidence that the apostles furnished the churches of that province with ministers at all. But who can believe that they would furnish them with an inferior order of officers and not with ministers? or, if with both, that the inferior order alone would be mentioned?

These arguments apply with equal force to all the apostolic churches; for the same term, as we have seen, is every where used, so that the inquiry may be added in reference to them all. Who can believe that the apostles would *invariably* designate two distinct and essentially dissimilar classes of officers by the same term, without once giving the least intimation that such was their intention?

But we have other evidence that these Presbyters were ministers. Lycaonia was a province of Asia. Writing to the churches of that province, (1 Peter, 1: 1.) the apostle Peter says, (1 Pet. 5: 1—4.) “The Presbyters which are among you I exhort, who am also a Presbyter, “feed the flock of God which is among you, taking the oversight thereof,” language which can have no application to any but ministers. This language, too, be it remembered, is addressed to *all* the Gentile Presbyters.—All are exhorted to *feed* the flock of God—are called under-shepherds by reference to Christ as the chief-shepherd. All, therefore, were ministers.

4. The Presbyters referred to in 1 Tim. 5: 17. were ministers. “Let the Presbyters that rule well be counted worthy of double honor, especially they who labor in the word and doctrine.”—These Presbyters were ministers because (1.) It is agreed that ministers are meant in the latter part of the verse, also in v. 19, which clearly refers to this. (2.) Because, as we have seen, all others were— (3.) Because they were Presbyters of Ephesus, (1 Tim. 1: 3.) to whom, as we have seen, Paul said, “Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock, &c., *to feed* the church of God,” Ac. 20: 28. (4.) Because they were Gentile Presbyters to whom Peter said, (1 Pet. 5: 1—4.) “The Presbyters which are among you I exhort—“*Feed* the flock of God,” &c. Ephesus was one of the most famous cities of Lesser Asia. Its churches were included among those to whom Peter addressed his general epistle, 1 Pet. 1: 1. (5.) If mere rulers be meant, then their office is made more honorable than that of ministers,

which is not true. The ministerial office is the most honorable in the church, 1 Tim. 3: 1. 1 Cor. 14: 5. (6.) Because by "double honor" is meant, in addition to the honor of the ministerial office, a competent ministerial support. This is clearly stated in the next verse. "For the scripture saith, thou shalt not muzzle the ox that treadeth out the corn. And, the laborer is worthy of his reward." (7.) Because ministers were the rulers proper of the apostolic churches, Mat. 24: 45. "Who then is that faithful and wise servant whom his Lord hath made ruler over his household, to give them meat in due season?" 1 Thes. 5: 12. "And we beseech you brethren, to know them which labor among you and are over you in the Lord, and admonish you," Heb. 13: 7: 17. "Remember them which have the rule over you, who have spoken unto you the words of God." "Obey them which have the rule over you, and submit yourselves: for they watch for your souls." Thus it appears that rulers preached, and preachers ruled. Others were "helps" only, 1 Cor. 12: 28. (8.) From the incongruity of supposing mere rulers to be meant: "Let ruling Presbyters be counted worthy, &c., especially preaching Presbyters." Let the captain of a ship be counted, &c., especially the Chaplain. A man is a very handsome animal, especially a woman! These are similar phrases, and show that the term "especially" forbids the transition from one class of officers to another.

The import of the passage is clearly this: "Let the Presbyters that rule (or rather *preside*) well, be counted, &c., especially those of them who labor to weariness, or exhaustion." This is clearly the idea of the original. *Proistemi* (to rule) means, to be before or over, to excel, or to preside; and *kopiao* (to labor) means, to be wearied, or exhausted from fatigue. In 2 Cor. 11: 27. it is translated "weariness."

5. I have one other Bible argument, covering all the preceding cases, which I wish now to present. It is this: All Presbytery are *bishops*, Ac. 20: 17, 28. "Take heed therefore unto yourselves and to all the flock over thee which the Holy Ghost hath make you *overseers*, (bishops) to feed," &c. All bishops are the *stewards* of God, Tit. 1: 7. "For a bishop must be blameless, as the steward of God." All stewards are *ministers*, Luke 12: 42. "Who then is that faithful and wise steward, whom his Lord shall make ruler over his household, to give them their

portion of meat in due season?" See also 1 Cor. 4: 1. Pet. 4: 10. Mat. 13: 52. Therefore all *Presbyters* are ministers. And this is expressly declared, Tit. 1: 5, 7, 9.

6. Should it be inquired whether the ministers of the apostolic churches were sufficiently numerous to afford each a plurality? I reply, it is not necessary to suppose that each had a plurality. In the phrase "Presbyters of the church," the emphasis may very properly rest on the word *church*, and be intended to distinguish *its* Presbyters from those of the state, and from old men. The phrase, Presbyters of *a* church, or of *the* congregation, does not occur. Furthermore, it is clear that the several churches of the large cities and of particular provinces, were called *the* church of those places, as the church of Jerusalem, of Ephesus, &c., and that over each of these individual churches or congregations, at least one Presbyter presided. (See Form of Govt. chapt x. sec. 1, with the proofs.) If any prefer allowing each particular church a plurality of Presbyters, the ministers will not be wanting. They were very numerous in those times. They were not required to study as we now do. They had not books. They were generally armed with supernatural qualifications, 1 Cor. 14. An idea of their number at Corinth may be drawn from 1 Cor. 3: 10, "another buildeth" on Paul's "foundation." 4: 15, "ten thousand instructors." 9: 12, "If others be partakers of power over you." 2 Cor. 11: 23, "Are they ministers? I more."

The ministers of those several churches, together with the apostles, constituted the Presbyters of those times. Those of Jerusalem would constitute one; those of Ephesus another, &c., &c., 15: 2, 4, 6, 22, 32. 16: 4. 21: 18. The churches had a clear right to be represented in those Presbyteries, (1 Chr. 19: 8—10. Mat. 18: Ro. 12: 6—8. 1 Cor. 5: 4—12:) and we may suppose that they availed themselves of this right whenever they chose. (Ac. 15: 2, 22. 2 Cor. 8: 19.) But their representatives were not essential to the existence of the Presbytery—they were not *constituent* members of it. Presbyteries were *perpetual* bodies. The representatives of the churches *necessarily* temporary. A temporary representative could not help to constitute a perpetual body. In this particular, as well as others, Presbyterians are strictly apostolic. Their Presbyteries are perpetual bodies. Their Ruling Elders, the representatives of the people; (Form of Govt. ch. v.) but not constituent members

of Presbytery or essential to its existence. 'Any three ministers and as many elders as *may* be present, shall be a quorum to do business.' "Any three ministers," being assembled at the time and place appointed, would think of nothing but to proceed at once to business, while any number of our worthy Eldership, being so assembled alone, would never think of organizing to transact the business of the church.

PRESBUTEROS.

For the Calvinistic Magazine.

Decrees and Natural Religion.

By the term natural religion is meant here those truths, which men might, *if they were so disposed*, discover by the light of nature without the Bible. I do not say, that they do discover any truths, as a matter of fact, for men following the light of nature alone, discern but little of God and immortality. But if a Socrates or a Confucius were to set himself upon the earnest search after truth, and *did not have a dark heart*, he would find many religious truths without ever having seen the Bible. These are the truths of natural religion. They are written on the page of inspiration, and on the volume of nature.

The enquiry now is, would these truths include the doctrine of the divine purposes? This is the doctrine: That God did from eternity, have a purpose or a design relative to every thing that is, has been, or will be; or in other words, that God, from eternity, hath foreordained whatever comes to pass. Is this a doctrine of natural religion? I am constrained to take the ground that it is, and here are some of my reasons.

1. God cannot exist without having a purpose or design respecting all things, for he has infinite wisdom. Men are wise according as they act with some end in view, or for the achievement of some purpose. It is the part of an idiot to busy himself to no purpose. The wisest men are those that set before them the best purposes; and the summit of wisdom is to reach the best purposes by the best means. Wisdom, then, cannot exist without there is some purpose; indeed the only evidence of its existence is, that it adopts means to an end. Therefore,

God who is the perfection of wisdom, cannot exist without a purpose; and his wisdom being infinite, that purpose or design must respect all things.

2. God must have had this purpose or design respecting all things from eternity, for he is an immutable being. Suppose that at some point in eternity, God has made a new purpose, would it not be implied, that before that purpose was made, he had less knowledge than after it was made? And would not the addition of that knowledge, and of that purpose, constitute a change in his mind? But God is unchangeable; therefore he must have had a purpose respecting all things from eternity.

3. God must actually execute his eternal purpose or design respecting all things, since he is Almighty. He can do all things that are objects of power. He cannot work contradictions; that is, make what is past, present, and what is present future; or make a thing exist and not exist at the same time.—Nor can he feel pain, nor die. Nor can he deny himself. But he can do all things that are objects of power, and only these wisdom would dictate. If, therefore, any purpose of his should fail of execution, it would be because his power is not equal to his wisdom, and hence he must be less than Almighty.

4. He must execute this eternal purpose or design respecting all things, for he is supremely happy. If one of his designs were frustrated, he would be disappointed, and if disappointed, he would be unhappy. Now suppose, that there might be one persecution raised against God's people, which he had never designed should take place, or that there might be one sinner in hell, whom he had not always designed to *permit to go to hell*, could an infinitely holy and happy being regard that suffering of his people, or that endless pain of that sinner, without feeling pain himself? Would not disappointment press down his heart at such a sight, and all the white robed throng put on crape?—What sad news to be heralded in heaven, that one of God's noblest works, contrary to his purpose, was stranded on the shores of despair! God's perfect happiness forbids such a thought!

The amount of what I have now said is this. Wisdom cannot exist without some purpose or design. God has infinite wisdom; therefore he must have some purpose always. A change of purpose, or the having a new purpose, implies a change of mind; God is unchangeable; therefore he cannot change his pur-

pose, nor have a new one, and hence all his purposes or designs must be eternal. Not to accomplish one's purpose, implies a want of power. God has all power; therefore he must accomplish all his purposes. Not to accomplish one's purpose, implies disappointment, and consequently unhappiness. God is supremely happy; therefore all his purposes must be fulfilled.

If then it be a dictate of nature, that God is perfect in wisdom, unchangeable, almighty, and supremely happy, then also it is a dictate of nature; that God did from eternity have a purpose or design, relative to every thing that is, has been, or will be, and that purpose will be accomplished. If nature denies the latter truth, then she denies the former ones.

One word in conclusion. If the divine purposes is a doctrine of natural religion, much more is it of revealed religion. How grossly inconsistent, unreasonable, uncharitable, is he who denounces those holding this doctrine! If he admits the truth, there is a perfect being, God, and denies the divine purposes, he is inconsistent, for he admits one truth, and denies a legitimate deduction from the truth; he is unreasonable, for he believes the premise and disbelieves the conclusion; he is uncharitable, for he himself holds fast to the principle of a doctrine, and denounces his neighbor, who carries out the principle.

R. P. W.

Westminster Standards.

In July, 1843, many Presbyterians of Great Britain, met in Edinburgh to celebrate the Bicentenary of the Assembly of Divines at Westminster. Two hundred years before, this distinguished body had met and prepared our Confession of Faith and Standards. The Bicentenary celebration was one of thrilling interest. We shall often quote from the published account of it. We give in this number some remarks by the Rev. John Eadie.

“But the Westminster Divines knew that men might have a “form of godliness and deny the power thereof,” that they might have “a name to live, while they are dead.” Against a dead orthodoxy, they issued their warmest and most affectionate remonstrances. While they strove to give men clear and intel-

lectual views of divine truth, they labored at the same time to impress them with the conviction, that "with the heart man believeth unto righteousness." So they felt it to be vain to defend Christ's divinity, unless the soul could say in faith, "my Lord and my God;" to maintain or illustrate his atonement, unless the heart had an interest in his peace-speaking blood; or to argue the soleness and universality of his Headship over all things to the church, unless the spirit bowed to his sceptre, and yielded him homage and service. This attention to personal and domestic religion, to the revival of it in our hearts and homes, is one of the peculiar refreshing features of the Westminster symbols, by which too they are nobly distinguished from other works of a similar nature. So that, in the words of the programme, "the Westminster Assembly has left a richer legacy of practical instruction to the Church of Christ, than almost any Council that has met before or since."

"Nobody, Sir, will suppose that I am eulogizing the Westminster Standards as perfect productions. I have also spoken of them only as subordinate standards. That they have faults I readily admit. Yet, viewed as a human compilation, they surpass all other attempts of a similar kind in modern times."

Methodist Admissions to the Church.

This leads me to speak of one of our difficulties as Presbyterians. We receive none to our church, *till they give satisfactory evidence of conversion*. Not, so, our brethren of the other denomination. When sinners are awakened, alarmed, and in distress, they begin anxiously to inquire "what shall I do? where go?" The preacher tells them, "join the church, for almost all who join the church, and attend meetings regularly, get converted; the old ship of Zion has carried many a full cargo safely into the port of everlasting happiness; she will carry you; come, get aboard. To join the church is no disgrace; for all men will think the better of you for it; and if you can't hold out, your name will just be scratched off the class book without any disgrace whatever. Come join the church." Then the church sing, shout, clap and shake hands; while the preacher still exhorts, raising

his voice above the noise, they go through the congregation, taking the anxious by the hand, and lead them to the stand; shake hands with them, and often kiss them; and welcome them as *brethren* into the church. This kind of exercise they often keep up for hours. Now, that sinner who has confidence in the church, and in the preachers, and who does not join under such circumstances, must be stubborn indeed. Thus they swept our sixty anxious or converted sinners into the church.—*Home Missionary.*

The Bible my own.

When I go to that book God speaks to me. I need no succession—I go at once to the fountain-head. It is not man that speaks. It is God who speaks—and he speaks to me, as if there were but one single Bible on the earth, and that Bible an angel had come down and bound upon my bosom. It is *my* Bible. It was written for me. It is the voice of God holding communion with my own soul, and never will I forfeit my right to commune with God. Nor is that communion to be held before councils, or in open temples, or in the presence of sects and priests, and through the intervention of others. It is an act to be transacted in the most secret sanctuary of the Lord. No sects, no priestly interference, can be admitted. It is an affair between God and my soul, and as Abraham bid the young men abide with the ass at the foot of the mountain, so will I ascend and go to meet God alone upon the top. I wish my views upon this point, thrown out as they are before this large assembly, to be stated clearly and to be distinctly understood, and the press may proclaim them to the world, as those of a man who speaks for himself and not under the constraint of creeds or the impositions of men.—That book is the book of God; and when I go out and commune with it, I hold communion with my God. I am Moses, just come down from the mourning mountain, his face shining with joy and the glory of God. I am Isaiah, and have come from the golden courts where the seraphim and cherubim shout hallelujah to the Lord God of Hosts. I am Paul, and have seen the third heavens opened, and can tell what is uttered there, and have

seen glories ineffable which no tongue can tell nor imagination conceive. I am John, and have laid my head upon the Master's bosom, and have caught, warm with his breath, the very whispers of the sweet counsels which he has breathed into my ear.—It is not from any intervention or interpretation of man, that it derives its power. God gave it to me. He made it and he has preserved it. Nor does the fact that he transmitted it for centuries through the agency of unclean birds, as Elijah was fed by the ravens of the valley, change its character. It is still bread and food for all the world.—*Dr. Tyng.*

For the Calvinistic Magazine.

Thoughts.

Prayer.—Prayer is the peace of our spirit, the stillness of our thoughts, the evenness of our recollections, the seat of meditation, the rest of our cares, and the calm of our tempest.

Danger of prosperity.—Many are not able to suffer and endure prosperity; it is like the light of the sun to a weak eye—glorious indeed in itself, but not proportioned to such an instrument.

Friendship of the world.—We are as safe at sea, safer in the storm which God sends us, than in a calm when we are befriended with the world.

Gratitude for present blessings. If God should send a cancer upon thy face, or a wolf into thy side—if he should spread a crust of leprosy upon thy skin, what wouldst thou give to be but as now thou art?

Hope.—Hope is like the wing of an angel soaring up to heaven, and bears our prayers to the throne of God.—*Bishop Taylor.*

Death and life.—Death in Adam, life in Christ; the curse hung upon the cross; who art thou that heedest of redemption as narrower than the fall? All were dead. He died for all; that living they might love,

The Trinity.—Shall all things else be in mystery, and God alone be understood? Shall finite fathom infinity though it sound not the shallows of creation? Shall a man comprehend his Maker being yet a riddle to himself? Or time teach the

lesson that eternity cannot master? If God be nothing more than one, a child can compass the thought; but seraphs fail to unravel the wondrous unity of three.

Human life.—A man's life is a tower, with a staircase of many steps that as he toileth up crumble successively behind him.—*Tupper's Proverbial Philosophy.*

Love.—Love is goodness in motion.

An altar.—The divinity of Christ was the altar on which his humanity was offered up. The altar sanctifies the offering. So Christ's divinity, the altar, sanctified his humanity, the offering, and gave it infinite value.

Miscellany.

A converted Indian was asked how he knew that he had experienced a change of heart. He gave no answer. He was asked if he saw the power.

“No.”

“Did you hear it?”

“No.”

“Did you feel it?”

“Yes.”

“Well, then, cannot you describe your feelings?”

He paused a moment, and then, kneeling upon the sand, made a small circle of chips and dry leaves. He then got a little worm and placed it inside the ring, and with a spark from his pipe lighted his pile. The poor worm, when it began to feel the heat, crept first to one point, then to another, and at last, after many ineffectual attempts to get out, finding that the flames completely surrounded it, crawled to the centre as if in despair, and coiled itself up, awaiting the result. When he began to feel the heat too sensibly, the Indian took it in his fingers and placed it without the ring in safety.

“Now,” said he, “I will explain my meaning. I was like that poor worm; the fires of hell were burning around me; they began to scorch me; I ran every way; I drank fire-water; I tried hunting, everything, but could not get out. At last I threw myself

down and tried to pray, and then God stretched forth his hand, and lifting me forth, gave me rest. "Now," said he, "I cannot explain it any better. I cannot tell you how it was done, but I felt a change, and I know it was so."—*Youth's Cabinet*.

THE YOUTH THAT WAS NOT READY.—During the closing service one Sabbath, says a pastor, my eyes rested on a lovely youth. I approached him, and exhorted him to repentance and faith on the Lord Jesus Christ. He replied, "I am not ready now, but in two weeks I am resolved to seek the salvation of my soul." A few days after, his minister was summoned to visit him upon a bed of sickness. He said to the minister, 'I was invited to the Saviour at the meeting of the Sabbath, I replied that I was not ready then, and now I am not ready to die.' On a subsequent visit the dying youth exclaimed, "I was not ready to seek God at the meeting, I was not ready to die when the message came, and now I am not ready to lie down in hell! My two weeks have not yet elapsed, when I hoped to have made my peace with God, and sickness, death and hell have overtaken me, and I am forever lost."—*N. Y. Evangelist*.

A WISE ANSWER.—A teacher once asked a child, "If you had a golden crown, what would you do with it?" The child replied, "I would give it to my father to keep till I was a man." He asked another, "I would buy a coach and horses with it," was the reply. He asked a third, "Oh," said the little girl to whom he spoke, "oh! I would do with it the same as the people in heaven do with their crowns, I would cast it at the Saviour's feet."—*Youth's Miss. Rep.*

THE UNICORN.—A recent number of the "Journal Asiatique" (published in Paris) states that M. Fresnel, the profound Orientalist, now French Consul at Jedda, in Arabia, has published a notice of the existence of the real unicorn in the wilds of Hadramant. This strange beast has a single horn, attached to its head by a joint, through which it can elevate or depress its horn at pleasure; remarkably confirming Psalms 92, 10, where it speaks of the "horn being exalted like the horn of the unicorn." This will throw great light on other passages of scripture, which ignorance of Arabia prevented our comprehending.—*Forum*.

THE
Calvinistic Magazine;

[NEW SERIES.]

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

Vol I.

April, 1846.

No. 4.

The Bible and Election.

"Thus saith the Lord," is the only argument that I will now employ. Let the Bible speak for itself. I will make but little or no comment. I have nothing now to do with *objections*. "Thus saith the Lord," settles the question.

The writer will adopt, as his definition of the doctrine to be proved, that given in the first number of our Magazine:

Election is, *God's choice from eternity of a certain portion of mankind to salvation, through repentance for sin and faith in Christ, not on account of their foreseen good works, but of his own sovereign wisdom and pleasure.*

Reprobation or preterition is, *God's purpose from eternity to leave the non-elect, having made their salvation possible so that they can be saved if they will, to leave them to their own chosen course of sin, and perish.*

Now, "to the law and the testimony."

1. *A certain part of mankind have been chosen to salvation.* "Because God hath from the beginning *chosen you to salvation,*" 2 Thessa. 2: 13. "As many as were *ordained to eternal life* believed," Acts 13:48. "Having predestinated us *to the adoption of children.*" Ephe. 1: 5. "He also did predestinate *to be conformed to the image of his Son.*" Rom. 8: 9. "As he hath *chosen us* in him that we *should be holy* and without blame before him in love." Eph. 1: 4. There are those who are "chosen" to "salvation," and "ordained to eternal life." The last three passages teach that there are those who are predestinated *to holiness of heart*; or in other words, chosen to be christians. I will now

quote a few texts to prove that all who become true christians are certainly saved. "He that believeth *hath* everlasting life." John 3: 36. It is just as certainly his as if he were already in full possession of eternal life. "He that believeth and is baptized *shall be saved.*" "And I give unto them eternal life; and they shall *never perish*, neither shall any *man* (man is not in the original) pluck them out of my hand." John 10: 28. Thus it appears that all christians shall be saved. THE ELECT therefore, being chosen to be christians, are elected to salvation.

2. *The elect were chosen from eternity.* "We are bound to give thanks always for you, brethren beloved of the Lord, because God hath *from the beginning* chosen you to salvation." 2 Thessa 2: 13. The meaning of the expression "from the beginning" may be gathered from the following passages. "In *the beginning* was the Word, and the Word was God." "I was set up *from everlasting*, from *the beginning*, or ever the earth was." "From the beginning" means therefore, from eternity. "According as he hath chosen us in him *before the foundation of the world.*" Ephe 1: 4. "Who hath saved us and called us with a holy calling, not according to our works, but according to his own purpose and grace which was given us in Christ Jesus *before the world began.*" 2 Tim 1: 9. Thus the elect were chosen "from the beginning," "from everlasting," "before the foundation of the world," "before the world began."

3. The elect were predestinated to salvation, *through repentance, faith and holiness.* "Hath chosen you to salvation, *through sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the truth.*" 2 Thessa 2: 13. "He also did predestinate *to be conformed to the image of his son,*" Rom 8: 9. "According as he hath chosen us in him, before the foundation of the world, *that we should be holy and without blame before him in love,*" Ephe 1: 4.

4. The elect are chosen to salvation, *in God's own sovereign wisdom and pleasure, and not from their foreseen repentance and faith.*

"Who hath saved us and called us with a holy calling, *not according to our works,* but according to *his own purpose and grace* which was given us in Christ Jesus." 2 Tim 1: 9. "According as he hath chosen us in him * * *that we should be holy and without blame before him in love.*" Ephe 1: 4. They were not chosen *because they would become holy and blameless,*

but *in order to their being made holy*. Their holiness is the *result of their election*, and not *their election the result of their foreseen holiness*. They become holy *because they are elected to holiness*. "He also did predestinate *to be conformed to the image of his son*." Rom 8: 9. They become conformed to the image of Christ, *because they are predestinated to it*. "When Rebecca had conceived by one, even by our father Isaac, (for the children being *not yet born, neither having done any good or evil*; that the purpose of God according to *election* might stand, not of *works*, but of *him that calleth*) it was said, "Jacob have I loved, but Esau have I hated." Rom 9: 10—13. The election is *not of works*, but of *the good pleasure of God who calleth*. "Even so then also there is a remnant, according to the *election of grace*. And if by grace, then is it no more *of works*; otherwise grace is no more grace. But if it be of works, then is it no more grace; otherwise work is no more work." Rom 11: 5: 6. This election is *of grace*, and *not of works*.

THE NONE-ELECT.

Reprobation or preterition is, *God's purpose from eternity to leave the non-elect, having made their salvation possible, so that they can be saved if they will, to leave them to their own chosen course of sin and perish*.

1. *God provides salvation for the non-elect, so that they can be saved if they will*.

Here I deem it unnecessary to multiply passages of scripture, as the point we are upon will be granted by Arminians. Christ "died for *all men*," he "taketh away the sin of *the world*," "*whosoever will* let him come and take the water of life freely," is the language of inspiration.

2. *God purposed from eternity to leave the non-elect to go on in sin and perish*.

Who, "were of *old ordained to condemnation*." Jude 4. Who, "stumble at the word, being disobedient whereunto they *were appointed*." 1 Pet 2: 8. In Rom 11: 1—10, two classes are spoken of, the elect, "the *election*," and "the *rest*," but "the *rest*" are hardened and blinded.

This strong language must mean at least as much as this, that God did determine "of old" to leave "the *rest*" those that were not of the election, to disobedience, hardness of heart, blindness of mind and "condemnation." "Then God turned and gave

them up to worship the host of heaven." Acts 7: 42. This refers to the non-elect Israelites. "Wherefore God *gave them up*, to uncleanness through the lusts of their own hearts. * * For this cause God *gave them up* unto vile affections." Rom 1: 24—26. This refers to the non-elect heathen. Thus both the Israelites and the heathen, who were not of the election, were *given up*, left to their own vile affections and depraved hearts.

Our Sovereign does all that he can, consistently with the best plan of things he can adopt, to bring the non-elect to salvation. "What more can I do to my vineyard that I have not done in it?" "Ye *will* not come unto me that ye might have life." God has *his reasons*, the *best* of reasons for choosing one and passing by another, but he sees best not to make them known to us.

INFERENCES.

1. My first inference from this scripture argument is that, *election is an important doctrine.*

Some say, this doctrine is true; we believe it; but it is of little importance; it need not be preached. Others again make too much of election. They magnify it above the atonement.—These are the extremes. The truth lies between. God determined from eternity to provide an atonement for man when he should sin. Next, in *the order of nature*, comes his purpose to make it *certain*, that some of those for whom this salvation was made should enjoy its full benefits. This is election, growing immediately out of the atonement, as its first great result to our race. Election makes it absolutely certain that the atonement shall not fail of its object, shall not fail of securing to some that salvation which it has provided for all. Thus the atonement comes first, and election grows right out of it. Is not the latter then an IMPORTANT truth?

ELECTION IS A COMFORTING DOCTRINE.

2. This is the second inference from my argument. Is it not comforting to know and believe that God's infinitely glorious scheme of redeeming love shall not utterly fail of saving the souls for whom it was planned and executed? Is it not comforting to know and believe that all Christ's chosen ones shall certainly, as God is true, be gathered in from every quarter of the globe, from every nation and tribe, from every age of time, and guided and guarded safely home, in spite of earth and hell, in spite of men and devils? Is it not comforting to know and be-

lieve that countless myriads of the redeemed, (I doubt not the *vast* majority of our sinful race) shall certainly repent, and reign on high? Is it not comforting to know and believe that all who perish, die because they *will*, and not because they *must*; perish in spite of a saviour, in spite of the Spirit, in spite of all that God can, consistently do, to bless and save? So comforting is the knowledge and belief of the truth established.

ELECTION IS A *PRACTICAL* DOCTRINE.

3. This is the last inference from our argument. Some say, the doctrine is true, important, and comforting; but it is not practical, it does not bring sinners to Christ.

In Washington city there is an incalculable amount of gold treasured up. The heralds of the government go through the length and breadth of the land and invite all who will to accept the offer and take a splendid fortune. It is also announced that many will certainly go and secure a share of the treasure, and some will certainly stay away and lose the prize. It is likewise proclaimed that, at a fixed unknown hour, the doors will be closed, and no more gold can be obtained. It is not known who will accept, or who decline the invitation. It is unknown when the door will be shut. All may partake who will. Now, the certainty that many will go and many stay away, and the uncertainty who will go and who will not go—the certainty that the doors shall be closed at a fixed moment and the uncertainty when that time will come, all combined has a most powerful influence to induce every one to say, "I will be of those who gain the prize."

This is precisely our doctrine of election. Heaven is offered to all. The heralds of mercy go through the world proclaiming salvation to the race. It is announced that myriads will accept, many reject the proffer. It is unknown who will come, and who will stay away. It is known that at a fixed, unknown hour, death will come and shut the door against any farther offer.—Now, this mixture of hope and fear, of certainty and uncertainty, must powerfully tend to draw and drive the sinner to Jesus.

This illustration, I believe, presents the truth under consideration, in its true light. The thought was given to the writer by an esteemed class-mate in another form.

Who then can say, that our doctrine of election is not *scriptural, important, comforting, and practical*?

J. M. C.

For the Calvinistic Magazine.

Maternal Influence.

The most endearing of all relations is that existing between mother and child, and there is not one involving more weighty and important duties. To unsanctified human nature, there is scarcely one view of these duties, which is agreeable. The fond mother loves to have you observe the Websterian forehead, or the Everett-like eye of her son, and you need not fear of wearing out her patience by enumerating his good qualities. A word, thoughtlessly dropped by some distinguished guest, is hid in her heart, and is by no means an ambiguous oracle, foreboding the grand destiny of her son. Maternal affection, unenlightened by the spirit of God, delights in the thought, that its object may be a germ of greatness and nobleness, which is soon to unfold, and expand, and be the pride and wonder of a nation. Its visions rarely combine a pilgrimage of sadness, a scanty abode in the vale of poverty, a home of bereavement, and a grave of infamy. A bright prospect stretches out before it, and all that prospect is within the compass of the land of mortality. Here is rank materialism. That same spirit which a few years since, scouted the idea of a God, and sought to stifle within man, that voice, which speaks of another world, has now crouched itself in the domestic circle, and is infusing itself insidiously into the minds of parents. They seem to forget in their anxiety to garnish the body, the casket, that the mind, the gem of the casket, is of infinite more importance. They little dream, that it is theirs to fashion, that which is more enduring than all things else, undying thought.

In every effort to impress upon mothers, the responsibility which attaches to their station, while I would by no means encourage one class, who are extravagant in their anticipations as to the fortunes of their children, I would caution another class, that they do not form too low an estimate of their task. You do not expect great things, but do you expect as great things as you ought? Your influence though small is not to be despised. It may be only a drop in the ocean, yet it will be there, and it will impart its own hue, to all the other drops. Because you do not expect your daughter to become a Harriet Newell, or a Hannah More, you have no right to think lightly of your charge.—Your son may not be the embryo of greatness, and his name may

not be associated with Washington or Howard, yet there is a germ there, and you are to expand that into full life. With this in view, let us look at the station of the mother as connected with immortal mind.

If you let fall upon polished steel a drop of water, there is a stain which can be removed only by removing the steel itself.— Thus with mind. Every soiled spot will remain so long as the mind remains. A false bias given to the youthful mind can be erased, but by taking the substance of the mind. Other biases may partially counteract it, or, so to speak, over-spread it, yet it defaces more than the mind's surface—it is deeply ingrained into its very essence. Suppose you let some physical deformity of your child pass uncorrected, let one of his limbs be disabled for life, in consequence of neglect, or even blameless ignorance, will you not have sharp misgivings? But the more real defects of the temper or heart may be rapidly gaining strength daily under your eye, while you perhaps are little aware of it. The ruling passion, which is to bear sway in the soul throughout life, and to wield its sceptre in the hour of death, and to talk wildly, is gaining force under your plastic touch. Thirst of fame, love of gain, desire of empire; whatever is to be the moving spring in the soul for life, and to be uppermost mid the tumult of death, that passion you are feeding by each look of approbation, each smile of love, each word of tenderness. The man who in the hour of death dreamed of battles, and gave words of command, drank into that spirit, when his mother's eye was upon him, and he felt the warm beatings of a mother's heart.

But the influence of a mother reaches far beyond the hour of death. When the mightiest fabric of human strength shall have decayed, when the deep, dense forest, the wide-spread ocean, the heaven-reaching mountain, the earth beneath and the sky above, shall have vanished, the mind, moulded by the mother, will have just begun to be. When she sits down to the task of instruction, it is not the sappy urchin who is taught; it is the soul, which shall live long after the body shall have ceased to be.

If there were sent from the pure regions of light, one of the higher order of spirits to be in your society, to be instructed by your counsel, to follow your example, and to enter upon that destiny you chose for it, what mother would not shrink back

from the task? And if you knew, there were a possibility of such a spirit's being an inhabitant of a gloomy cell in despair, your breast would be a stranger to repose—your pillow would be set with thornes.

Such, however, is little short of the truth. The soul which moves those tiny arms, and sparkles in those loving eyes, is only an angel in embryo; and it will soon spread its wings and take its stand among the shining ones above, and mingle in their songs, or it will grope through the mournful land of silence, forever an out-cast from heaven's bliss; and not till the pillars of heaven shall have begun to crumble will its destiny have but just been commenced. You are not, O! ye who are mothers, you are not rearing some decayless castle, nor putting up huge pillars to be looked upon by men of other years, nor are you writing a code of laws, which shall be quoted as authority in later times, but the fabrics you rear are of mind.

“’Tis for the generations yet unborn

To bless your labors and repay the toil;

Your monuments, their hearts—their lives, your praise.”

A century and a half since an obscure mother in London, taught her little son the history of the Bible on some Dutch tiles in the chimney corner. She had only turned his steps towards heaven, and she was called to lead the way. While yet on his pilgrimage, that son wrote a little volume and sent it out upon the world. That little volume met the eye of a talented young statesman. He also began a pilgrimage towards heaven, nor far did he proceed before he sent forth a little volume into the world. That volume found its way to a proud, unconverted minister of the established church. He also welcomed the truth to his heart, and was found soon a pilgrim, setting his face towards heaven. Doddridge, Wilberforce, Leigh Richmond have all doubtless met the mother of Doddridge in the skies; and not till the “Rise and Progress,” “The Practical View,” and “The Dairyman’s Daughter,” shall have returned from their last errand of mercy, will it be known to that sainted mother, how many bright seraphs will sing forever, as the result of her faithfulness in that humble dwelling of that obscure alley of London.

O ye, who sometimes wish for a higher sphere of action, and pant for larger opportunities of usefulness, yours is in truth a heavenly mission. Your crown of glory may be encircled by

stars of the first magnitude. By your feeble hand, may be started, a train of events, which shall issue in the ransom of an empire to Christ. Beneath your low cottage roof, that may take place, at which the arches of heaven will ring loud again. Be faithful, then, to your charge. Fulfil the vows you have taken upon you. If you are rich, if you are poor, if you are wise, if you are ignorant, Be Faithful, Be Faithful.

R. P. W.

Decrees and Free Agency.

They regard the supposition, that God has planned a certain system of things according to his own pleasure, and that he has made, and placed, men in such a manner, as that they will certainly do those things; and those only, which will accord with that pleasure, as inconsistent with the doctrine, that they are free agents.

To this objection, to which I have intended to give its true import, and full force, it is commonly answered, that the doctrine which I have attempted to support, is capable of being clearly proved both from Reason and Revelation; and that men are intuitively conscious of their own free agency; being irresistibly sensible, that they act spontaneously, and without any coercion or restraint. Both doctrines being, therefore, true, and certain, it is justly alleged, that they are of course consistent with each other.

It would seem that this answer might as well satisfy the mind in the present case, as in numerous others, in which we perceive propositions to be true, but are unable to discern the nature of their mutual connection. But, as the objection is still insisted on, and seems to have no small weight in the minds of many persons, it will not be improper for me to offer some further considerations on the subject.

All those who make this objection, agree as well as others, that it is possible for a finite agent, possessed of certain supposable attributes, and placed in certain supposable circumstances, to be free in the absolute sense. I shall take this for granted; because, otherwise, the objection itself, and the debate founded on

it, can have neither place nor meaning. We will suppose, then, such an agent to exist; and to act, while he lived, in a manner perfectly free: while, at the same time, no being knew, at all, in what manner he would act in any case whatever, until his actions had existed. In this case, he would undoubtedly be allowed to possess all possible advantages for acting with perfect freedom. Lest I should not be thought to be sufficiently particular, I will suppose his actions to be all absolutely contingent, because some Philosophers suppose contingency to be an indispensable and inseparable attribute of a free action. We will, now, in the second place, suppose this agent, without any change in his powers, or his circumstances, in any other respect, to have all his actions, which, according to the former supposition are the freest possible, foreknown by God, or some other being. I ask, whether they would be at all the less free, in consequence of being thus foreknown?

The powers, the circumstances, and the actions, of this agent, remain exactly the same, as before; the agent himself (for that is included in the supposition) being perfectly ignorant, that his actions are thus foreknown. Can it be perceived, that this foreknowledge affects the nature of the actions in any manner, or the freedom of the agent? To me it is clear, that it cannot; because, in the case supposed, the foreknowledge has not the remotest influence on the agent, nor his actions; both he and they continuing to be exactly the same, in every respect, whatever. On the contrary, all the possible influence of this foreknowledge is confined to the bosom of him, by whom it is possessed.

But if this agent would thus continue free, and his actions would still be perfectly free, notwithstanding they were foreknown; then it is clear, that a preceding certainty, that the actions of a voluntary agent will exist, does not at all, of itself, lessen, or affect, their freedom. Foreknowledge renders the future existence of that, which is foreknown, certain, and will of course exist; yet it is, I think, unquestionably clear from this statement, that their freedom will not be affected.

Again, we will suppose, that the actions of the agent already specified, which are thus foreknown by God, are perceived by him also, to be exactly agreeable to his pleasure. Will this circumstance affect the freedom of agency? Surely it will not be asserted, nor believe, that actions; in order to be free, must

contravene the pleasure of God. As I presume this proposition was never advanced by any man, and as it is an obvious absurdity in itself; I shall take the liberty to consider it as being an absurdity.

It is therefore clear, that the actions of a voluntary agent may be certainly foreknown by God to be exactly agreeable to his pleasure, and yet be attended with the highest possible freedom.—*Dwight's Theology*.

The Free Church of Scotland.

For several years past Scotland has been agitated from the centre of her capital to the extremity of her most retired glen; even to the loneliest of her Hebrides. The spirit of John Knox has been evoked from its rest by the infringement of the civil power upon the lawful dominion of the spiritual courts; and it has become a question whether the State or Christ shall be the Head of the Church in Scotland. The issue raised was, Has the State or the Church, through her proper courts, the right of creating the pastoral relation between the minister and the people he is to serve? Since the reign of Queen Anne, the State has claimed it for the patrons of the different livings, and enforced it repeatedly through the civil courts against the violent protestations of the people. For more than a century was the strife continued, though with different degrees of energy. At first, the regular protest, recorded by the General Assembly, year after year, against the act of 1712, was a document of some meaning; but in the process of time it came to be a matter of form. By degrees, of course, the character of the Assembly was changed, as the old ministers fell off and the new supply, furnished by patronage, filled their places. The Moderates, as they were called, who vindicated patronage, were the majority. But the people were not easily subdued. The old Scottish spirit remained. They sometimes took the presentee captive, and detained him until the time for ordination and installation had passed. At other times the government sent a detachment of soldiers to ensure the installation and possession of Kirk, and glebe, and tithes.

But the mighty movement of the religious mind of Christendom, caused by the blessing of the Spirit of God upon the labours of Wesley and Whitfield in the last century, had reached Scotland, and the Church awoke from the lethargy of moderatism. A Chalmers and a Gordon arose. They saw the abuses of patronage; they saw bad men placed over the people as ministers, against their wishes, and against the decisions of the Church courts. They resolved to fall back upon the Treaty of Union, which secured the independence of the Church of Scotland; and the General Assembly in 1834 passed an act ensuring to each congregation that no minister should be intruded on them against their will, though the patron should insist in favor of the presentee. This was the *veto act*, giving the people a negative in the case of presentation. All who maintained it were called vetoists, or *non-intrusionists*, because they would not suffer a minister to be intruded upon them against their consent. Under this act of the General Assembly, the spirit and piety of the people revived; but the interests of the patrons declined. Their right of presentation was not so valuable, as the presentee might be rejected by the people, and most assuredly would be required by them to lead a reasonably exemplary life; in default of which he might be arrested, tried, and deposed from his ministerial office, and, of course, ejected from the living. These dangers to the interests of patronage were increased in proportion to the growth of the evangelical party in the ministry and among the people. The patrons applied to the civil courts to protect them in their rights according to the act of Anne; and the people looked to the General Assembly of the Church to protect them from the rapacious wolves in sheep's clothing presented to them by the patrons, and forced upon them by the civil courts. The Assembly not only fell back upon the Treaty of Union, but upon the act of 1690, giving them a *liberum arbitrium*, or final jurisdiction over all spiritual cases. They took their stand nobly for the rights of the people, the rights of conscience, and the independence and glory of Christ in his Church. The battle was now fairly begun between the true spirit of the Reformation, which had set Scotland free three centuries before, and that secularized church power which, unfortunately, is incorporated closely with the British Constitution.

There was much at stake on both sides. The government

saw clearly that, if the communicants in the Scottish Church had a right to exercise a veto power over the presentee, it might not be long before the communicants in the English Church might discover and claim their rights, too, in this matter. Perhaps they saw, also, that the triumph of the Scotch Church would be, and truly, too, held to be a dangerous encroachment upon the "vested rights" of patrons or great families. This would have been throwing a bomb into the citadel of the aristocracy, whose foundations are laid in vested rights, *i. e.*, rights which they themselves have created in their own favor, and which time has consecrated, and thus protected from the vulgar touch. On the other hand, the Church felt that she was called to preach the Gospel to the poor, and to protect her flocks, at all hazards, from devouring wolves. On the one hand was the civil power, through the courts, putting whole districts under interdict, forbidding the preaching of the Gospel and the administration of the sacraments under the authority of the Church; restoring wicked men, whom she had excommunicated, to the holy office, and protecting them in the exercise of it; and appointing others to the pastoral charge whom she declared never to have been ministers. On the other hand, the Church stood on her principles and her integrity, and appealed from the civil courts in her own midst to the House of Lords for protection. The answer of the government to her powerful and eloquent petitions too clearly showed that she had nothing to hope from the peers; and with a decision and prudence worthy of the best ages of the Church, she took preliminary steps peaceably to separate from the Establishment.

The people saw their shepherds preparing to lead them forth from spiritual bondage; and their hearts beat quick and strong as they looked to their coming deliverance, and comprehended clearly that it would cost their pastors their salaries, churches, manses, and glebes—in short, their homes—and cast them wholly upon the voluntary support of the people. All Scotland became one volcano of excited feeling. Whether those deep earthquake throes pervading the community should issue in an explosion or not, depended upon the fate of the appeal sent up to the House of Lords. During the progress of these events, the Queen and her government made a tour through Scotland; but they could not discern the spirit of the people, nor of their

pastors. They made inquiry, but not of the right persons, as to the probability of any secession if the government persisted in enforcing the pretended rights of patrons, and if any, whether it would be to such an extent and of such persons as ought to give the government any concern. Unfortunately, the conclusion was that there would be but a trifling secession, if any. So the government and the Queen rambled through the Highlands and returned to London.

In the mean time, the House of Lords decided against the Church, and maintained the rights of patrons. The civil courts vitiated the elections to the General Assembly. The resolution of the people and pastors grew firmer, and the attention of all Scotland was turned towards the capital as the month of May, 1843, advanced. The General Assembly was to meet on Thursday, the 18th. After the duties of the Sabbath were over, on Monday, the 15th, and the following days, the people thronged the highways leading to Edinburgh. The crowd in the city became greater and greater, and on Thursday morning, the popular interest rivalled that which had been felt on the preceding August upon the advent of the youthful Queen and her court.

The morning of the 18th had scarcely dawned when noble ladies and pious men were knocking for admittance at St. Andrew's, though the Assembly was not to meet before three o'clock, P. M. Scotland gathered around the sacred pile, and awaited the coming of the representatives of her truly reformed church. As the venerable men who stood at the head of the Assembly advanced, a chasm opened in the masses of people, and the Canongate reeled under the rounds of applause with which they were greeted. As the moderator, Dr. Welsh, entered, followed by Drs. Chalmers, Gordon, Candlish, and others, the vast and massive edifice shook with the reception which the people gave them. Scarce had the applause died away, when the most noble the Marquis of Bute, her majesty's lord-high-commissioner, enteted with his suite. He was received standing and in silence. The cause of his mistress and the patrons had no hold upon the hearts of the people. The moderator rose in a few minutes, and no one breathed, lest a single word from him should be lost. He said, "A Free Assembly of the Church of Scotland, in accordance with the laws and constitution of said church, cannot now be holden, for reasons set forth

in the following paper, which, with the permission of the House, I will read." It was a protest, in which the wrongs done to the Church by the government were recited; and the document concluded by declaring "that we are not responsible for any consequences that may follow from this our enforced separation from the Establishment, which we loved and prized, through interference with conscience, the dishonour done to Christ's crown, and the rejection of his sole and supreme authority as king in his Church." A pin might have been heard to fall amid the three thousand persons who listened; and the vast multitudes in the streets observed a profound silence, as if, by sympathy, they understood what was going on in the House. When the moderator ceased to read, he handed the paper to the clerk, took up his hat, and advanced to the door, followed by Drs. Chalmers, Gordon, Candlish, Cunningham, three hundred ministers, and a host of elders. The audience, struck with the sublimity of the act, burst into tears, and were silent; but when the band of martyrs for liberty in the Church emerged into the streets, they were received by the people with such thunders of applause as shook the Hills of Fife beyond the Forth, and startled the House of Lords for the first time to a sense of their danger. The seceding Assembly walked four abreast to Tanfield Hall. As they passed, the streets were thronged, windows were full, housetops were alive, and the air was rent with successive shouts, accompanied with the waving of handkerchiefs and the approving smiles of women.

The deed was done; the separation was made. Israel had escaped from Egypt; and there was as much consternation and disappointment in the residuary Assembly as formerly in Pharaoh's dominions, when he and his ministers became fully sensible that the Jews had escaped from them.

The Free Assembly was constituted by choosing Dr. Chalmers moderator. They proceeded to business. Spirit and dignity marked their transactions. I have not room to note the evangelical and patriotic speeches made on the various occasions. Every hour that the Assembly sat, day after day, other ministers, who had faltered or had not been present, came to the Free Assembly and gave in their adherence. Upon its adjournment, a noble roll of five hundred true and faithful pastors, embracing the learning and worth of the clergy, was made out and

distributed throughout the kingdom. The Assembly—having taken steps to prevent the scattering of their flocks, and for building some six or eight hundred churches by voluntary subscriptions, which poured in from all parts of the kingdom, and from England and Ireland—dissolved, and the pastors returned home to preach the last sermon each in the kirk where he had so often fed the people. Now came the reality of separation.—The churches were closed against them, and their people stood at the doors or wandered amid the graves of their forefathers. But where the Spirit of God is, there is liberty. They sat under a tree, or by the wayside, or on the margin of the stream, and heard the Gospel from their faithful shepherds. On Monday, notices were served to many of them to quit the manses.—Their wives and children now became sensible what had been done to them. They were called on, without a day's notice, to quit their happy homes, and go forth they knew not whither.—Some of them were sick, some old and infirm; but no matter, they must go. They went forth, and God tempered the wind to the shorn lambs. The poor received them: the people provided for them, either sharing their own humble dwellings with them, or providing others for them. They lived with the people and in their hearts.

But as the Sabbath morning dawned, the people sighed for the kirk. It was closed against them, or occupied by one intruded on them, and whom they disdained to hear. They essayed to assemble in barns, or shops, and sometimes on the highway, or by the water's side, but the lairds forbid them. Wherever sites could be obtained, they commenced building churches; but in many parishes they could not obtain a foot of ground to build on, either for love or money. The lords of the soil had no sympathy with the *Free Protestant Church* of Scotland, because it rejected their unhallowed claim to supreme rule in the house of Christ. Where new tenures could not be obtained, some good man or poor widow gave up their lease of a little spot for the erection of a plain church. His grace the Duke of Buccleuch refused to allow a free church to be built anywhere on his vast estates. He would take no money. An old woman had a long lease on a little spot. The duke offered her hundreds of pounds for it; but she refused, and said she would give it for a church to the Free Church of Scotland.

Upon a survey of this great movement in the Church of Scotland, I am persuaded that nothing more glorious appears in the history of Christianity since the days of the Reformation. There was a body of five hundred ministers, followed by their people, going out voluntarily from a richly-endowed establishment, throwing away their salaries, and homes, and schools, and all for conscience' sake. But they have been abundantly rewarded, and their conduct has given a new impulse to piety and freedom, and struck a blow at the union of Church and State from which it will not soon recover. The judgment and sympathy of Europe are with the Free Protestant Church of Scotland.—*Dr. Durbin's Observations in Europe.*

Progress of Civilization.

For two or three years past, including spring and fall, we have had nearly four hundred whale ships here annually to recruit. These are to be supplied with water, hogs, goats, bananas, melons, pumpkins, onions, squashes, sweet potatoes, yams, turkies, ducks, fowls and beef, all which can be had in abundance; but the greatest article for which they come is Irish potatoes, which grow plentifully in the interior of this island.— This demand for the produce of the Islands encourages industry; and it brings in clothing and other necessaries for the people, and makes money more abundant on this than on other islands. Most of the wealth, however, gained from all this traffic, goes into the hands of foreigners. Still enough is received by natives to enable them to improve their mode of living. Such improvements are constantly going on among us. Among our three thousand people, there is already a considerable number of comfortable stone houses; there are also one hundred or more built of adobies (dirt bricks dried in the sun.) About one hundred and fifty families eat at the table in our style; this is a great change from the native mode of eating on mats. Many sleep on foreign bedsteads, or rather bedsteads made in a foreign style; and many have a pretty good supply of chairs, of cooking utensils, and table furniture. Some of them have also clocks in their houses, or other time-pieces.

Last spring, at the dedication of a sectional meeting-house in this place, myself and family attended a feast, at which two hundred common natives sat down and ate at the table. Lately they renewed the feast, and there were, I judged, about three hundred and fifty natives who all ate in the same style. This is an unheard of thing among common natives at the Sandwich Islands. We hope it is a token for improvement in many things.

Progress of Liberality.

I herewith forward you a contribution of one hundred dollars from the Molokai church to the Board. The donors wish it to be appropriated to the education of a girl in the female seminary at Ceylon. If the scholars are named by the donors, let her be called Rebecca Howard. Our people are poor. Whatever they do for the cause of religion, either at home or abroad, they do out of their extreme penury. But they have already made sufficient proof of active benevolence to satisfy them that nothing is lost by giving to the Lord. Heretofore their donations have not been very systematic, and of course they have been of no great amount. The hundred dollars which they now send you, is the fruit of the monthly concert for about one year. They are adopting a system of contributing which will I hope insure more. It is to be hoped that by extending their charities to distant lands their views will expand, and that they will be the more ready to help themselves.

In addition to this contribution,—which has been mainly the result of braiding mats and bringing wood on their backs from the mountain, a stick at a time,—our people have subscribed more than four hundred dollars for our support the present year. Half, or nearly half, of it is already paid. Besides which they have to pay for the schooling of their children, together with exorbitant taxes to government; so that it is a fact that they are ready to do above their ability. This is not because they are any more disposed to be charitable than Christians in other parts of the world; but because they have been taught that the giving of their property to the cause of benevolence is as indis-

pensable to their Christian character, as to pray or to comply with any other demand of the gospel.

In addition to the above contributions, the people are engaged in erecting a permanent house of worship, one hour and a quarter's ride from the station, sixty feet by thirty. The inhabitants of that district are now obliged to come to meeting a distance of from nine to twelve miles, over a bad road. When their new house shall be finished, they will no longer be under the necessity of going so far to hear the gospel. But the promptitude and cheerfulness with which, for many years, they have attended the house of God, notwithstanding the distance, would surprise you.

I am not without the hope that the time is not far distant, when the funds of the Board will cease to be needed for my support and for that of Mr. Andrews. We shall hasten that time as fast as possible.—*Missionary Herald for June.*

Solemn Responsibility of Christians.

It is an affecting truth and a solemn reflection, that we cannot expect to see sinners converted as long as Christians are asleep in their sins. God, it is true, sometimes converts sinners without the instrumentality of Christians. He brings sinners to repentance, and leads them into the ark of Christ's salvation, when Christians are standing in the way. He sometimes even reverses the order of spiritual influences, by which he usually leads men to repentance. He first converts sinners, and then, through their instrumentality, works on the hearts of professing Christians, instead of employing Christians as instruments to operate on sinners. Still the church is the great instrument in the hands of God of saving souls. For this purpose, God has furnished his church with the ministry, and the ordinances, and spiritual influences, and great moral power. And these powers and influences must be exercised before we can expect to see sinners converted. Christians must wake out of sleep, they must take hold of the work and be active in the service of Christ, or we need not expect that much impression will be produced on those who are hardening their hearts in sin. If Christians will return from their

wanderings, and confess their sins, and humble themselves before God, and pray, and consecrate themselves anew to the work, we shall soon see the effect; the Holy Spirit will come down and bless their efforts, and sinners will be converted.

Then let Christians awake. They are sleeping under an awful responsibility, under a tremendous load of guilt. Sinners are perishing around, and stumbling over them into the bottomless pit. Oh, then, let the church rouse from her slumbers; let Christians call upon the Lord, that he may pour out his Holy Spirit into their hearts, that they may see their own state, and feel for those who are perishing in consequence of their indifference, and want of feeling, and neglect of duty. Let every Christian awake; let every parent who has children out of the ark of safety, awake, lest his children die in their sins, and their blood be required at his hands; let every head of a family awake, lest the unconverted members of his own household rise up in the day of judgment and say, "You were a professor of religion; I looked to you for instruction and example; but you neglected your duty, you cared not for my soul, and you suffered me to perish when you might have saved me." Let every Christian who has impenitent friends, awake, and labor with renewed diligence, that the souls of those friends which are so precious, and every moment ready to perish, may not be lost forever.—*N. Y. Evangelist.*

Counsels for the Young.

Never be cast down by trifles. If a spider breaks his thread twenty times, twenty times will he mend it again. Make up your minds to do a thing, and you will do it. Fear not if trouble comes upon you; keep up your spirits, though the day be a dark one.

Troubles never stop forever,
The darkest day will pass away.

If the sun is going down, look up at the stars; if the earth is dark, keep your eyes on heaven! With God's presence and God's promise, a man or a child may be cheerful.

Never despair when fog's in the air!
A sunshiny morning will come without warning.

Mind what you run after! Never be content with a bubble that will burst, or a firework that will end in smoke and darkness. Get that which you can keep, and which is worth keeping.

Something sterling that will stay
When gold and silver fly away.

Fight hard against a hasty temper. Anger will come, and resist it stoutly. A spark may set a house on fire. A fit of passion may give you cause to mourn all the days of your life. Never revenge an injury.

He that revenges knows no rest;
The meek possess a powerful breast.

If you have an enemy, act kindly to him and make him your friend. You may not win him over at once, but try again. Let one kindness be followed by another, till you have compassed your end. By little and little, great things are completed.

Water falling day by day
Wears the hardest rock away.

And so repeated kindness will soften a heart of stone.

Whatever you do, do it willingly. A boy that is whipped to school never learns his lessons well. A man that is compelled to work cares not how badly it is performed. He that pulls off his coat cheerfully, strips up his sleeves in earnest, and sings while he works, is the man for me.

A cheerful spirit gets on quick;
A grumbler in the mud will stick.

Evil thoughts are worse enemies than lions and tigers, for we can keep out of the way of wild beasts, but bad thoughts win their way everywhere. The cup that is full will hold no more; keep your heads and hearts full of good thoughts, that bad thoughts may find no room to enter.

Be on your guard, and strive, and pray,
To drive all evil thoughts away.

N. Y. Evangelist.

EDUCATION.—Education is a companion which no misfortune can depress; no clime destroy; no enemy alienate; no despotism enslave. At home a friend; abroad an introduction; in solitude a solace; in society an ornament; it chastens vice; it guides virtue; it gives at once an ornament to genius.

Sheep and Shepherds in Judea.

A traveler in Palestine gives the following picture of pastoral life in the East: "On our way we met several flocks of sheep, preceded by their shepherds, walking slowly towards Jerusalem; and at once the full force of all the beautiful imagery, and the many touching similes derived from such scenes and associations; so often alluded to in Scripture, came vividly before me. These Arab shepherds, clad in the turbans and simple abbas worn by their class, and carrying a wooden crook in their hand, walked in front. The sheep, which are a peculiar and very handsome variety, are mostly low-sized; the fore parts of their bodies are of a fawn color, the hinder parts white; they have long, pendant, silken ears and sweeping tails; their faces more oval and longer than the species in these countries, and they have altogether a more pleasing, docile, and mild expression of countenance. Not one of them ventured before the shepherd, but stopped or quickened their pace as he did; or if a young and froward creature lagged behind or stepped to either side, a single word from their leader, often a very look, brought it back and checked its wanderings. A few favorite lambs frisked familiarly about their master, and rubbed themselves against him. After the sheep, came some young goats and lambs, and the whole procession closed with about two dozen of old patriarchal looking goats, who brought up the rear. These goats have long horns, and pendent ears that hang almost to the ground, and their hair is a glossy black, and of the finest grain; the sheep and goats were perfectly distinct. These shepherds are often to be seen about sunset slowly approaching the city from all sides, to seek shelter for their flocks during the night, in some of the deep valleys by which it is surrounded, carrying the lambs in their bosoms. It is almost incredible, the influence that the shepherds of Palestine possess over their flocks; many of them have no dogs, but a word is quite sufficient to make them understand and obey the will of their shepherd. He sleeps among them at night, and in the morning leads them forth to pasture—always walking before them, guiding them to those places where they can enjoy the best food, and resting when he thinks they have obtained a sufficiency, or during the heat of the day in some cool shady place, where they all immediately lie down around him.

He has generally two or three favorite lambs, who do not mix with the flock, but follow close at his side, frisking and fondling about him like dogs: indeed, the degree of intelligence and understanding that exists between the Arab and his flock is truly astonishing. 'They know his voice and follow him;' 'he careth for the sheep.' It was probably to such shepherds as these, that the angel announced the glad tidings of the Savior's birth."—*Wilde's Narrative.*

Miscellany.

AN ANCIENT DRUM.—In the rooms of the Connecticut Historical Society, there is an antique drum shown to visitors amongst other interesting relics of past time, which was used in 1718 by the citizens of Farmington, "to call the people together on the Lord's day, and on public occasions;" to the archives of which village the following record is attached:

Paid Stephen Andrus for drumming	£0 13 4
Paid Nathaniel Cowles for drumming	0 13 4
Paid Daniel Woodruff for drumming	0 13 4
Paid Joseph Bird for drumming	0 13 4

Probably the phrase we sometimes hear used of "*drumming the people together*," had its rise with this old custom.

A GOOD ANSWER.—A boy was once tempted by his companions, to pluck some ripe cherries, on a tree which his father had forbidden him touch.

"You need not be afraid, for if your father should find out that you had them, he is so kind, that he will not hurt you."

"That is the very reason," replied the boy, "why I would not touch them."

"It is true, my father may not hurt me; yet my disobedience, I know, would hurt my father and that would be worse to me than anything else."

Was not this an excellent reason?

The Land which no Mortal may know.

The land which no mortal may know—
 Tho' earth has full many a beautiful spot,
 As a poet or painter might show;
 Yet more lovely, and beautiful, holy, and bright,
 To the hopes of the heart, and the spirit's glad sight,
 Is the land that no mortal may know.

There the crystalline stream bursting forth from the throne,
 Flows on, and forever will flow;
 Its waves as they roll are with melody rife,
 And its waters are sparkling with beauty and life,
 In the land which no mortal may know.

And there on its margin with leaves ever green,
 With its fruits healing sickness and wo,
 The fair tree of Life, in its glory and pride,
 Is fed by that deep inexhaustible tide
 Of the land which no mortal may know.

There too, are the lost, whom we loved on this earth,
 With whose mem'ries our bosoms yet glow;
 Their relics we gave to the place of the dead,
 But their glorified spirits before us have fled
 To the land which no mortal may know.

There the pale orb of night and the fountain of day,
 Nor beauty nor splendor bestow;
 But the presence of Him, the unchanging I AM!
 And the holy, the pure, the immaculate Lamb!
 Light the land which no mortal may know.

Oh! who but must pine in this dark vale of tears,
 From its clouds and its shadows to go?
 To walk in the light of the glory above;
 And to share in the peace, and the joy, and the love,
 Of the land which no mortal may know.

BERNARD BARTON.

Good friend, a warm word in your ear. The time will come, and the day may not be distant, when a voice will whisper in your ear—"This night thy soul will be required of thee." Then to whom will thy riches fall?—*N. Y. Tribune.*

THE
Calvinistic Magazine.

[NEW SERIES.]

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

Vol I.

May, 1846.

No. 5.

Ministerial Support.

Want of preachers in the Presbyterian Church, is a common complaint; and when we look at the preparations required, and the inducements held out to ministers, the wonder is, not that there are so few, but that there are so many, who are willing to encounter difficulties so serious.

The preparation for the ministry is long and arduous, confining the student within the walls of colleges and seminaries a longer period than the human constitution can well bear—resulting but too often in shattered health, and the seeds of disease deeply seated. His attenuated person and pallid countenance plainly indicate the severity of his labors—while he is qualified, it is true, for his office, but for nothing else. Is he sure of a warm and cordial reception from the church? No! She has many preliminaries to settle with him. His talents are to be looked into, his gifts, as they are sometimes called. His pulpit qualifications, his elocution, his colloquial powers, the character of his piety are all to be criticised.

Being satisfied in all these respects, what does the church now propose? A settlement for life, with a competent salary? Very rarely indeed, and in the region of country for which this paper is written, never. Usually a careful estimate is made of the amount necessary to keep him alive. A subscription is then made up, falling a little short, and he is required to teach a school to make up the deficiency. Having agreed to all this, he is engaged *for one year*, at the end of which, if he has made himself acceptable, a renewal of the engagement is proposed for

another year, generally with a diminished subscription; and in this way things progress until he is gradually starved out, and turned adrift, to seek a new home, and a repetition of the same trials. These are the opening prospects of the minister. Do they brighten as he looks forward? Suppose he, like other men, should think of the comforts of home and family—what obstacles lie in his way, in the cares and wants of a dependent family?—dependent on one who is himself a dependent.

But enough. We have gone far enough to see the source of one great evil in our church—the diversion of ministerial labor from its proper channel. This results not from the love of money, nor the love of the world among ministers. I utterly deny the charge, and throw it back upon those who make it. It arises from that, next to the love of God, most amiable trait in the human heart—the love of wife and children. That he may not see these destitute of the comforts and advantages common to all others, he reluctantly yields, in a great measure, his claims upon the church, and seeks relief in some secular pursuit.

This is a deplorable alternative, for, these pursuits are all of them inconsistent with the ministerial office. Not that labor, or the common avocations of life are degrading, but that they expose the man of God to the foul suspicion of mercenary motives, and to the odious comparisons which the men of the world are ever ready to make between him and themselves, as they see him toiling at the plough-tail or higgling in the market—all tending greatly to impair, if not to destroy his influence. Besides, it exposes him to catch the spirit of the world, and though pure at first, he may contract the love of money, and the love of making money, and thus become sordid, if not avaricious. Such things have happened, perhaps even now exist among us.

Again; the time of one qualified to preach the gospel is too valuable to be employed in digging in the ground. It is a desecration to apply that to the uses of the body which would be beneficial to the soul. No congregation can afford to let their minister make his own living. Whilst he is making bread for himself, he is starving them for the want of that which is more than bread.

And again; these pursuits are disqualifying in their tendency. He loses the elevation and spirituality of mind which the minister should ever enjoy. His own wants and cares continually

drag him down to earth—and he feels that he cannot rebuke with proper freedom, the inordinate love of the world while, seemingly at least, he is laboring under it himself. Hence it is, that the labors of so many of our ministers are comparatively inefficient—and hence too, the heartless indifference with which our congregations are seen to change them. They do not appreciate them, because they receive little benefit from them—and they receive little benefit from them, because they have not sustained and kept them in a situation in which they could be useful to them. Secure to yourselves their whole time, and you will soon find them bound to you by ties which may not be easily broken, if they do not become indissoluble.

Our preacher is doing but little good, is a very common complaint. It reminds one of the miller who is always complaining of dry weather and low water, while four-fifths of the stream are pouring round him, through a leak in his dam. Stop the leak, and turn the water upon your sluggish creaking machine, and all will be well.

But, ministers themselves are not without blame in this matter. A false delicacy has prevented them from placing their claims upon proper grounds, and while they are entitled to a support upon every principle, human and divine, their people have been left to suppose that it was given in charity—and that they might give or not at their discretion. Let them know that not only their own best interests, but that God requires at their hands, a competent support for their minister, and they will no more fail in this than in any other duty.

That their own interests require the services of a minister, we need not argue. That God requires his support from the church we will endeavor to show; nor need we take a wide range for this purpose, as the apostle has condensed the subject in IX Chapter of I Corin.

“Having first asserted his apostolical authority, he proceeds to claim the rights belonging to his office, especially that of being maintained by it;” and not only himself but a wife, a sister, in other words a family if he chose to have one.

1st. “From the common practice and expectations of mankind.”

“Those who addict and give themselves up to any way of business in the world, expect to live out of it. Soldiers expect

to be paid for their services. Husbandmen and shepherds expect to get a livelihood out of their labors.”

Next from the Jewish law. “Say I these things as a man? or saith not the law the same also?”

Is this merely a dictate of common reason, and according to common usage only? No, it is also consonant with the old law. God had therein ordered that the ox should not be muzzled while he was treading out the corn; or hindered from eating while he was preparing the corn for man’s use, and treading it out of the ear. But this law was not chiefly given out of God’s regard to oxen or concern for them, but to teach mankind that all due encouragement should be given to those who are employed by us, or laboring for our good, that the laborers should taste of the fruit of his labor.

He next argues from common equity. “If we have sown unto you spiritual things, is it a great thing if we shall reap your carnal things?”

He next argues from the old Jewish establishment. “Do ye not know that they who minister about holy things, live of the things of the temple; and they which wait on the altar, are partakers with the altar?”

And lastly, he asserts it to be the institution of Christ: “Even so hath the Lord ordained, that they which preach the gospel, should live of the gospel.”

It is true he tells us he had used none of these things, but this only entitles his argument to the more weight, as it shows he was not influenced by selfish motives, but a sense of justice.

But can there be no circumstances where a congregation will be released in whole or in part from this obligation?

The minister may chance to have property sufficient to afford him a support. If so, he must devote his time to it, or it will produce nothing. Or he must devote the property itself, and live upon it while it lasts. The first is incompatible with his office. The last he is under no obligation to do, any more than to give it to the Bible, tract, missionary, or any other benevolent cause.

But here too we are not without light from the Gospel itself. When our Saviour first sent his disciples to preach, he commanded them to take nothing with them—no money, not even two coats. Small as was their property, they must have had

something, or the injunction would have been needless. On another occasion it is true, he told them to take their purse, and to buy a sword if they had none—but they are wholly dissimilar. Their first mission was to the church—the house of Israel—their last to the heathen world.

In short, cases must be rare either in the church or out of it, when men can be required to *work for others and find themselves*.

It is very common to hear of congregations in our section of country, who say they can't support a minister. This may be true of some, but the number is very small. It may be true where the calculation is made upon the supposition that every man will pay his just proportion; but that is a supposition that will rarely happen. It may be true where each is determined to give a sum so small as to occasion him no sort of inconvenience—the mere gleanings of his crop. But it would rarely, if ever, be true, if these congregations would place their spiritual, even upon a level with their temporal wants. When bread is needed, it must be had. The cost is a secondary matter. When the body is sick, we do not stop to count the cost. The doctor must come. Take care of the body, is the practice, if it is not the maxim of our members, let what will befall the soul.

The Presbyterian Church seems to me to be regarded by many as a hiding-place for parsimony. If it does not allow the same latitude say they in *making* money, we can at least save what we have. It is a mistake; so every pious man has found it who is living up to his duty. A few can be singled out in every congregation, who find their religion an *expensive* matter—making heavy drafts upon both time and money; and the heavier because so many fall short of their duty.

Let our churches then lay this matter to heart; look their duty in the face, and determine to meet it. Let them feel that they must have ministers, and that their ministers must be sustained, and so sustained as to be able to give them their whole time—the week days as well as the Sabbaths. They ask not for fat livings—but such livings as most of you yourselves enjoy. Feel that the “laborer is worthy of his hire,” and pay him as you pay other men. Put him upon the same footing with the man who reaps down your fields, and feel that he is as justly entitled to his reward, and all will be well.

J. K.

Self Education.

An Address delivered before the Calliopean Society of

Emory & Henry College, January, 1846,

BY JAMES M'CHAIN.

You will pardon me, I trust, gentlemen of the Calliopean Society, if I begin my address to you, with an allusion to days and scenes of which the present occasion forcibly reminds me. We are assembled in a College Chapel. Around me are College professors. Before me are College students. This is the anniversary of your Literary Societies, and I have now risen to address you. The present brings up the past. I am carried back to the time when *I* stood, where you now stand. I am reminded of four happy years passed within the time-honored walls of "Old Yale." I seem to enjoy again the instructions of those honored and loved professors who taught me. I am once more in the Hall of our Literary Society, bearing the same name with your own, and mingle again in the essays of youthful talent, and the excitement of debate. I behold around me my College acquaintances, my classmates, my intimate friends. I see their smiling faces, I hear their ringing laugh. I call to mind our last meeting, our final parting. We met as you now have; our valedictorian bade us farewell; we grasped each others hands as if we could not separate; we parted; we shall all meet no more on earth. We shall meet, many of us, I trust, on high.

I ask, where now are these loved ones? They are scattered to the four winds of heaven. They are dwelling in almost every quarter of the globe, and engaged in every variety of pursuit.—Some are filling the highest places in the Church and the State. Some, I fear, are wretched outcasts,—a burden to themselves, and a disgrace to their friends. Some "are not," for death has claimed them. Some live not here, but they live in heaven. One labors for the perishing in Persia. One lies buried in the ocean.

This is the memory of the past which the present calls up.—Soon, young gentlemen, the scene will be changed with you, as it is with me. Soon your College course will be run. Soon your parting hour will come. Soon your College life will be some-

thing treasured up in the memory, something to be looked upon in retrospect. When you leave these walls, and look back in after years on these scenes, may you be able to think with more pleasure than I can of opportunities improved, and with less regret than I do of advantages lost, and time wasted.

But, gentlemen, I must remember that I am not here to-day, so much to speak of what *is past to me*, as to say something which may be of service in what is *future to you*. I will therefore announce the subject upon which I will briefly address you, a subject which though not new, is most important; though not novel, will not, I trust, be wanting in interest.

SELF-EDUCATION is the topic upon which I propose to offer a few thoughts.

That we may have more distinct and correct views respecting self-education, let us first enquire what is *education*?

This word in its largest sense, includes the *whole man*, the *mind*, the *heart* and the *body*.

In the train of thought which I propose to pursue, I will confine my attention to the cultivation of the mind, since this is most appropriate to this occasion. I ask then, what is *education*?

Some seem to think that the great object of intellectual culture, is to convey into the mind something from without it.—They make it a *receiving cistern*, instead of a *bubbling spring*—a mere reservoir, instead of a *gushing fountain*. They deem it enough for the mass to take in the thoughts of *other men*, and acquire knowledge which the more gifted have made ready to their hands. The mind is indeed designed to receive many things from without itself, and much from others. So do the bubbling spring and the gushing fountain. They do not *make* the limpid streams which they send forth to quench thirst, water the earth, and beautify the landscape. They receive their liquid streams from many a secret rill, and by many a little drop. But what they receive, they *make their own*, and send it forth as fresh and sparkling, as if each drop had been made in their own mystic chambers. So it is one part of education to convey *into the mind the thoughts of others*, but it is to be so trained as to make other's thoughts its own thoughts, and to bring them out bearing the marks of having passed through the processes of its own laboratory. If the mind can not be made to yield gold and silver like the mine, it should at least be educated to coin

and stamp them like the mint. It is the great object of intellectual training, not so much to *take into the mind from without* itself, as to *bring out of itself from within*. To educate it, is *educere, to bring it out*, to develop it. A man's mind is not to be made a mere blank book for others to write their thoughts in. A man's mind should not be all *memory* just to retain what others teach him. It is to *take in* the thoughts of others, that it may make them its own thoughts, and stamp upon them its own impress. It is to *take in* the thoughts of others that it may *bring out* thoughts of its own. It is to *bring itself into* contact with the powers of higher minds, that it may *bring out its own powers*.

The great point in this process, is to train the mind *to think*. It may be taught to acquire rapidly, and retain well; and still know not how *to think*. Let the mind be disciplined to reason, to investigate, to think for itself; not self-confidently, not with that contemptible affectation of *originality* which differs from others for the sake of differing, which regards differing from others as *originality*, but to think fixedly, protractedly, discriminatingly, clearly and candidly, and then, modestly yet firmly and independently draw its own conclusions. Then it has acquired that grand element of education, that mental power, which like the great natural agents wind, water and steam, may be brought to bear in any way that we please. Let a man be trained thus to think, and then his mind is his own. Otherwise it belongs to others, since they mostly govern it. Let it be taught thus to think, and it will easily learn to acquire. Then it can successfully prosecute any profession to which it may lend its powers.

Another most important point in mental culture is to train the mind to *speak*, as well as to think. It should learn *to get* good thoughts; it should also be able to give out those good thoughts in good words, with the living voice, and a strong pen. However valuable any one's thoughts may be, if he cannot communicate them to others by writing or speaking, they can be of but little service to any but himself. Of what use would be the water which the earth contains, if it never came forth in gushing springs and flowing rivers, to refresh the face of nature, and satisfy the wants of man? Of what use would all the gold and silver and precious stones of the mine be, if they were never got out of their native beds, and sent to the mint, and placed in the artist's hands?

It is also a most important particular in intellectual training, to develop not merely *a corner* of the mind, not only *one side* of it, but the *whole* of it. This wondrous agent is not all memory, or all imagination, or all intellect. It is a combination of all these powers. Each has its proper place, each is an important element in our happiness and usefulness. Therefore each should be cultivated in due proportion, so as to form the inner mental man one symmetrical whole. You would not so train and trim a noble tree as to have it grow all on one side, or all trunk, or all branches. Of this noble tree of the mind, intellect is the trunk, imagination and memory are the leaves and branches, and good thoughts are the fruit. Therefore, so cultivate it that it shall have a strong trunk, graceful branches, and rich fruits.

This is education, this bringing out the mental powers, this training the mind to think, to think closely, protractedly, discriminatingly, and honestly, to think for itself, this educating it to give out its thoughts by the tongue and the pen, this cultivating in symmetry and harmony, the memory, imagination and intellect.

Were I to sum up in a word, education in the largest sense, it would be, disciplining the mind to think rightly, the heart to love truly God and man, and the body to act in accordance with such thinking and loving. Such a thinking mind, and loving heart, and acting body, would be the *whole man thoroughly* educated.

We are now prepared to show what is *self-education*.

By this term, I mean the training of our minds *ourselves by our own efforts*. By this phrase I mean the doing this great work of mental culture for ourselves, and not depending on others to do it for us. You will ask, will you have us shut up our books, disband our schools, and break down our colleges, and then without help, without teachers, to go to work ourselves? I am far from recommending any such course as this. Books and schools and colleges of the right sort, so far from being enemies to this self-training, are the necessary means and nurseries for its attainment. The way to have more self-educated men is to put the means of reaching this end more fully within the power of all.

What I mean by the language I have employed, is, that we are not to depend upon books and schools and colleges and

teachers to educate us. We are to use these as *helps*, to do the work ourselves. They are not to do our thinking *for us*, but they are to stimulate and lead us to think. They are not merely to give us results which we are to retain; but they are to enable us to know the *why and wherefore*, and go through *the process* which leads to the result. In fine they are not to climb the hill of science *for us*, but they are to do it *with us, to help and stimulate us to climb*. They are not to substitute their minds for ours, but they are to bring theirs into contact with ours, to invigorate and bring ours out.

Books cannot educate us, though we learn all the best books upon earth by heart. This may make us learned men, this may make us good librarians, and *walking libraries*, but it will not make us *educated men*. Schools and colleges and teachers cannot educate us, though we retain every particle of knowledge which they ever give to us. Education is something higher than mere memory or mere knowledge. There must be a waking up of our own minds, there must be a calling out of our own powers, there must be a process of thinking and examining and discriminating and deciding with our own faculties. This is what I call the *self* part of education. It is using the minds of others as helpers to our own, not as substitutes for them. It is taking the seed which others may have given us, and with their aid preparing our minds for sowing it, and so cultivating it as to produce a harvest of our own, on our own mental soil. It is too, without help from others, throwing ourselves upon our own mental resources, originating and following out thoughts and plans of our own.

I have thus endeavored, gentlemen, briefly to show what education, and self-education are. In what I shall further say, I will present some considerations to stimulate you to strive after such an acquisition, and direct you in its attainment.

My first observation is that, all *true education is self-education*. If this be correct, it presents a most powerful reason for this self-culture, since this is the only way for us to obtain it. We are in the habit of calling those *only* self-educated men who, without the advantages of academies and colleges and professional schools, acquire thorough mental culture. This is a wrong limiting of this word. All *really educated men are self-educated*. He who has graduated at Harvard or Princeton or Yale, and

then gone through our best schools for the learned professions, and come out a well-trained man, is as truly self-educated as Elihu Burritt, who graduates at a New England common school, works all his days at his anvil, hardly sees the inside of a college, and at last bursts upon the world "the learned blacksmith," acquainted with fifty different languages. What then is the difference between Elihu Burritt, Roger Sherman and Benjamin Franklin, whose school advantages were nothing more than those of a common English course, and the Dwights and Websters, who have gone through the best colleges and professional seminaries? The difference is simply this, that the first *educated themselves* with *books* as their principal teachers, with but little help from any other source, while the latter *educated themselves* with the *best helpers* in mental training, by the aid of the best books and the best instructors. They are all self-educated, distinguished only by the fact, that some reached this point with fewer aids, and the others with more and better helpers in carrying on the process themselves.

If right mental culture is what I have described, then from the very nature of the case, the man who attains it must acquire it for himself. He may do this with more or less, with fewer or better helps. Thus the work may be slower or more rapid, easier or more difficult, as he has more or less assistance from others. If it is the development of the mental powers in symmetry and harmony, if it is the bringing out the mental man within, if it is mental discipline, the power to think, to investigate, to discriminate, reason and conclude, if it is the power to give out our thoughts and conclusions in a manner worthy of them, then, this is something, which, whatever assistants we may have, we must get for ourselves, by the vigorous and protracted exercise of our own intellectual powers. We might as well hope to live by having others eat and breathe for us, as to imagine that we can become educated by having others think and learn for us.—Others may pour knowledge down us, or we may pour it down ourselves, but like food in this way taken into the system, unless digested by ourselves, it will impart to the mental man no nutriment or life. We may breathe a literary atmosphere, and thus by a sort of mental absorption take in some outside polish, and superficial knowledge, yet there will be but little mental power.

I repeat it then, all true education is self-education; all truly

educated men are self-educated men. Others may have helped them more or less, but they did the work themselves, and, no doubt, it has often been, that the best help to a man has been no help but the man's self. Thrown upon himself, depending upon himself, doing the work almost entirely himself, there was a summoning of his powers, there was an energy, a determination and self-reliance, which made his few books and want of teachers better means of self culture than would have been the best books and the best instructors. Therefore, young gentlemen, remember this fact, that if you have thoroughly cultivated minds, you must acquire this yourselves. Let this stimulate and encourage you in the right improvement of the advantages which you here enjoy.

Another consideration which should rouse and animate you and all in the course which I recommend, is that *the end desired may be attained.*

To read, to hear lectures, to attend recitations to get knowledge, is one thing, and an easy thing—but to train the mind, to discipline it, to educate it, is another thing and far more difficult. Mental work is hard work, but it is pleasant work. It is like toil up a steep hill or lofty mountain. As we climb upward the new and beautiful flowers which cheer the eye, the gushing springs which revive the strength, the bracing air which invigorates the limbs, and the new prospects which open to the view more extensive and splendid as we rise higher and higher, all reward our toil and relieve it each step of the ascent. This thought should also increase the pleasure and furnish fresh stimulus in our work, that the object in view can be accomplished.— A mind naturally weak may, by proper culture, be made strong, and one naturally strong become gigantic. A mind naturally wandering may by application and perseverance, at length be able to concentrate all its powers on any point or subject. All minds have their infancy, and all may grow up to manhood, if their possessors will use the means. An English nobleman finds the Principia of Newton in his garden showing marks of being studied. He inquires for its owner, and the son of his gardener claims it as his. The astonished lord asks the humble young man, how he acquired such knowledge. His reply was, “my mother taught me my letters, and what more does one want?” How many are there now occupying the most respecta-

ble and responsible places in the community, and the different professions, who, in childhood and youth, were thought very ordinary in mind! But, they determined to try, and that determination carried out has made them well-educated and strong-minded. One of this class was thought by his friends to be so unpromising, that they again and again urged him to give up his design of studying for the ministry. His answer was, "i. my life is spared, you shall know that I have lived." Yes, and they have known for years that such a man has lived. He now lives, known over the United States as one of the first preachers and most useful men of the day. How well-educated ordinary minds may become if they will!

In a little village in the State of New York, there is a journeyman mechanic regarded as an industrious, studious, well behaved young man. By and by he comes out a well-trained lawyer. By and by he is the first lawyer in a legal argument in the Empire State. In England there is a shoemaker who works at his shoes with his hands, and on a profound subject of thought with his mind. At length the shoemaker's thoughts come before the world, and "Drew, on the soul," is pronounced by all, one of the profoundest and most original works ever written.

Perhaps you will say, these were men of uncommon natural mind. Probably they were. But their *uncommon industry, determination and perseverance* brought out their uncommon minds and made them what they were. Indeed facts prove that, especially in our country, there is hardly a farmer, or mechanic, or merchant, or day laborer, or any one, who cannot, in a good degree, and in the true sense, become an educated man. How powerful then is the incentive set before those who enjoy the advantages of an institution like this, to attain the mental culture described!

Permit me now to throw out a thought or two which may serve to direct you in the attainment of the end proposed.

I would first say to you, young gentlemen, be *resolute*, be *determined*, be *persevering*. This lies at the foundation of success. There are obstacles to be overcome, which nothing but such energy and perseverance can remove. Set your faces as a flint, and nerve your souls as steel against indolence, irresolution, despondence and despair. Let the rainbow of hope always arch your sky. Say to yourself, "the work is great, but success may be mine, and, heaven helping me, I will succeed."

Again, I say to you, be *thorough*, go down to the bottom, never skim over the surface. *Learn to dive deep*, rather than soar high. Do both if you can.

Be *industrious*. Husband your time. Make the most of your resources. Be deaf to the syren voice of pleasure. Be insensible to the benumbing power of sloth.

Once more I would say, be not discouraged with gradual attainments and little success. How slowly the body grows from infancy to manhood! So does the mind. How imperceptibly and gradually the infant mind becomes a Newton's! Slow growth is generally *strong growth*. Quick growth is usually *weak*. Be not discouraged therefore with slow and gradual self-education. Grow as fast as you can, but be sure that your growth is strength and not weakness.

I have now said, young gentlemen, on the subject before us, all that the time will allow. You will follow it out more fully, I trust, in the processes of your own minds. I must now close. I began, by looking back to what is past to me, I will end, by looking forward to what is future to you.

I see you, young gentlemen, met in this consecrated place for the last time. I see your eyes moisten as you grasp each others hands for your final parting. I catch the faintly murmured word "farewell." I see you brush away the falling tear. I see trembling fears and animating hopes and high resolves written on your faces, as you turn your backs on these walls to return to your homes.

In a few years I look upon you again. I see some of you engaged in the noble and honorable pursuits of agriculture. There may you still go on educating yourselves;—there may you be distinguished for that intelligence, largeness of view and interest in the mental and moral improvement of the community, which should always characterize the educated farmer. I see some of you in the professions of law and medicine, and others engaged in the strife of politics, and sitting in our legislative halls. There may you still carry on the work of self-education. There may you be honorable, prosperous and useful. There may you prove that you are not only college-educated, but also self-educated. I see some of you ministering at the altar of religion. There may you give good proof of minds and hearts self-educated and divinely taught. There may you have a

double portion of the spirit of Elijah. There may you win many souls to wear in your crowns. I also see you one after another, disappearing from the view and dropping into the tomb. In the lapse of years I see the last representative of those before me numbered with the dead. When you are dead, may you still speak—speak with power, speak for good. When your bodies lie in the grave may your souls rest with God. After you part here to meet no more on earth, may you all meet in heaven to spend an eternity there.

Christ's Glory in his Humiliation.

“Even the meanness of Christ did not wholly becloud his glory; many beams shone through the disguise. His birth was mean on earth below: but it was celebrated with hallelujahs by the heavenly host in the air above. He had a poor lodging; but a star lighted visitants to it from distant countries. Never prince had such visitants, so conducted. He had not the magnificent equipage that other kings have: but he was attended with multitudes of patients, seeking and obtaining healing of soul and body; that was more true greatness than if he had been attended with crowds of princes. He made the dumb that attended him to sing his praises, and the lame to leap for joy; the deaf to hear his wonders, and the blind to see his glory. He had no guard of soldiers, nor magnificent retinue of servants: but, as the centurion that had both, acknowledged, health and sickness, life and death, took orders from him: even the winds and storms, which no earthly power could control, obey him; and death and the grave durst not refuse to deliver up their prey when he demanded it. He did not walk upon tapestry; but when he walked on the sea, the waters supported him. All parts of the creation, except sinful man, honored him as their Creator. He had no treasure: but when he had occasion for money, the sea sent it to him in the mouth of a fish. He had no barns nor corn-fields; but when he inclined to make a feast, a few loaves covered a sufficient table for many thousands. Nor was his glory wholly clouded at his death: He had not indeed that phantastic equipage of sorrow that other great persons have on such occasions,

but the frame of nature solemnized the death of its Author: heaven and earth were mourners, the sun was clad in black, and, if the inhabitants of the earth were unmoved, the earth trembled under the awful load. There were few to pay the Jewish compliment of rending their garments; but the rocks were not so insensible; they rent their bowels. He had not a grave of his own, but other men's graves opened to him. Death and the grave might be proud of such a tenant in their territories; but he came there, not as a subject, but as an invader, a conqueror; it was then the king of terrors lost his sting, and on the third day the Prince of Life triumphed over him, spoiling death and the grave."—*Mac Lurin on glorying in the cross.*

To Christians.

"Child of God," said Dr. Griffin once at the close of a discourse, "debase not thyself by sordid actions. Forget not the glories of thy nature, nor sell thine infinite birthright for such a contemptible mess of pottage as earth can yield. Child of God, cheer up under the trials of life. Let nothing cast you down who are standing on the verge of immortal glory. It is the only opportunity you will ever have to suffer for Christ. Eternity will be long enough for enjoyment. Your toils and self-denials will all be recompensed a thousand fold by that 'far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory.' Child of God, why are you cast down? I wonder you are not constantly transported. Our Savior said to his disciples, 'Rejoice not that the spirits are subject unto you, but rejoice rather because your names are written in heaven.' So say I to you, Rejoice not that your wealth is increased, that your honors flow in upon every gale, that the laurels of science encircle your brow, that you have the sweetest and most affectionate friends; but rejoice rather that an immortality of glory is before you. Child of God, why are you growing to earth and sleeping out life in ungrateful inaction? What is the world to you who are so soon to be transported to the heaven of heavens? How will the world appear to you when it is melting down in the general conflagration? How will the world appear to you a million of ages after the judgment, while

you are lost among the glories of heaven? And why this ungrateful *sloth*? Have you nothing to do for him who entailed this immortality upon you? Have you nothing to do for him who redeemed you from hell by his own blood, and has gone to prepare a place for you? Have you nothing to do for *him* on earth at whose feet you will presently lie in such unutterable transports of wonder and gratitude? Have you nothing to do for him on the very ground which was stained by his blood, and while breathing the air that was agitated by his sighs? Have you forgotten that he left on earth a beloved church, and that he has said, 'Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me?' Have you nothing to do for that church on which his heart is so tenderly fixed? Have you nothing to do for *his* honor among men, who came out to seek you when you were wandering from the fold of God—who separated you from your former companions? Ah sirs, how will this listlessness appear when you are enveloped in the glories of heaven, and are filling the celestial arches with your bursting praise? Up, every redeemed soul, and do what you can for your God and Saviour. Take your harps from the willows and begin the raptured song. Let all the country around be charmed and won by your sacred melody. Go on your way enchanting the ear of a Christless age with your harp and your song; and when you come to the last enemy, enchant the ear of death itself with the same celestial notes; and let your praises die away from mortal ears, only to burst in new and louder tones on the ear of heaven.

A STERLING SENTIMENT.

In vain do we seek to awaken in our churches zeal for missions as a *separate thing*. To be genuine, it must flow from love to Christ. It is when a sense of personal communion with the Son of God is highest, that we shall be most fit for missionary work; either to go ourselves, or stir up others. If we allow it to become a business of dollars and cents, we shall see no results. 'Find preachers of David Brainerd's spirit,' said John Wesley, 'and nothing can stand before them; but without this what can gold or silver do?' Let gushing affection to the Lord Jesus Christ become the ruling passion, and it communicates the thrill

of evangelical zeal to every member of the electric chain. A church of such ministers, of such members, would be an apostolic, a heavenly church.—*Dr. Alexander.*

To Ministers.

PREACHING.

Preaching is a work which requires greater skill, and especially greater life and zeal, than any of us commonly bring to it. It is no trifling matter to stand up in the face of a congregation, and deliver a message of salvation or damnation, as from the living God, in the name of the Redeemer. It is no easy thing to speak so plainly, that the most ignorant may understand us; so seriously, that the deadest heart may feel; and so convincingly, that contradicting cavilers may be silenced. Certainly, if our hearts were set upon the work of the Lord as they ought to be, it would be done more vigorously than by the most of us it is.—Alas! how few ministers preach with all their might, or speak about everlasting joys and torments in such a manner as may make men believe they are in earnest! It would make a man's heart ache to see a number of dead and drowsy sinners sit under a minister, without having a word that is likely to quicken or awaken them. The blow often falls so light, that hard-hearted persons cannot feel. Few ministers will so much as exert their voice, and stir themselves up to an earnest delivery. Or if they speak loud and earnestly, oftentimes they do not answer it with earnestness of matter, and then the voice does but little good. The people will esteem it but mere bawling if the matter does not correspond. On the other hand, it would grieve one to hear what excellent subjects some ministers treat upon, who yet let them die in their hands for want of a close and lively application; what fit matter they have for convincing sinners, and yet how little they make of it. O sirs! how plain, how close, how serious should we be in delivering a message of such importance as ours, when the everlasting life or death of men are concerned in it! Methinks we are nowhere so much wanting, as in seriousness; yet nothing is more unsuitable to our business, than to be slight and dull. What! speak coldly for God, and for the sal-

vation of men? Can we believe that our people must be converted or condemned, and yet can we speak to them in a drowsy tone? In the name of God, brethren, awaken your hearts before you come into the pulpit; that when you are there, you may be fit to awaken the hearts of sinners. Remember that they must be awakened or damned; but surely a sleepy preacher is not likely to awaken them. Though you give the holy things of God the highest praises in words, if you do it coldly, you will unsay by your manner all that you have said. It is a kind of contempt of great things, especially so great as these, to speak of them without great affection and fervency. Speak to your hearers as to men that must be awakened either here, or in hell. Look upon your congregation with seriousness and compassion, and think in what a state of joy or torment they must be forever, and that surely will make you earnest, and melt your hearts for them. Whatever you do, let the people see that you are in good earnest. You cannot soften men's hearts by jesting with them, or telling them a smooth tale, or patching up a gaudy oration. They will not cast away their dearest pleasures, at the drowsy request of one who seems not to mean as he speaks, or to care much whether his request be granted or not.

Let us then rouse up ourselves to the work of the Lord. Let us speak to our people as for their lives, and "save them as by violence, pulling them out of the fire." Satan will not be charmed out of his possessions; we must lay siege to the souls of sinners which are his chief garrisons; must play the battery of God's ordnance against it, and play it close, till a breach is made; not suffering them to make it up again. As we have reasonable creatures to deal with, we must see to it that our sermons be all-convincing; and that we make the light of Scripture and reason shine so bright in the faces of the ungodly, that unless they willfully shut their eyes, it may even force them to see. A sermon full of mere words, while it wants the light of evidence, and the zeal of life, is but an image or a well-dressed carcass. In preaching, there is intended a communion of souls between us and our people, or a communication of somewhat from ours to theirs. We must endeavor to communicate the fullest light of evidence from our understandings to theirs, and to warm their hearts by enkindling in them holy affections from our own.

LOOKING UP THERE, AND DOWN HERE.—The celebrated Matthew Wilkes was once in company with a young clergyman, who was appointed to preach in the chapel formerly occupied by Whitefield. Having to look into the Bible in the pulpit for some purpose connected with the services, before the congregation were assembled, Mr. Wilkes discovered the young minister's notes between the leaves. "What! (said he) notes, where Whitefield preached? What! are you going to *read* a sermon from Whitefield's pulpit?" "Ah! (said the minister) the place is large, and is a new one for me, and I tremble at the thought of coming to the people without some written preparation."—"Ah, well, well," said Mr. Wilkes, "it may be so; but remember, (and here he looked up to heaven, at the same time laying his hand upon the manuscript sermon on the desk) remember, the more you look up there, the less you'll find it necessary to look down here."

THE LOG-CHAIN SERMON.—A Presbyterian minister once preached a sermon which in some parts was very good, and in others very poor. A sensible member of the church said that "the sermon reminded him of his father's log-chain. When he first got it, it was a poor weak affair. Every once in a while a link would break, and his father would have it replaced with a new and strong one. Thus at length it came to pass that the chain had alternately a strong and a weak link. So with the sermon, it had alternately a good strong link and a poor weak one."

SOFT SERMONS.—A New England minister was settled over a church and congregation, with the understanding, that a certain number of cords of hard wood were to be taken in part for the salary. One of the deacons, a venerable, shrewd, good man brought a load; and the clergyman, standing by as it was being thrown down, noticed occasionally a stick of soft wood. "I was to have all hard wood," said the clergyman; "but I see you have some soft sticks here." "Hem, hem," replied the deacon, with a droll look upon his venerable face, "we have some *soft sermons*."

What Perseverance can do.

You may recollect the mention, in one of our conversations, of a young man, who wasted in two or three years a large patrimony in profligate revels with a number of worthless associates who called themselves his friends, and who, when his last means were exhausted, treated him of course with neglect, or contempt. Reduced to absolute want, he one day went out of the house with an intention to put an end to his life; but wandering awhile almost unconsciously, he came to the brow of an eminence which overlooked what were lately his estates. Here he sat down, and remained fixed in thought a number of hours, at the end of which he sprang from the ground with a vehement exulting emotion. He had formed his resolution, which was, that all these estates should be his again; he had formed his plan too, which he instantly began to execute. He walked hastily forward, determined to seize the very first opportunity, of however humble a kind, to gain any money, though it were ever so despicable a trifle, and resolved absolutely not to spend, if he could help it, a farthing of whatever he might obtain. The first thing that drew his attention was a heap of coals shot out of carts on the pavement before a house. He offered himself to shovel or wheel them into the place where they were to be laid, and was employed. He received a few pence for the labor; and then, in pursuance of the saving part of his plan, requested some small gratuity of meat and drink, which was given him. He then looked out for the next thing that might chance to offer, and went, with indefatigable industry, through a succession of servile employments, in different places, of longer and shorter duration, still scrupulously avoiding, as far as possible, the expense of a penny. He promptly seized *every* opportunity which could advance his design, without regarding the meanness of occupation or appearance. By this method he had gained, after a considerable time, money enough to purchase, in order to sell again, a few cattle of which he had taken pains to understand the value. He speedily but cautiously turned his first gains into second advantages; retained without a single deviation his extreme parsimony; and thus advanced by degrees into larger transactions and incipient wealth. I did not hear, or have forgotten, the continued course of his life; but the final result was, that he

more than recovered his lost possessions, and died an inveterate miser, worth £60,000. I have always recollected this as a signal instance, though in an unfortunate and ignoble direction, of the decisive character, and of the extraordinary effect, which, according to general laws, belongs to the strongest form of such a character.—*Foster on Decision of character.*

Miscellany.

THE DYING SCHOLAR AND HER TEACHER.—There was a little girl in my own Sunday school, that was called at an early age to lie down and die. She was visited by her teacher with great frequency and urgency. The teacher, on the last occasion, found her very weak, and asked her whether she was happy; to which she replied, "Yes." On inquiring as to the ground of her hope, she said she was resting on the word of Jesus Christ. Pausing a little, she said to her teacher, "You have told me that Jesus will give to those who die and trust in him a golden crown in heaven." The teacher, with tears rolling down her cheek, said, "It is true; you shall have such a crown, according to the word of Christ." "O!" said the little girl, "shall you get a crown?" The teacher cut to the heart for a moment, paused for a reply, and the little darling lifted up her sweet eyes with gratitude to the teacher, (mistaking the object of the pause,) and said, "Well, if he does not give you a crown, I will take mine from my head and put it on yours." Such a response of gratitude from a child just soaring into paradise, would surely be enough to pay a large period of toil and labor.—*London Bap-C. Mag.*

THE VENDER AND HIS VICTIM.—"Give me a responsible endorser" said Mr. Puncheon Purse to his customer, yesterday,—
"Give me a responsible endorser and you shall have the goods."

"An endorser!" returned Mr. Edward Easy—you never asked me that question before. And I've bought hundreds of dollars worth of you, for which you had your money, except the present

balance of ten dollars. And do you refuse to trust me for twenty dollars more?"

"Indeed I do," replied the merchant, "and with good reason. When I trusted you, you were a sober man—but now you can't pretend to that character."

"Aye, Mr. Puncheon Purse" retorted a bystander,—“What you say is true—and it is also true that the *rum* you sold Ned Easy, has changed him from a sober man into a sot.”—*Genius of Temperance.*

NAPOLEON AND HIS BOTTLES.—Says the London Quarterly:—In Napoleon's carriage, taken at Waterloo were found two bottles nearly empty—the one of *Malaga*, and the other of *Rum*.

This fact affords a signal instance of that which is every day and in almost every place occurring—namely, of defeat and disaster, happening in connexion with the use of alcohol.—*N. Y. Observer.*

A sailor lately joined the Sons of Temperance in Philadelphia, after running a course of dissipation, by which his means were pretty well exhausted. At the time of signing the pledge he owed the rum-seller *one shilling*. A few day ago he went to fork, but being determined not to enter the house in which he had been robbed, he got a long pole, attached the money to the end of it, and standing at the outside of the door, reached to the astonished republican, and walked off.

Five Bibles a minute for ten hours every day, except the Sabbath, making three thousand per day—have been sent out the past year by the British and Foreign Bible Society, according to its last annual Report.

THE OLDEST BIBLE IN THE WORLD.—Among the curiosities in the Rooms of the Connecticut Historical Society, in Hartford, is a bible printed in 1478, and which Dr. Robbins thinks the oldest bible in the world. There is also a volume of the *Con-*

necticut Gazette, printed in this city in 1775—the first paper printed in the Colony of Connecticut. Each number is about the size of a sheet of letter paper.—*N. Y. Advertiser*.

OBITUARY.

DIED, on the 2d of April, 1846, near Lawrenceburg, Ky., in the 82d year of his age, MR. DAVID KING, a native of Lancaster Co., Pa., but for many years a citizen of Sullivan Co., Tenn.

To him as a good citizen, as a consistent and energetic member and Elder in the Prebyterian church, as the father of a numerous family, into whom he had successfully infused the sound principles that governed his own life, and as a kind and indulgent master, all praise is due. His long and well-spent life was brought to a close, and his end perhaps hastened by a pious effort to pay a last visit, and deliver his last counsels to five daughters residing in the State of Illinois. He will be long remembered and referred to, as a bright example of a good man.

THE METHODIST EPISCOPALIAN.

We have received one number of this paper, published by the Holston Conference, at Knoxville, Tenn. In paper and typographical execution, it is much superior to any paper with which we are acquainted in our region of country. Its contents have a good degree of life and variety. Its editor, the Rev. Samuel Patton, is justly regarded as one of the most strong-minded ministers of his Conference. We are pleased with the thought, that, if collisions occur between us, we shall have our Methodist brethren defended by one of the ablest among them.

PUBLISHER'S NOTICE.

The Publishers are pleased to inform the subscribers and friends of "The Calvinistic Magazine," that another fount of type, such as was originally designed for the work has been ordered and will be received in a few weeks, when, with a *covering* such as was first intended, and ordered, we will present the work in a style corresponding with the original design. We ordered with our stock at first, paper of a different color for the cover of the work; but thro' mistake or carelessness, the paper at present used was sent, which we have been compelled to use, much against the wish of the Editors.

THE
Calvinistic Magazine.

[NEW SERIES.]

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

Vol I.

June, 1846.

No. 6.

An Examination

*Of the doctrine of the imputation of Adams' Sin to his posterity;
in connection with the interpretation of Rom. 5: 12—21.*

BY REV. STEPHEN TAYLOR, *Petersburg, Va.*

The occasion of the following article may be briefly stated.—In the summer of 1845, the writer of it, while conversing with a very intelligent gentleman, in an advanced period of life, but not a professor of religion, nor in the least partial to Presbyterianism, was twice interrupted with the remark, that “we all committed sin enough in Adam to send us to hell, besides our own personal sins;” and in the second case, it was added, “so that we are doubly exposed to damnation.” The respectability of the source of this remark, a wealthy, intelligent elder of the Presbyterian Church was calculated to give it importance. It did not seem to change the course of the conversation, which was intended to urge the necessity of repentance and the new birth. In reflecting upon the occurrence, the writer was overwhelmed with the practical bearing of the doctrine and the responsibility resting upon all who profess to teach the truths of the Bible. He was conscious that he had never felt it to be his duty to address an unconverted man in that manner. What is more, he does not recollect ever having heard a preacher of any school, or sect, in a direct appeal to sinners, introduce that doctrine. The writer of this article supposed himself and had been supposed by others, to be orthodox in doctrine. He felt it his duty to investigate anew this subject and the following article is the substance and nearly the words of the notes which he made,

and have for some time been lying by him without any purpose of publishing them. If, however, they shall be thought worthy of a place in your Calvinistic Magazine, you are at liberty to publish them.

1. It will be necessary to have, at the outset, a distinct understanding of what is meant by "imputation," and having adopted a definition, adhere to it strictly. That of Prof. Hodge, in his commentary on Romans, Phil. Ed. 1835, see Rom. 4: 1—17. p. 134, seems to be distinct and perfectly unobjectionable.

"These, and numerous similar passages render the scriptural idea of imputation, perfectly clear. It is laying anything to one's charge, and treating him accordingly. It produces no change in the individual to whom the imputation is made; it simply alters his relation to the law. All those objections, therefore, to the doctrine expressed by this term, which are founded upon the assumption that imputation alters the moral character of men; that it implies an infusion of either sin or holiness, rest on a misconception of its nature. It is obviously, so far as the mere force of the term is concerned, a matter of perfect indifference, whether the thing imputed belonged antecedently to the person to whom the imputation is made, or not. It is just as common and correct to speak of laying to a man's charge what does not belong to him, as what does. That a thing rarely can be justly imputed to a person to whom it does not personally belong, is a matter of course."

2. It will be conceded that such a connexion has been constituted between Adam and his posterity, that what was his character and condition after the fall, is the character and condition of every individual descended from him, even "by nature" or from the commencement of their existence. To state this particularly, I would say, that as he became dead in sin, so are all his posterity, even infants—as he became subject to natural death, so are all descended from him—as he being left in this state must be lost forever, so must they—as he was doomed to eat bread by the sweat of the brow, so are they born to toil and trouble as the sparks that fly upwards.

As this connexion certainly exists, and doubtless entered into the constitution under which he was placed in the Garden of Eden, there can be no substantial objection to calling him the federal or covenant Head of the race, and as little to his being

called the representative Head, without, however, implying that he had been certainly chosen of them, or appointed by God, as such, upon our ordinary principles of legal representation. It is certain that in his apostacy and subsequent condition and conduct, he was a fair representation of his whole posterity.

3. It is conceded by all, that Adam was the natural Head of his posterity, and that his specific properties have been propagated to his descendants, such as the general attributes of his body, mind and heart, apparently, just as the peculiar properties of the brute species are propagated.

It will not be denied by the evangelical christians of any sect, that sinfulness is a universal attribute of Adams' race, in every age, condition, and country; as much so, as speech or reason, which belong to human nature, though they are not exercised so as to be manifest at first. This is a plain matter of fact which no natural historian would fail to observe and record, and which is recorded in the sacred scriptures. "Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean? not one." Job 14: 4. "Behold, I was shapen in iniquity, and in sin did my mother conceive me." Pr. 51: 5. "That which is born of the flesh, is flesh." John 3: 6.

The fact that sin, or a sinful disposition is universal and apparently propagated as naturally and regularly as any other attribute, will not be questioned, whatever difference may exist respecting the manner in which it is really transmitted down, or the principle on which the Divine Governor of the world proceeds in permitting or causing this state of things.

4. It is agreed on all hands, that what God does is wise, holy, just and good. He may do things which appear otherwise to us, but it must be so only in appearance. We need concern ourselves only to know what are unquestionable facts in the works of nature and providence, and what he has taught us in his word, and so far as his doing or permitting is concerned in the former, or his truth, in the latter, we may rest in perfect confidence, that all is right. In this, we are all agreed, who believe the scriptures.

5. It will be conceded, that while God in his word does claim the right of treating some of the children of men better than they deserve, as in the parable of the labourers in the vineyard, Mat. 20: 1—11. and as is implied in the word *Grace*, and in every illustration and instance of divine favour to men, yet he nowhere

claims the right of dealing with any of his moral creatures worse than they deserve. He is a just God, and in the great day of final accounts, he will judge the world in righteousness, and his decisions will be approved and consented to by all intelligent beings in heaven, earth, and hell.

There is nothing, then, repugnant to reason, nor to the word of God, in the doctrine of the imputation of the righteousness of Christ to believers, *i. e.* if he pleases, he may treat them as though they had made full satisfaction to law and justice, and were perfectly righteous in his sight. They certainly cannot complain, and if in so doing, others are not injured, there is no cause of complaint anywhere.

The doctrine of the imputation of the righteousness of Christ, or justification by faith, rests upon its own foundation and is perfectly independent of the 5th chapter of Romans, and also of the doctrine of the imputation of Adam's sin to his posterity. Whether this latter doctrine be true or false, the former has no need of argument here. Whether the word "imputation" be used in the bible in connexion with the doctrine of justification or not, the truth conveyed by the word "imputation," is so clearly expressed, and so variously illustrated, as to require no laboured argument or explanation. Let the doctrines of universal and total depravity and justification by faith rest upon their own independent and scriptural foundations.

6. If Adam's sin is imputed to his posterity, *i. e.* "laid to their charge, and they are treated accordingly," while it produces no change in the individual to whom the imputation is made, but simply alters his relation to the law, it raises a serious and an important question, involving the character of the divine government, respecting the principle of rectitude upon which it is done. Without any personal demerit, without any thing in ourselves which can be the occasion of remorse, we find ourselves treated as though we had violated the Law of God under the most aggravated circumstances.

Can it be on the ground of justice? But the law is the standard of justice. Is there anything in its phraseology which covers the case? or which makes any provision for the infliction of its penalty on the unoffending, on the ground of imputation?—We are forced to reply in the negative. As to the law forbidding our first parents to eat the fruit of a particular tree, *in terms,*

it was nothing more than the moral law, adapted to their condition, just as the same law is in the 5th and 7th commandments.

It is irrelevant to appeal to the fact that the sins of men were imputed to our Saviour. It will not be pretended that this was just, or would have been justifiable on any other ground, than that of his voluntary offer of himself to bear our sins. The work of Redemption was an expedient to arrest the regular course of law and justice without dishonouring either. Nor will it be more pertinent to refer to the fact that God visits the iniquities of parents upon their children. It is a scriptural doctrine and confirmed by universal consciousness, that all are "by nature, children of wrath," and personally guilty before God, and if dealt with according to their own deserts, they would experience evil and only unmitigated evil at the hands of the Lord. He has, then, an unquestionable right to impart or withhold the blessings of his providence and grace, according to any rule which in his infinite wisdom, he shall see fit to adopt, since whenever he bestows a favor, it is giving more than is deserved, and whenever he withholds, he does no injustice. Hence, in whatever measure, and through whatever instrumentality children suffer, no child could ever say with truth, my sufferings are greater than I personally deserve.

It has been said that the posterity of Adam had a fair trial in him, since if they had individually been placed in his circumstances, they would have fallen. This may be true, and must reverently be believed, as a revealed truth, if it can be shown that it has been revealed, as the principle upon which the ways of God with men are to be vindicated. But it is nowhere expressly said. Nor is it taught by implication in any passage which I have ever seen quoted. No being, personally holy and innocent was ever arraigned and sentenced to punishment, for what he would have done, if he had had a trial. To suppose that before the trial and without it, he had the disposition to transgress, would be to suppose that he was neither holy nor innocent, when put upon trial. Besides, if he were dealt with according to the principle under consideration, it would not be on the ground of imputation, as clearly defined in the commencement of this article, but on the ground of his own real character and merits. It is equally unsatisfactory to an enquiring mind, to resolve the connexion between Adam and his posterity into

an act of divine sovereignty. God nowhere claims a sovereign right to do wrong, nor to make that right which is intrinsically wrong. This relation between Adam and his posterity must be holy, and just, and good, and one which in the day of judgment will be freely and universally acknowledged to be so. I look in vain for any hint in the word of God, that he claims the sovereign right to alter the relation of his moral creatures to his law, irrespective of their personal acts or characters.

7. We now say that if we are justly chargeable with the sinful act of Adam, and made liable to the penal consequences, we are utterly incapable of apprehending it in our own consciousness. Professor Hodge, *Doctrine* 1. p. 221, at the close of his commentary on the 5th chap. of Rom. says, "The doctrine does not include the idea of a mysterious identity of Adam and his race, nor that of the transfer of the moral turpitude of his sin to his descendants." And again, on the same page, "The sin of Adam therefore, is no ground to us of remorse; and the righteousness of Christ is no ground of self-complacency in those to whom it is imputed."

Dr. Chalmers, near the close of his 24th Lec. on Rom. p. 128, says, "Many, we are aware, carry the doctrine of imputation much farther than this, and make each of us liable to answer at the bar of God's judicature, for Adam's individual transgression. We shall only say of this view at present, that whether it be scriptural or not, we are very sure that we cannot follow it by any sense of morality or rightfulness in our own heart." Again, Lec. 25, near the commencement of it, "We have not denied that this may be the doctrine of scripture—we have only said, that our own moral sense is altogether unable to apprehend it, and that while we can perceive how a man is justly culpable for every iniquitous deed of his history caused by the iniquitous tendency of his heart, however that tendency may have been derived,—yet we cannot perceive how it is that he is justly culpable for the iniquitous deed done not by himself, but by another who lived six thousand years ago." Doctor Chalmers here unequivocally endorses Prof. Stuart's opinion, in his *Com. on Rom. 5*:—see p. 239.

It is in accordance with this, that while we meet with confessions of sin in the word of God, both of inherent original sin, or total depravity, and of actual sin, yet we find no confession of

Adam's sin, nor any ascriptions of afflictions to him as the meritorious author or cause. Neither do we find that the heathen ever betray the least consciousness of being culpable for the acts of any progenitor. It is a sin, and a liability to penal consequences totally unknown to the heathen world, being made known to them, neither by the light of nature, nor the operations of their consciences. Nor do we find that the apostle who was especially commissioned to preach the Gospel to the Gentiles, in any of his addresses to them, examples of which we have in the Book of Acts, chapters 14th and 17th, ever announced to them their guilt or liability to suffer for Adam's sin.

8. Ordinarily, "by the law is the knowledge of sin," but no application of the law to the understanding or the conscience can ever give a knowledge of imputed sin. No construction which we can put upon the terms of the moral law, as expressed in the ten commandments, or expounded by our Saviour, can make it apply to any other than our own personal actions. There is no intimation, that we are liable to any curse except what we incur by our own transgressions of that law. Nay, it would seem that if we are not transgressors of it, we have the promise of life, or happiness. This do, and live,—but in order to cover the case under consideration, we must make an addition to the language expressed of the punishment of transgression, that it may read, "the soul that sinneth," or to which sin is imputed, "it shall die." But it is plain that the law, either as it is inscribed upon the heart, or revealed in the Decalogue, or enforced by the conscience, does not convict us of our liability to suffer in this way. To feel that we are sinners and deserving of the penalty of the law, is one thing. To feel that irrespective of our personal character, or any fault of our own, we are charged with sin, and treated as if we had committed it, is another thing. And if ever the latter be the case, we must become acquainted with the fact, either by consciousness of suffering undeservedly, or by special revelation. But none, with a proper conviction of their own personal sinfulness, ever feel that they suffer any thing which they do not personally deserve. The knowledge of the fact that some portion of their sufferings is for imputed sin can be obtained only by revelation.

To what end or purpose, shall the doctrine of the imputation of Adam's sin to his posterity be preached? Not to produce

conviction of sin, because no one according to Prof. Hodge and Dr. Chalmers appears to agree with him, can or need feel any remorse on this account. Neither need it be preached in order to convince men of their dependence upon grace, since that conviction is produced in all cases, as in that of the apostle by the proper application of the law of God. See Rom. 7.

9. There is another objection to the doctrine of imputed sin which cannot but strike the mind with some force. The doctrine implies this, that God claims the right to punish a particular act in the original agent or perpetrator, and also in a million or hundreds of millions of others, for successive centuries, to punish the same act, irrespective of any moral character or deserts of their own. What, according to this statement, is justice, either as to the amount of punishment, or the persons on whom the punishment shall be inflicted? See Barne's Introductory Essay to Butler's Analogy, p. 35.

10. The doctrine of imputed sin, seems to remove no difficulty. Even Prof. Hodge is at as great pains as any other writer to maintain that inherent or native depravity is propagated in such a way as to acquit God of the charge of being the author of sin, and fix corruption on us, as our own proper sinfulness. If he is correct in this, (and he undoubtedly is,) then we have here enough to account for all the sufferings in the world, while it leaves the parallel between Adam and Christ, as the federal or representative head of believers uncontradicted and unimpaired. With Dr. Hodge, agree Howe, Ridgely, Colquhoun and others.

11. If all the penal consequences which fell upon Adam, fell upon his posterity on account of the imputation of his sin to them, then the imputation of his sin will account for all the labors and toil, all the calamities and deaths which occurred between Adam and Moses, and why say that either the inhabitants of the old world, or of Sodom, perished on account of their actual sins? Was more suffered by any individual than Adam deserved to suffer on account of his federal act?

12. It is often said in justification of the representative character of Adam, that if he had not fallen, but by his obedience had secured to his posterity a legacy of eternal life, no complaint would ever have been made, that our character and condition had been involved in the result of his trial.

Is it intended by this, that the relation between him and his

posterity in this case, is so intrinsically just, that in any case, it cannot be complained of, when there is an equal chance of gain? Has our neighbor a moral right to make us a party in his speculations, without our personal consent, because there was a fair prospect of success, and advantage, and therefore, we have no right to complain, if there should be a failure? The enquiry here is respecting a moral right, and not a right according to the laws of the land. If not, this connection between Adam and his posterity, must be resolved into a sovereign power in God—and the enquiry will arise respecting his claim to possess such a right, and in accordance with what he exercises it.

Allowing that if the question had been proposed to the whole race of Adam, whether they would consent to be placed upon trial through him as their representative, they would have regarded it as a fair trial and affording to them, at least, an equal chance of being gainers and not losers, and would therefore have assented to the proposition; yet, on the part of God who made the proposition, it was known that the trial would issue in their ruin. Had they known what he knew, would they have assented? Again, if all had consented that Adam should act in the trial as their representative, would that authorize God to create them sinners? If not, but they still become sinners in such a way, that not God, but themselves are the proper authors of their sinfulness; then the doctrine of imputation of his sin, removes no difficulty and is wholly unnecessary to account for the fallen condition of the posterity of Adam.

13. To impute righteousness, or treat sinners as righteous, is not a legal, but a gracious act. To impute sin, or treat as sinners, those who have done nothing which can be a subject of remorse, is not a legal, but what we should spontaneously pronounce to be an unjust act. Our opinion could be changed only by a clear revelation that God has done it. We know that the judge of all the earth cannot but do right.

14. There is no resemblance between the character of Adam and that of his posterity in relation to his sin, for to him it was personal sin, and the occasion of deep remorse, shame and repentance, while to them, it can be the occasion of none of these things. If in any way saved from the sin, they must feel totally different emotions from those which actuate him, Rom. 5: 12—21.

With the preceding propositions before our minds, we pro-

ceed to examine a passage, and the only passage which, by most commentators, is supposed to teach the doctrine of the imputation of Adam's sin to his posterity.

In writing to the church at Rome, the members of which generally, the apostle had never seen, he had a very delicate task to perform. It was composed of Jews and Gentiles, and at a time when many of the churches were powerfully agitated by questions of great interest and practical importance respecting the observance of the Jewish rites. This church, more than any other, would be likely to be visited by men of different opinions on this subject. Moreover the whole force of Jewish prejudices would be adverse to the admission of the Gentiles to the same privileges with the Jews.

The apostle evidently designed to correct these false notions, and at the same time, give a comprehensive view of the christian system, whose doctrines were adapted to establish them in the faith. By a course of argument, at once clear, ingenious and convincing, he conducts us to the conclusion, ch. 3: 20,—“Therefore by the deeds of the law, there shall no flesh be justified. Hence, the necessity of that righteousness which God has provided in the gift of his Son, and is testified in the law and the prophets,” for v. 22, 23, “there is no difference, for all have sinned and come short of the glory of God.”

He points their minds to the great propitiatory sacrifice, v. 25, and asks, v. 29, “Is he the God of the Jews only? Is he not also, of the Gentiles? Yes of the Gentiles also?”

This announcement, he was aware, would be startling and offensive to the Jews; and in ch. 4: he proceeds to prove from the Old Tes. that the Jews had sufficient evidence, that the favor of God was not confined in purpose, and would not be limited in fact, to the descendants of Abraham, but that the Head and representative of Israel was saved not on the ground of his personal merit, but through faith, and of course, upon terms on which the most unworthy Gentile might be accepted and blest. All this was humbling doctrine both to Jew and Gentile, but particularly encouraging to the Gentile.

Carrying forward his leading design, the apostle follows the current of his own overflowing gratitude and delight, in setting forth the blessedness of the condition into which we are introduced through the unmerited grace of God in Christ Jesus.—

This is the burthen of his discourse in the first part of the 5th chapter. Being justified by faith, we are introduced into a state of glorious comfort and hope, all through grace. "Christ died for the ungodly." "When we were yet sinners, Christ died for us."

Let any one look at the course of the argument up to chap. 5: 12, and he will see, that while the apostle is sufficiently guarded against the supposition that any are benefitted by the death of Christ but those who believe on him, yet his purpose is to show that the whole world is in a sinful and ruined condition, but in the atonement of Christ, there is a remedy co-extensive with the ruins of the apostacy, of course, embracing upon the same terms, both Jews and Gentiles.

Now, whether the doctrine of the imputation of Adam's sin to his posterity is taught in Rom. 5: 12—21, depends upon one point in the exposition of it; what is the design of the apostle in this passage? Prof. Hodge says, "The design of this section is the illustration of the doctrine of the justification of sinners on the ground of the righteousness of Christ, by a reference to the condemnation of men for the sin of Adam." Is this the special design of the apostle? Is illustration the object? If so, Prof. Hodge's exposition of the passage is correct.

There can be no doubt that throughout this epistle he designs to teach and explain, and enforce the doctrines of christianity upon both Jews and Gentiles. He is aiming to expound the truth so that it shall commend itself to both branches of the human family. He has shown that "all have sinned;" all must be "justified freely by his grace," and now he seems to aim at destroying the last vestige of Jewish limitation of the blessings of the Messiah's work, and afford to all, both Jews and Gentiles, the most ample ground of encouragement and joyfulness, by a comparison of the blessings procured for us by Christ with the evils which have involved the race in consequence of the sin of Adam.

Prof. Hodge, in his exposition of the 18th v. freely admits what every one moderately acquainted with the Greek language, knows to be true, that the phraseology of this passage does not necessarily teach the doctrine of imputation,—that the more obvious, grammatical construction of the preposition (*dia*) with the genitive is "by means of," rather than "on account of." There

is the same equivocal phraseology throughout the passage. It is remarkable that in not one passage is it unequivocally declared that the posterity of Adam is condemned on account of his sin so as to leave no doubt of the imputation of his sin to them. Prof. Hodge gathers the doctrine of the imputation of Adam's sin from a logical, rather than a philological investigation of it.

But we more confidently conclude that it is not the design of the apostle to "illustrate the doctrine of the justification of sinners on the ground of the righteousness of Christ, by a reference to the condemnation of men for the sin of Adam," for in the state of the argument at the commencement of this passage, *it would be an attempt to illustrate that which was already sufficiently plain, by what is obscure and itself in need of explanation and illustration.*

The doctrine of the justification of men, on the ground of the righteousness of Christ, had been clearly and abundantly taught and illustrated in the Old Testament. The clothing of our first parents in the skins of animals, doubtless slain in sacrifice, the example of Abraham, referred to in the preceding chapter of this epistle—the language of David quoted in the 6th and 8th verses—the 53d of Isaiah—and numerous other passages, such as Isaiah 61: 10, all illustrated the doctrine of justification on the ground of the righteousness of Christ. Our Saviour in the early part of his ministry, illustrated this doctrine to Nicodemus by a reference to the serpent which was lifted up in the wilderness. Now these things were known to the christians at Rome. The doctrine of the universal, and total, and hereditary corruption of human nature was well known to the Jewish christians there, as a doctrine taught in their scriptures. It is sufficiently implied in the preceding chapters of this epistle, and must have been known to all who had heard from christian teachers, or read in the gospel, the doctrines which our Saviour taught. But where should the christians at Rome have so clearly learned the doctrine of original sin imputed, that it should afford them a familiar and perspicuous illustration of the doctrine of justification by faith, so as to add to their understanding of any mystery which might be involved in it? Is it taught clearly, according to Prof. Hodge's definition in the Old Testament? I am yet to learn where. Neither Job, nor David, nor Ezra, nor Isaiah, nor

Jeremiah, confessed or deplored their guilt of Adam's sin.—Up to this point of the epistle, the apostle has pursued a most cautious line of argument. He seems to take nothing for granted, which is questionable. He was aware that he was addressing himself to a church, composed of Jews and Gentiles, situated in the capital of the world, a city abounding in wealth, talents, learning, idolatry and sin. He proves every thing, so that whatever position he occupies may be impregnable. Has he, however, in the preceding chapters of this epistle, proved that all men are condemned and punished on account of Adam's sin?—Has he intimated that it is imputed to them so that without regard to their moral characters, they are on account of that one sin, subjected to all the penal consequences, just as if it were their own personal act? Has he, as in several other instances in the course of this epistle, answered the objections which would be likely to arise in the minds of those to whom he wrote? especially, in the minds of the learned, cavilling and philosophical Gentiles, to whom the doctrine would be new, and a doctrine of which, they would find in their own consciousness, no moral sense to take cognizance? No, we think, that nothing of this can be found in the preceding parts of this chapter. Moreover, it is worthy of serious consideration, that Prof. Hodge; and almost every commentator who entertains his views, is occupied throughout their expositions, rather in proving and illustrating this doctrine of the imputation of Adam's sin to his posterity by a reference to the well-known doctrine of justification by faith, than in illustrating the doctrine of the imputation of Christ's righteousness by a reference to the condemnation of men in Adam.

But further, in this as in other cases, the apostle did perceive that an objection would be started, which should be met and silenced. This we find at the beginning of the 6th chap. What is it? Is it such an objection as we should naturally expect would be raised against the doctrine, that the sin of another is set to our charge, and we are treated accordingly without any regard to our personal character or deserts? Not at all. It is just such an objection as we should expect might be suggested to a mind which had received no other impression from the apostle's reasoning than that of the super-abounding grace, provided through Christ over all the sin which has been introduced into

the world through Adam. "What shall we say then? Shall we continue in sin, that grace may abound?" The objector says, if what you say is true, the more we sin the better, for it only occasions a more abundant display of grace. Your doctrine of the super-abounding grace of God affords an encouragement and an apology for sin. But would this be the most natural objection in the mind of one who has understood the apostle to teach in the preceding chapter, as the main subject, that we are saved by the imputed merits of Christ, just as we have been condemned by the imputed sin of Adam?

V. 12, Dr. Hodge interprets the sentence, "for all have sinned," to mean "all men are regarded and treated as sinners." That is, they are sinners by imputation. But why should the word "*heemarton*" mean sinners by imputation, when in chap. 3: 23, the same word is used with reference to the universal character of man, as proved by the prevalence of known and outward sins throughout the world, both Jewish and Gentile.—"For all have sinned and come short of the glory of God." And again in v. 8, of this chapter, "while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us," *hamartooloon*—a word of the same root. Character here, and not corruption of nature merely, nor particular acts is intended,—character, which has its seat in the heart, but is proved by the outward conduct, as the apostle has done in the first three chapters by a survey of the conduct of all, both Jews and Gentiles.

But there was a prevalent notion among the Jews, that sin consisted mainly, if not wholly, in overt transgressions of the law, as it was given by Moses. The law as given by Moses was the only standard to which they were accustomed to refer their actions. The apostle seems to have this in view when he introduces the fact that sin must have existed in all its evil deserts before the time of Moses; for death, which is the wages of sin, and the sure evidence of its existence, prevailed from Adam and Moses, and even over those who had not sinned like Adam against such a clearly revealed law, as that which was given to Adam.

This general expression may, and we believe, certainly does include infants, for it is a scriptural doctrine and one to which our own consciousness bears its testimony, that infants have by nature, the character of fallen man, and are sinners in the

sense, in which the word is used in chapter 3: 23, and in the 8th verse of this 5th chapter.

Merely to be treated as sinners, is not sinning according to the use of words in any other passage in the whole epistle, even in this passage, v. 14, "that had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression," *hamarteesantas*, no one supposes that the apostle means "sinning by imputation," but having actually sinned.

As to the whole of this passage, there is not a single expression which will not admit of the interpretation, that by or through Adam, we have become sinners—have acquired that character and condition. By or through Christ, we become righteous—obtain that character and state, leaving it for other portions of the sacred volume, to inform us as to the manner.

We may with all propriety, apply to this passage, the argument of Prof. Hodge, found on p. 138, and under chap. 4: 1—17, where he is arguing against the imputation of faith. "We are said to be saved by or through faith, but never on account of our faith or on the ground of it. It is always *ek pisteos* or *dia pisteos*, but never *dia pistin*."

So we say, an accusative with the proposition *dia* is not found in this passage, either with respect to Adam's sin or Christ's righteousness. It seems strange that the apostle should throughout, avoid this unequivocal form of expression, and so uniformly use one which, as every Greek scholar knows, is susceptible of a different meaning, if he intended to teach the doctrine of the imputation of Adam's sin and of Christ's righteousness.

As the form of expression is throughout this passage ambiguous, and will admit of either interpretation, *i. e.* condemned on account of Adam's sin, or through its medium and instrumentality, we must pursue the same course of reasoning which we do in determining the meaning of the proposition "for," in those passages which declare that our Saviour died, or suffered for us. Our English word, and the propositions in the original, are equivocal, and we must determine whether it means "on account of," "in behalf of," or "in the stead or place of," by examining other parts of the scriptures. When we look at the sacrifices, at Is. 53: Gal. 3: 10—13 and 1 Pet. 2: 24, &c., we come to a clear conclusion, that substitution is intended, and would be suggested to the minds of the Jews and all who are familiar with

the Scriptures. But we do not find the doctrine of the imputation of Adam's sin, so sustained by an appeal to other portions of the Scriptures. As to the word *kathisteemi* "made" or constituted v. 19, it in no passage in the N. Tes. appears to mean, made or constituted by imputation, but to make or constitute in reality. Mat. 24: 45, "who then is a faithful and wise servant, whom his Lord hath *made* ruler over his household, to give them meat in due season?" Luke 12: 14, "who hath *made* me a judge or a divider over you?" James 3: 6, "And the tongue *is* a fire, a world of iniquity," is constituted or made by perversion. As to the two classes, mentioned in v. 14, it is clearly implied, that those who had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression, had sinned. If they had sinned only in Adam, and by imputation, then they had sinned precisely as the others who had sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression. If two classes of sinners who lived between Adam and Moses are intended, (of which I am not quite satisfied,) I think that they are actual sinners against the law of nature and such light as had been communicated—and infants who have not actually sinned, but possess the same disposition and character.

The conclusion to which I am compelled by these considerations is, that the apostle in this passage, teaches that by or through Adam, the whole of his posterity has come into a state of sin and condemnation, without any explanation of the manner in which this has resulted from his sin. So through Christ, a provision is made for all who have fallen, which is abundant and superabundant for their necessities, but is available only to believers. Neither the imputation of Christ's righteousness nor of Adam's sin is taught or alluded to in this passage. Elsewhere the connection between Christ and his people, and between Adam and his descendants is more fully explained. And very different in the manner in which this relation is formed. Between Adam and his posterity, it is hereditary, and through natural generation, but so that every one's depravity is his own fault, and not chargeable upon God as its author. The connection between Christ and his people, is a gracious one, in which Christ is the author and finisher, and his perfect righteousness imputed to the believer, is the ground upon which every favor to our guilty race rests. I see, I feel the practical power and value of this last doctrine. I love it because it humbles the sinner in the

dust, and exalts Christ to the priesthood and the throne, and calls forth the shouting of grace, grace, from every redeemed tongue. The doctrine of the imputation of Adam's sin, appears to me, too important, too much at variance with other principles of the divine character and government, to be left to stand upon such a narrow foundation.

I may be asked, how I reconcile my views with an honest subscription to the Confession of Faith and the Catechisms of our church? My reply will be found by recurring to the second article of this examination, where I state the conviction which is acknowledged to exist between Adam and his posterity. If asked, what I mean by the guilt of Adam's sin, I answer, as I have often and always done, "liability to the penal consequences," without being positive upon what principle of the divine government this liability rests. Here I am willing for the present to stand, leaving it to others to agree or dissent in the fear of God and humble subjection to his word.

Perseverance Explained.

Such is the attraction of the Cross, that what it once secures it holds fast forever. Those who are once interested in it never lose that interest. Once attracted to it by a true and heaven-imparted faith, they never so break the bond as to be ultimately severed from Christ, and finally perish. There is no falling away from the Cross.

This is a truth which is liable to perversion and abuse, and ought therefore to be stated with some clearness and caution.— There is no doubt that not a few who *profess* to have received Jesus Christ, and are for a time outwardly conformed to the requisitions of the Gospel, do ultimately apostatize and perish.— To deny this forms no part of the truth we propose to establish. Though, in a well-instructed community, there are comparatively few who, when they make a profession of religion, either intend or expect to renounce their profession, there are, notwithstanding, very many who profess religion without possessing it, and who, on that account, apostatize from their profession and

perish. The Word of God, as well as melancholy facts which have taken place under our own observation, show us that the professed disciples of the Cross have become apostates, and have renounced both the principles and the duties of Christianity, beyond recovery. But it is no impeachment of the efficacy of the Cross, that men whom it never held at all it does not continue to hold. Persons of this description were never at heart believers in its truths and power. It is perfectly natural for such persons to fall away, even from all their false appearances of godliness. It has only "happened unto them according to the true proverb, the dog is turned to his own vomit again, and the sow that was washed to her wallowing in the mire." The exalted Redeemer will say to all such deceivers, when he comes in the clouds of heaven to judge the world, "I never knew you." The true account of all persons of this description is given by the apostle in a single sentence: "They went out from us, but they were not of us; for if they had been of us, they would no doubt have continued with us: but they went out, that it might be made manifest that they were not all of us."

Nor is it any part of the truth we propose to substantiate, that true believers in Christ may not and do not fall into great sins. Not only are all of them imperfect in holiness, but frequently lose so much of the spirit and power of godliness, as to bring deep reproach upon the sacred name by which they are called. Inward declension almost always leads to outward negligence; while an uncircumspect and untender walk and conversation, are very apt to degenerate into some of the forms of open wickedness. The Spirit of God is often thus grieved away from the bosoms of his own people; and where that fountain of living water within them is at its ebb, or for a time diverted into other channels, not only do the plants of righteousness wither, but noxious weeds spring up in their stead. Where spiritual activity and diligence are superseded by indifference and sloth, where vain desires and inordinate affections after this world shut out the love of God, the fellowship of the soul with Him is interrupted, and the believer for a time exhibits little evidence that he has ever passed from death unto life. Such defections form no part of the Christian character; and while from all such defections every believer is ultimately recovered, from none of them is he infallibly sure of being uniformly and always pre-

served. The Scriptures nowhere represent his condition as such, that in consequence of his union to Christ, he is in no danger of sinning. Their admonitions imply directly the reverse of this. "Let him that thinketh he standeth, take heed lest he fall." "Take heed, brethren, lest there be in any of you an evil heart of unbelief in departing from the living God." "Let us therefore fear, lest a promise being left us of entering into his rest, any of you should seem to come short of it." "Let us labor to enter into that rest, lest any man fall after the same example of unbelief." "Thou standest by faith: be not high-minded, but fear; for if God spared not the natural branches, take heed lest he spare not thee." Admonitions like these would be out of place, if there were no danger. If there ever was a man who was warranted, from the strength and ardor of his piety, and from the assurance of his faith, to live above this cautious and watchful spirit, that man was the Apostle Paul.—But, so far from bordering on presumption, his language is, and in perfect consistency with his conscious glorifying in the Cross, "I keep under my body, and bring it into subjection, lest by any means, when I have preached to others, I myself should be a cast-away." There is nothing in the *nature* of holiness to keep good men from falling; for if there were, neither the fallen angels, nor our first parents, would ever have lost their primeval integrity. It would be the highest arrogance for those, who have perfectly conclusive evidence that they are accepted of God, to yield to the temptation that they are in no danger of falling into grievous apostacies. Everything is leagued against them, from within and from without: a heart desperately wicked and deceitful above all things—an alluring and a threatening world—and a powerful, malignant and subtle adversary, watching every avenue through which he may enter and lead them captive at his will. If they do not fall, it is not because there is no danger of falling; for they often stand on slippery places, and where it wants but little to precipitate them into the gulf below. It is with extreme caution that they do not turn aside from the way, and with great difficulty that they are rescued from the pit. "The righteous are scarcely saved."

But while all this is true, and important truth, it is also true that "the righteous shall hold on his way, and he that hath clean hands shall wax stronger and stronger." What the Cross

of Christ has done for all true believers, it has done effectually and forever. While many who profess the religion of Christ, and appear outwardly conformed to it, will apostatize and perish; and while true believers may, for a time, be left to themselves and fall into sin, and are always in a condition which calls for unsleeping vigilance; *yet will they persevere in holiness to the end, and be infallibly preserved from final apostacy and perdition.* This is what I mean, when I say there is no falling away from the Cross.

Before I call your attention to the evidence by which this truth is substantiated, it is important to a just view of this truth itself, to show *by what power, or influence, believers are thus preserved, and enabled to persevere.* On this part of the subject, I desire to do honor to the Cross, and ascribe all glory to its atoning blood, its sanctifying power, and its unchanging faithfulness. No creature, were he ever so holy, can persevere in holiness, independently of divine power. It belongs to the nature of creatures, to "live, and move, and have their being in God." Gabriel does not possess a holy thought independently of his Maker. The unremitting and powerful energy of the great Supreme is the immediate cause of all the holiness, perfected and continued as it is without intermission and forever, of cherubim and seraphim in the upper Sanctuary. Divine power is as necessary for the preservation of right principles and right affections in the heart, as for their original existence. Firm in principle and vigorous in action as the faith of Christians may be—nay, though it were a thousand fold more deeply seated than it is, and though it uniformly pervaded and consecrated all their powers and conduct—it is not so incorruptible and unchanging that, if forsaken of God, they will not fall and perish.—Their dependence on all-powerfull grace is one of the sweetest and most cheering truths in all the Bible, and is most deeply and at the same time most gratefully felt, when they themselves have most of the spirit of that blessed Book. Take from them their dependence on God, and they sink in despair. They are "kept by the power of God, through faith, unto salvation."—Who, that is acquainted with his own heart, has not felt how much more in accordance with his own depraved desires to give way than to resist, and to yield the conflict with his spiritual enemies, rather than maintain it! The best of saints would be

the worst of sinners, without preventing and sanctifying grace. Of all the disasters a good man deploras, this is the greatest, that God should depart from him! Were their perseverance in holiness dependent on the saints themselves, there is not one among them all that would persevere. Moses would have turned away in disgust from the bright visions of Pisgah, but for this; David would have persevered in adultery and blood, but for this; but for this, Paul would have drawn back to perdition, though within sight of his crown of righteousness. Hence, Moses so earnestly prays, "If thy presence go not with us, carry me not up hence!" and David supplicates, "Hold thou me up, and I shall be safe;" and Paul expresses the assurance, "The Lord will preserve me unto his heavenly kingdom." The Scriptures are full of this truth. "The steps of a good man are ordered by *the Lord*: though he fall, he shall not utterly be cast down, for the Lord upholdeth him with his hand." "Now unto him who *is able* to keep you from falling, and present you faultless before the presence of his glory with exceeding joy." What but the fulfilled promise, "My grace is sufficient for thee, for my strength is made perfect in weakness," spreading itself before them, like the cloud by day, and shining on their path like the pillar of fire by night, could ever guide the people of God to the heavenly land?

The truth we wish to illustrate, may be made still more plain and unobjectionable, if in addition to the power and divine influence by which believers in the Cross are preserved, we also *advert to the means by which they are kept from falling away*. There are appointed and appropriate means of their perseverance, as well as an efficient cause; nor may the former be dispensed with any more than the latter. The Scriptures insist on this truth, as itself a component part of the doctrine that there is no falling away from the Cross. This is that feature of the doctrine which is overlooked by that class of its opposers, who affirm that it is a doctrine which *tends to licentiousness*, and one which even the best of men would feel strong temptations to abuse. "He that *endureth to the end*, the same shall be saved." "Be thou faithful unto *death*, and I will give thee a crown of life." "To him that *overcometh* will I grant to sit with me on my throne." "He that *overcometh, and keepeth* my words, to him will I give the morning star." There is no hope without

continued holiness. The believer may not suppose his work is done, because he has found pardon and peace. It is not more necessary that he should come to the Cross, than that he should keep at the Cross, and live and die by the faith of that finished redemption. There is no divine purpose or grace to keep him from perdition, if he does not persevere in faith and holiness.—His own faith and holiness are themselves the very things to be secured in order to his salvation; nor can there be any salvation without them. It is a disingenuous and perverted view of the truth, to say, that because a man is once in Christ, he is sure to be saved, though he goes away from Christ. The true doctrine is, that once in Christ always in Christ, and that the only proof and way of being in him at all is to continue in him. “I am the way,” says the Saviour. Men are no longer in the way to heaven than they are in Christ, and pursuing the straight and narrow path marked by his footsteps and his atoning blood.—The Christian is engaged in a perpetual conflict; and no sooner does he put off his armor, than he is at the mercy of the foe.—He must watch and pray, lest he be led into temptation; he must live above the world, and walk with God; he must hunger and thirst after righteousness, and grow in grace and the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ. As he advances in years, he must make advances in piety, till his “hoary head is a crown of glory, because found in the way of righteousness;” nor must he be satisfied until the last vestige of corruption is erased, and he “beholds the face of God in righteousness.” Men, therefore, must continue in holiness, or die in their iniquity. God has solemnly declared, “When a righteous man doth turn from his righteousness, and commit iniquity, he shall die.” He may not dismiss his solicitude, because he is once righteous, but must hold on his way. If he is lifted up, and grows presumptuous, because, in some favored hour, he has enjoyed some peculiar tokens of the divine favor—if he stops where he is, and is satisfied with his present attainments—he will draw back to perdition. He will not gain the prize without reaching the goal, nor wear the crown unless he achieves the victory. He may never be satisfied, without pressing forward. “I count not myself to have apprehended,” says Paul; “but *this one thing* I do: forgetting the things that are behind, and reaching forth to those that are before, I press toward the mark of the prize of the high

calling of God, which is in Christ Jesus." There is no other doctrine of not falling away than that all true believers "are kept by the power of God, *through faith*, unto salvation." A continued faith is the appointed *means* of perseverance; and to look for the end without the means, is stumbling over palpable error, walking in darkness, and ignorantly and rudely separating what God has joined together. The design of the Cross is to make men holy as God is holy. God would make them meet for his presence, and by the continued and progressive influence of the death of his Son. The most confident will lose their confidence, if they work not out "their own salvation with fear and trembling, because it is God that worketh in them to will and to do of his good pleasure."—*Dr. Spring's Attractions of the Cross.*

Sayings of Dr. Emmons.

Strict Calvinism brings God near to us; all opposing systems put him far away.

The weakest spot in every man is where he thinks himself to be wisest.

Great objects form great minds. Great men always commit great errors.

Whatever President Edwards investigated for himself, he understood and mastered; but in his treatise on Original Sin, he took his first principle on trust, and hence is like a great horse floundering in the mire. The more he tries to push through, the deeper he gets.

Style is only the frame to hold our thoughts. It is like the sash of a window; a heavy sash will obscure the light. The object is to have as little sash as will hold the lights, that we may not think of the frame, but have the most light.

Being asked, what is the secret of popular preaching? he replied, To preach without meddling with your hearers consciences.

Our most trying afflictions come unexpectedly. I have often seen the clouds of adversity gathering over Mendon hills, but they would generally disperse before they reached Frank-

lin; but those troubles that come in at the back door, are grievous to be borne. We are unprepared for them, and the suddenness of their shock often prostrates us.

The Celestial Sabbath.

“The golden palace of my God,
Towering above the clouds, I see;
Beyond the cherub’s bright abode,
Higher than angel’s thoughts can be.
How can I in those courts appear,
Without a wedding garment on?
Conduct me thou life giver there,
Conduct me to thy glorious throne!
And clothe me with thy robes of light,
And lead me through sin’s darksome night,
My Saviour and my God.”

Translated from the Russian.

Emblem of a Departing Saint.

“A cloud lay cradled near the setting sun,
A gleam of crimson tinged its braided snow,
Long had I watched the glory moving on,
O’er the still radiance of the lake below.
Tranquil its spirit seemed and floated slow.
Even in its very motion there was rest,
While every breath of eve that floated slow
Wafted the traveller to the beauteous west.
Emblem, me thought, of the departed soul,
To whose white robe the gleam of bliss is given,
And by the breath of mercy made to roll,
Right onward to the golden gates of Heaven,
Where to the eye of faith, it peaceful lies,
And tells to man his glorious destinies.”

THE
Calvinistic Magazine.

[NEW SERIES.]

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

Vol I.

July, 1846.

No. 7.

Methodist Episcopalian.

The following editorial, from the Methodist Episcopalian, published at Knoxville, we give entire to our readers, with comments.

“A NEW BOOK.

“The doctrine of t^{he} DIRECT WITNESS of the SPIRIT, as taught by the Rev. John Wesley, shown to be UNSCRIPTURAL, FALSE, FANATICAL, and of MISCHIEVOUS TENDENCY. By Frederick A. Ross. Philadelphia,—Published for the author, by Perkins & Purves, 1846.’

“The above is the imprint on the title-page of a new book, a copy of which, handsomely bound in morocco, gilt, has been kindly sent us, by the author, at our request. A significant reference to Deut. 20th chap. and 12th verse, accompanies the book. The import of this reference would be difficult to misapprehend. We have read the book, and have only to remark at present, that it is exceedingly disingenuous—a perfect caricature of Mr. Wesley and the Methodists, on the subject of the ‘direct witness of the Spirit.’ As regards the ghosts and witches, we are perfectly content to leave Mr. Wesley in company with Luther, the celebrated German Reformer—Flavel, the distinguished Calvinistic puritan writer, and a host of pious Calvinistic Divines; who, notwithstanding their superstitions, have been among the chosen instruments of heaven, in transmitting to us the pure and unadulterated records of the will of God concerning man. We wish Mr. Ross all possible success in his war upon the *witches*. We cannot but think, however, that if he had included in the same category with Mr. Wesley, the distinguished Calvinistic writers who are in the same condemnation, his work would have had, at least, the *appearance* of impartiality, in so far as belief in ghosts and witches is concerned. If all, who in the judgment of the present age, have been superstitious, are to be cut off as *fanatics* and *deceivers*, what will become of some of the brightest stars in the galaxy of Calvinistic divines?

“Some two years ago, we remarked in a discourse, having reference to the attacks of Mr. Ross upon Mr. Wesley and the Methodists, that if Mr. Ross would print his sermons, and print them as he preached them, we would attend to them. Some of our friends regard this remark as binding us to reply to Mr. Ross through the press. We think a little differently, as he said some things in his sermons which he has left out of his book. We allow that his book, coming from the highly respectable source from which it does, contains enough to demand a reply from some one. And although we do not regard our remark alluded to above as binding in the premises, we confess the very specific challenge given us in the reference accompanying the book, leaves us no choice. We must gird on our armor, *volens volens*. We wish it, however, to be distinctly understood, that unless circumstances render it necessary, our examination of the ‘book’ may not be expected in this paper. Neither will we be hurried to a publication, as though the interests of Methodism in East Tennessee depended on a *speedy refutation* of the erroneous positions taken by Mr. Ross, or a *speedy correction* of his misrepresentations of Mr. Wesley. All must know that an onerous burden is already imposed upon us, in our present relation to the church at Knoxville, and to this paper. But so soon as other duties will admit of it, we propose, with leave of divine providence, to show that Mr. Ross has done great injustice to Mr. Wesley and the Methodists,—that he has contributed his mite (unwittingly no doubt) to weaken the path of christians in scriptural christianity, and to strengthen the hands of unbelievers in their objections to experimental religion.

“Meanwhile, let not any Methodist be alarmed by the violence of the attack. Neither by the confidence with which the charges of ‘fanaticism’ and ‘blasphemy’ are hurled at Mr. Wesley. The sun will rise and set, and the planets will move in their respective orbits, just as though no such book had ever been written. Aye, and the Methodist preachers will move around their circuits, and fill their appointments, just as they did before. And what is better than all, God will accompany the word of his grace with the outpouring of his Holy Spirit; and sinners will be awakened and converted; and the Holy Spirit will bear them witness that they are born of God, before they shall have been regenerated long enough to indulge in any train of reasoning, or to make any deductions from premises, which never can be established till that important change takes place in the soul. Permit us to say again,—let no Methodist be thrown off his guard by the wholesale charges of duplicity, double dealing, and mystification, which are levelled at the Methodist ministry in that little book. Indeed, we allow that coming from a different source, and claiming for its author any other than a professed minister of the gospel, high in the estimation of his church, the ‘book’ would

require no serious notice; such is the violence of its attacks, and such the spirit in which it is written. Notwithstanding, the 'book' allows that the Methodist church is an 'evangelical church.'—And its author claims to be liberal in his christian sentiments.

"So far as we know Mr. Ross, in his private character, he is a gentleman. As a christian minister we respect him. But his book is public property. We judge its character by its contents. It comes from a respectable source—this gives it influence. It deals in ingenious sophistry—this may entrap the unwary. It is violent in its attacks, and severe in its denunciations. It assails the motives of men, and holds them up to public scorn. These things may pass for just what they are worth. But the nature of experimental christianity, and the import of the exceeding great and precious promises of the gospel are different things, and require the calm, sober, and prayerful investigation of all who desire to know the fulness of the blessings of the gospel of Christ.

S. PATTON."

The expressions of personal courtesy, so kindly made towards us, are returned to the editor of the *Episcopalian*. He is our neighbor, and has been on terms with us of uninterrupted personal civility for, perhaps, twenty years. Present relations, we trust, will not disturb the attitude we have heretofore sustained to each other.

We have both written, it seems, things requiring the notice of the other. Mr. Ross has printed a "book," and Mr. Patton has published remarks about it. We are both, then, in these respects, "public property." The book, we hope, will be "public property," in the widest sense, because we think it a good book.—The editor of the *Episcopalian* thinks it is a bad book. Thus, then, fairly at issue with the editor, we now notice his first attack. The first assault is sometimes half the battle. If successfully repelled, it often decides the engagement.

The article above, signed by the editor, is written with sufficient mildness of temper. If we read it right, it has two objects: *First*, to **FORESTALL** public opinion as to "*the book*," until the editor can write his reply. *Secondly*, to **DIVERT THE MIND** [especially of those who have not read "*the book*"] from the true issue between Mr. Wesley and Mr. Ross.

I. The editor attempts to *forestall* public opinion by the "*remark*," that the book is exceedingly disingenuous—a perfect caricature of Mr. Wesley and the Methodists, on the subject of "the direct witness of the Spirit." This "*remark*" is the morn-

ing shot of the engagement, and the weight of the gun, and the range of the ball, is the NAME of the Rev. S. Patton. One fire from us, just to say "*all ready*," will do;—as Mr. Patton's first practise has fallen short, our gun will reach.—Listen!—Look!

From the Christian Observer, Phila., A. Converse, Editor:—"A reply to Rev. Frederick A. Ross, on Mr. Wesley's doctrine of the *direct witness* of the Spirit"—a very able refutation of some of the distinguishing principles of Methodism—is *promised* by the Rev. S. Patton, Editor of the Methodist Episcopalian—"We must gird on our armor," he says, '*volens volens.*' But he wisely postpones the work for the present. We know not how he can speak of the book as he does—as 'exceedingly disingenuous—a perfect caricature of Mr. Wesley and the Methodists, on the subject of the 'direct witness of the Spirit.' This, of course, is his opinion merely. We read Mr. Ross' book with great care. The doctrines which he controverts, are stated with great precision in Mr. Wesley's own words, and we cannot conceive how even a disciple of Wesley can torture the open, clear, and able refutation of his master, into caricature, or imagine it to be so.' That will do for the first bout—our men may now take breakfast, fill their canteens, and wait till the enemy comes up.

Before we leave this FORESTALLING "remark" of the Episcopalian, we may as well say, that, it is very clear Mr. Patton is afraid of "the book." "*Two times*" in one paragraph he exhorts Methodists "not to be alarmed"—"not to be thrown off their guard." This is his *general order*; and, to sustain his courage and theirs, he *prophecies* after this fashion:—"The sun will rise and set, and the planets will move in their respective orbits, just as though no such book had ever been written. Aye, and Methodist preachers will move around their respective circuits, and fill their appointments, just as they did." And so, Mr. Patton cheers his men by the *prediction* that the stars will not fight against Methodism. Now, be it said, we looked for no such supernatural aid, because, in our opinion, suns and planets, and certainly Methodist preachers, are not likely to be turned from their circuits, by the attraction of *truth*, however strong in Bible criticism or in logical argument. Besides, we are not disposed, at present, to see the orbits of the one or the other, broken up. The sun and planets are doing well enough—ruling the day and night—and as for Methodist preachers, altho' we do not as yet

see that they are "the greater" and "the lesser lights," yet they are *lights* in the firmament, and set for *signs*—at least for a season—even for days and years.

II. We have said the article in the *Episcopalian* was calculated to turn public attention from the true question in the book:—The thing to be settled in regard to the truth of our Tract, is this:—*Is the doctrine of the DIRECT witness of the Spirit, as taught by the Rev. John Wesley, unscriptural, false, fanatical, and of mischievous tendency?* That is the issue. Mr. Patton tries to blink that issue.

1. He refers only to one point—fanaticism—and writes about it, so as to lead his readers from the thing to be looked at. He writes as if we had condemned Mr. Wesley *merely* for superstitious belief in ghosts and witches! With great simplicity he says—"We cannot but think, however, that if Mr. Ross had included in the same category with Mr. Wesley, the distinguished Calvinistic writers who are in the same condemnation, his work would have had at least the *appearance* of impartiality, in so far as belief in ghosts and witches is concerned," &c., &c.

Well.—The editor says our book is "*exceedingly disingenuous—a perfect caricature*—and he *promises* to prove this charge against our book *some day*. Now, we beg to apply these words to his own statement above, and we will *not* promise our readers the proof *when* our "onerous burdens and other duties" will permit—Nor will we comfort them by the farther assurance that our proof will *not* be "*speedy*." No—we will prove it *now*. In our book, the III Position reads thus:—"The doctrine of the *direct witness*, as taught by Mr. Wesley, is **FANATICAL**." There is our position—perfectly *specific*. Read again what the book says: "I affirmed at the opening of this argument, that I did not assert the doctrine of the direct witness to be fanatical, *because* Mr. Wesley gave credence to ghosts and witches. No. The doctrine is fanatical, *because* *IT teaches we have direct, conscious, miraculous intercourse with God*. In teaching *THAT*, *it opens the door into the spiritual world*, and it authorizes him who receives the doctrine to believe it is now possible for him to see and hear what is in heaven and hell. *THAT* is *fanaticism*. Hence in exhibiting Mr. Wesley's actual faith in open intercourse with the spiritual world, I establish the fact that he believed *just what his doctrine of the direct witness sanctioned*."—[Our book, page

83.] There, again, is the point; and we ask every reader not hood-winked by prejudice, if we have condemned Mr. Wesley on the *vague* and *general charge* of superstitious belief in ghosts and witches? No. We say again, as we say three times under that III head, in our book—No. But we charged Mr. Wesley with *fanaticism* in his doctrine of the *direct witness*; and we only exhibited his superstition at large, as *just what his doctrine of the direct witness sanctioned*. We should not have noticed his general mysticism in our book, at all, had it not been connected *in his mind*, as “*part and parcel*” with the doctrine of the direct witness. Hence we were under no obligation, whatever, to notice the superstition of distinguished Calvinists; because, *in their minds*, the belief in ghosts, witches, &c., was *not* connected with the *fanatical notion of the direct witness of the Spirit*. But, nevertheless, knowing that Methodists would cavil on the point, just as Mr. Patton has done, *we do*, in our book, expressly “*include in the same category with Mr. Wesley,*” *all those whose views were the same as his, just so far as they went with him*. Nay, we do even recommend, that all such, Luther among them, should “*sup in their fanaticism with the Methodists—that the Hon. Emanuel Swedenborg should preside at the feast of horrors—that John Wesley be Vice President, and George Bush act as Scribe.*”—[Our book, p. 91.]

We *have*, then, been IMPARTIAL—not in *appearance*, but in *reality*. We *did* condemn the Puritans, Luther, and all the good people, *so far* as they were superstitious, with Mr. Wesley.—We let them alone, of course, when they stopped in their mysticism; but we held on to Mr. Wesley, *when he did not stop*.—We held on to him in the doctrine of the *Direct Witness*—for *that* was the *heart's core* of his fanaticism—and *THAT* was THE THING, and that *is* THE THING held up by us to the public, for decision and condemnation. Mr. Patton hides that point from sight, and presents the false issue, that we have condemned Mr. Wesley for the common superstition in ghosts and witches!!—Not so, sir—but this—look at it:—“The doctrine of the *Direct Witness*, as taught by Mr. Wesley, is *FANATICAL*”—and *his belief in ghosts and witches, &c., &c., &c., &c.*, was “*sanctioned by that doctrine.*”

This is our proof that Mr. Patton is the “*disingenuous*” man, and that he has made a “*perfect caricature*” of our book.

2. The article in the *Episcopalian* tends to divert the attention of readers from the true question in "the book," in *another particular*. The editor says he proposes, sometime, "to show, that Mr. Ross has done great injustice to Mr. Wesley and the Methodists—that he has contributed his mite (unwittingly, no doubt) to weaken the path of scriptural christianity, and to strengthen the hands of unbelievers in their objections to experimental religion."

This sentence is as "*disingenuous*" as the former passage, and we will prove it to be so, and do it *now*. The disingenuousness is in this—that Mr. Patton *singles* out Mr. Ross, as if Mr. Ross *differed* from other Presbyterians and Calvinists, on the subject of the direct witness of the Spirit—and in that light represents *him* as "strengthening the hands of unbelievers"—yet Mr. Patton had our book before him, in which we affirm, that we intended to teach the doctrine of the witness of the Spirit, precisely as it has been held, as we believed, by all distinguished Calvinists. And, amongst others, we mentioned Henry, Dodridge, Scott and Chalmers. We proved, if words can prove any thing, that these eminent men held to the Indirect Witness of the Spirit, and denied and rejected the Direct Witness, as taught by Mr. Wesley, exactly as we do. We proved, also, from Mr. Wesley himself, that *he* did not attempt to sustain his scriptural interpretation, nor his views in general, of the *two* witnesses, *by any authority among Bible Commentators, or of theological writers*, save a most absurd reference to one man—the Bishop of London. We proved, that Mr. Wesley not only did thus set up his *idea* of a Direct Witness without any authority, as claimed by him, from the commentators of his day, but asserted that that notion of a Direct Witness was God's peculiar blessing upon Methodists in searching the Scripture."

We cannot permit ourselves to believe Mr. Patton will deny any of this statement. Why, then, does he slyly insinuate that Mr. Ross is strengthening the hands of unbelievers, unless, forsooth, he is prepared to say the same thing of that galaxy of Calvinistic divines he talks about? and prepared to say that Thomas Chalmers has strengthened the hands of unbelievers? Yet Thomas Chalmers has denied, and scouted, Mr. Wesley's direct witness, exactly as it is denied, and rejected, by Frederick A. Ross. Why, then, is Mr. Patton *num* as to the galaxy of Cal-

vinistic divines?—*nam* as to Thomas Chalmers?—but tries to hurt Mr. Ross' good name for rejecting just what Calvinists, as a body, have rejected? Is there any other word for Mr. Patton's course, than to call it "*disingenuous*?" Did he thus hope to divert the pious mind from a calm consideration of "the book," by hinting a suspicion that Mr. Ross was not with his brother Calvinists in his opposition to Mr. Wesley? We were prepared for this trick—and thus we expose it.

3. The article before us deserves notice in a third particular. The editor writes—"Some two years ago we remarked, in a discourse having reference to the attacks of Mr. Ross upon Mr. Wesley and the Methodists—that if Mr. Ross would print his sermons, and print them as he preached them, we would attend to them. Some of our friends regard this remark as binding us to reply to Mr. Ross through the press. We think a little differently, as he said some things in his sermons which he has left out of his book."

We think we understand this allusion. And if we do read right, then we say, that Mr. Patton here publishes an *error*, under which he has been laboring three years! the tendency of which is to turn the public mind from the things in the "*book*," to wonder after the "*somethings*" which Mr. Patton says have been left out of the "*book*." The public are encouraged to believe, that these "*somethings*" must be very bad things. The "*book*," says Mr. Patton, "coming from the highly respectable source it does, demands a reply from some one." But he does not feel bound in the premises by his remark years ago; yet, if those "*somethings*" had been printed, his harness would have been buckled on at once, without hint from friends. The inference is clear, that, bad as the "*book*" is, the "*somethings*" were worse;—and the tendency of the remark is, to turn the mind from the doctrine of the Direct Witness, to the mysterious and dreadful "*somethings*" which Mr. Patton says he challenged Mr. Ross to print years ago, and which Mr. Ross had not the courage to publish.

We have declared that this is an error, and it has the demerit of being an error without a particle of truth for its foundation.—We have said, if we read Mr. Patton right, he has been in mistake about this matter three years, viz:—He has been led to believe for that time, that we preached "*some things*" which we

never preached! Well—how happened Mr. Patton to believe so? Did he hear us himself preach these “*some things?*” No. How, then? Just this way:—*Somebody* told Mr. Patton about these “*some things!*” What were they? Why, that Mr. Ross *denied* that there was *any witness* of the Spirit, or *any agency* of the Holy Ghost in man’s salvation!! These are the “*some things,*” if we rightly understood Mr. Patton’s remark. Three years ago; and if we correctly construe his remarks, now made—Yes, three years ago, (for Mr. P. is mistaken in saying some two years ago,) viz: 16th July, 1843, he made that statement of our views of the Holy Spirit, upon *hearsay*, from his pulpit in Kingsport, and gave us the challenge, which he acknowledges, to print the same. So we understood—for we were not present.—Yes, thro’ ignorance, or malice, this foul misrepresentation was, we believe, carried to Mr. Patton, and published by him. It had the demerit, we have said, of being an error without a particle of truth. No words which the English language furnishes can express more strongly than those employed by us, from the first, to *anticipate*, and to *prevent*, that misrepresentation. In our first sermon on Mr. Wesley’s doctrine of the Direct Witness, and in every sermon, bearing even remotely on the subject, and every where, with a particularity which was tedious to our hearers, we affirmed our faith in the strongest Calvinistic doctrine of the Divine agency, in conviction, regeneration, and in guiding the heart. We affirmed, also, how far we held *with Mr. Wesley*, viz: in the common doctrine of the Indirect Witness of the Spirit—we declared that we *confined* our denial to the doctrine of the Direct Witness as taught by Mr. Wesley. We warned Methodists not to misunderstand, or misrepresent us—yet the misrepresentation was made—made every where—made to Mr. Patton—made by him three years ago—made by him now, if we rightly interpret what he means by the “*some things?*” left out of our book! A misrepresentation more utterly without truth in its composition, was never made.

We acquit Mr. Patton of any intentional wrong—yet he has done us great wrong—and wrong which we commend to his Christian consideration, in the following view:—When Mr. Patton understood from his informers, that we denied all witness of the Spirit, and all agency of the Holy Ghost, he knew that, if that was so, we denied *the doctrine which is the very life of the*

Gospel. Was not Mr. Patton, then, bound to know, with as perfect certainty as the case admitted, whether we did deny that doctrine? Was there any thing to prevent his conferring with us? No. He lives within five miles of us—he professes respect for us as a Christian minister—he has been on terms of courtesy with us, for, perhaps, twenty years. Ought he not to have been tender of our ministerial character? Ought he not to have gone personally, or sent these five miles, and known the act, without doubt, before he held us up to the condemnation of the pious, as a Presbyterian minister denying the faith of his church, and the very power of God in the salvation of the soul? Will Mr. Patton say that he had his information from very respectable persons who heard us? But Mr. Patton knows that his informers did wrong to communicate *to him* a charge so grave against us, inasmuch as *they* had taken no steps to satisfy themselves that they had not misunderstood our meaning. This Mr. Patton should have felt in regard to his informers, while his own duty to the ministerial calling at large, to himself, to us, his neighbor, ought to have been as plain as the summing up of the second table of the law, in the words of his Master—“*As ye would that men should do to you, do ye also to them likewise.*”

We have noticed this general misrepresentation in our book—(pages 102—3.) It was due to ourself to say now thus much as to Mr. Patton’s allusion to the same misrepresentation in his paper. We desire him, then, to know, and all others concerned, that “*somethings*” in our sermons have not been left out of our book, and that the views, upon the entire subject of the Agency and Witness of the Spirit, which we have *preached, we have printed.*

4. The editor of the Episcopalian has fallen into another error. He tells us—“Altho’ we do not regard our remark above as binding us in the premises, we confess the very specific challenge given us in the reference accompanying the book, leaves us no choice. We must gird on our armor, *volens volens.*”

One mistake usually leads to another. Mr. P. was wrong in the last particular. He, of course, is wrong in this. He did, it seems, according to his own showing, give us a public, pulpit challenge to print what we preached, and pledged himself to have the work attended to. Well. What we *preached, we printed*—“*Some things*” were not “left out.” What next?—

Why, Mr. P. so soon as the book is announced, sends a messenger to us, for a copy. The book is sent, and, in a *private* note, he is *reminded* that he had challenged us to print it. Lastly, upon the outside of the note, Mr. P. is *again reminded* of his challenge to us to print our sermon, by reference to Deuteronomy 20: 12, *on the seal to the note*—It runs thus—“And if it will make no peace with thee, but will make war against thee, then thou shalt besiege it.” There—that’s the “*specific challenge!*” Now, we do not understand much about the code of duelling, but, this great matter looks very much to us, as if the challenge had been given by Mr. Patton, and accepted by Mr. Ross—and, that Mr. Ross was determined, altho’ three years nearly had passed, that Mr. Patton should not be allowed to forget the fact, No. We should not have defied Mr. Patton to “besiege” our little book had he not challenged us to print it, and then sent to us a special messenger for it. We should not otherwise have disturbed the editor in his chair, by our reference to Deut. 20: 12, nor have laid the weight of our little book to increase the onerous burden already imposed on the shoulders of the editor, by his relation to the church at Knoxville, and to his paper.—And, now, be it said, that if he finds he has been compelled to gird on armor he had not “proved,”—and if he groans under its unassayed weight, he has nobody to blame but himself. And should he fall in his harness, and cry out “*nolens volens*” as his dying speech, nobody will consider even *that*, any evidence against us, of having brought him to such extremity by our “specific challenge.”

In conclusion, we remark, that we are not surprised at the excitement Methodists feel on the subject of Mr. Wesley’s doctrine of the Direct Witness. That doctrine, and its kindred delusion of christian perfection, are the *feet* of Methodism. For, be it understood, there is nothing *peculiar* in Methodists holding to Arminianism. In embracing that system of incipient infidelity, in opposition to Calvinism, they find sympathy amongst Universalists, Unitarians, Swedenborgians, Puseyites, Jesuites, Quakers, and all who tamper with the scriptures to suit the carnal mind. But, the doctrine of the *direct witness* and *christian perfection* constitute the cherished peculiarities of Mr. Wesley’s system. These are the *feet* of the metallic image which Mr. Wesley dreamed in his dream. The *toes* of the *feet* are, part of

iron, and part miry clay. These *feet* will be smitten by the stone cut out without hands, and be broken to pieces—and the whole image, the iron, the clay, the brass, the silver, and the gold, shall become like the chaff of the summer threshing-floor—carried away by the wind, and no place found for them. It is impossible that *Methodism* can exist, when the christian church shall attain its perfect form of doctrine, discipline, and government.

This is prediction. But as our brother has prophesied about the stars, we may tell of things to come on the earth.

FREDERICK A. ROSS.

For the Calvinistic Magazine.

Presbyterianism.

(Continued from page 66.)

If then, by the term elder, in the N. T. is to be understood minister, it may be asked, where is the authority for the office of Ruling Elder in the Presbyterian Church? In view of this very natural inquiry, I remark,

If Presbyterians had no palpable divine authority for this office, they would only be in a class with their brethren of other denominations, most, and perhaps all of whom, have offices and modes of procedure for which most of them certainly, and many confessedly, neither have nor pretend to have such authority.—And what is remarkable is, that this is true of others in proportion to the earnestness with which they insist upon a divine warrant from Presbyterians.

On the subject of Church Government, Presbyterians have expressed themselves with characteristic wisdom, prudence, and liberality. (Form of Govt. ch. 8, sec. 1.) They say, “It is absolutely *necessary* that the government of the church be exercised under *some* definite form. And we hold it to be *expedient* and *agreeable* to scripture, and the *practice* of the primitive christians, that the church be governed by congregational, presbyterial, and synodical assemblies. In full consistency with this belief, we embrace in the spirit of charity, those christians

who differ from us in opinion or practice on these subjects.”— We have here the sense in which Presbyterians claim authority for their mode of church government, either in whole or in part. It is sufficiently high, noble, and scriptural, but it does not impose the necessity of producing an express declaration of heaven for the office in question. It is sufficient that it “be expedient, and agreeable to scripture, and the practice of the primitive christians.” That it is all this, it will not be difficult to show.

Of its expediency, the test of centuries under every form of civil government, has fully satisfied a great part of the christian world. Government is absolutely necessary. Discipline equally so. “It must needs be that offences come.” Without wholesome discipline there might be congregations, but could be no church. A church is “a garden enclosed” by the environs of government and discipline. By whom are these to be maintained? Either by the mass of the people at large, by the ministry alone, or by the people and ministry combined. Presbyterians say, expediency dictates the latter mode, and that the churches shall be represented by a number of their grave, wise, and pious men, of their own selection, equal to the number of ministers in each representative body. The plurality of elders in the church session is counterpoised by the superior authority of the minister in that court, he being *ex officio*, moderator, having “power to convene the session when he may judge it requisite,” and otherwise holding a kind of veto power over its proceedings. In this way Presbyterians avoid the temptation to, or the possibility of creating an ungodly hierarchy on the one hand, and the danger of being governed by servants, children, females, and the weaker, more ignorant and prejudiced part of the church in general, on the other. The argument from expediency is greatly strengthened by the fact, that most denominations which are committed to the more independent and mainly democratic mode of church order, do in fact *practice* more or less the Presbyterian mode; while many of them have actually committed the government of the church to committees, who perform essentially the duties of ruling elders.

That it is agreeable to the practice of the primitive christians, the histories of those times abundantly show. And that it is agreeable to the tenor of scripture, I proceed, in a few words, as possible, to prove.

1. The *civil polity* of the Jews affords us a strong inferential argument here. The government of the Jewish nation consisted more in a union of state with church, than of church with state. Its features were essentially ecclesiastical and spiritual; so much so, as, with a high degree of probability, to determine the mode of their church government, if indeed the former was not derived from the latter. And from the earliest period of their national organization, they were governed by bodies of elders, either alone or in connection with other rulers. (Ex. 3: 16. 18. 24: 9.) These elders were not simply old men. They were the *rulers* of the people, "and officers over them." (Nu. 11: 16. Ezra 10: 14.) Yea more, they constituted civil Presbyteries. (Lu. 22: 66. Ac. 22: 5.) The word in the original here is the same that in 1 Tim. 4: 14, is translated (ecclesiastical) Presbytery, showing the essential order of the two to be the same: and no one doubts that God approved of both.

2. My second argument is drawn from the government of the *Jewish Synagogue*, after which the christian church was modeled. Synagogues were of very ancient date. The term in the Greek means an assemblage of persons, mainly for religious purposes. As therefore, men are religious and social beings; as they must and will have some form of government, and as a representative republican form in church and State, is as natural in the ruder stages of society, as it is equitable and desirable in every stage, the first assembly that ever convened for the worship of God, was in all probability, on this principle. Just as soon as "men began to call upon the name of the Lord," in religious assemblies, would they naturally adopt those principles and forms which were afterwards found under the title of the Jewish Synagogue, which was under regular organization as early at least as the days of Ezra. The Synagogue originally meant the assembly itself, afterwards, the place of meeting. It was the church of the Jews. The same arguments which prove this, prove that it was the model of the christian church, or rather, that the christian church was but a perpetuation of it.— They are such as the following:

Its service was wholly moral and spiritual, disconnected from that of the temple, and alike adapted to every age and nation. In earlier times its worship consisted in singing the praises of God, imparting religious instruction, and doubtless attending to

all the elements of divine worship. (1 Sam. 10: 1—13. 2 K. 4: 23. Ps. 74: 8.) In later times, in reading the law, offering prayers, delivering sermons, lectures, &c. (Matt. 6: 5. Luke 4: 15—22. Acts 13: 14, 15.) The abrogation, therefore, of the Temple service, which it preceded, and from which it was wholly disconnected, (sacrifices alone being required to be offered at the Temple,) could in no way interfere with the service of the synagogue. (2.) The Saviour and his Apostles resorted constantly to the synagogue for divine worship, thus sanctioning its organization, and showing it to be the church proper of the Jews. (Luke 4: 16. Acts 18: 4.) Moreover, “to be put out of the synagogue,” was the same as to be excommunicated from the church. John 12: 42. (3.) The first members of the Christian church were Jews, and would think of nothing but to perpetuate the essential order of the synagogue under the new dispensation.

What, then, was the government of the synagogue? I answer, it was governed by a plurality of grave, wise, and pious rulers, over whom a premier or chief ruler presided. Mark 5: 22. Acts 18: 8. These rulers were selected by the people. This was the invariable custom of the Jews. To this, I believe, all agree.—The argument, then, is strongly presumptive, not to say certain, that such was the government of the apostolic churches; and such, confessedly, is that of the Presbyterian church.

3. From the *greatness of the ministerial work*, the consequent *right* of the ministry to look to the churches for such “helps in government,” and the strong presumption that the Great Head of the church would make provision for their being furnished. The work of the ministry is, emphatically, a great work. It is enough to tax the energies of the noblest of God’s creatures. Nor is the obligation to give the gospel to the world, confined to those who preach it. It rests upon the whole church. Ministers are the leading agents of the church in accomplishing it. Their great business is to preach the gospel.—“As ye go, preach”—“Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature.” From the greatness of this work, they have a right to claim of the church that their hands be not unnecessarily tied by service, a part of which can be better done by others. This was the sole argument of the apostles for the establishment of the deacon’s office—(Acts 6: 2—6)—and it holds good in the case of the ruling elder. I agree that so much of the government of the church

as is inseparably connected with the business of preaching, is essential to the minister's highest usefulness in his appropriate work, and this he should never renounce any more than he would renounce the ministry itself. But more than this is essential to the highest prosperity of the church; so much more as to render it impossible for the ministry to attend to it, without greatly engrossing their time, and from the great delicacy of this department of service, greatly endangering their ministerial usefulness. Paul would not even take charge of a trifling contribution for certain poor saints, without some one, appointed by the church, to travel with him and witness to his faithfulness and help him in disbursing it. 2 Cor. 8: 18—21. How much less should ministers be expected to enter alone upon the arduous and delicate work of supervising, governing and disciplining the church at large? The apostles themselves did not. They had their travelling assistants. (1 Cor. 4: 17. Phil. 2: 19, 23, 25. Tit. 1: 5; 3: 12.) Why not ministers have their settled ones? And who can doubt that the Master would authorize them.

4. From the *right of the church* to be represented in all ecclesiastical courts. It is true, that the ministry hold a governing power over the church by virtue of their office. (Matt. 24: 45. 1 Thes. 5: 12. Heb. 15: 17.) But it is equally true, that the church possesses "certain unalienable rights, among which" is the right of representation. Not merely *nominal* and *apparent* representation either, as is the case in hierarchical forms of church government; but *real, actual*, "bona fide" representation. And wo be to the day when all churches, as some tamely, ingloriously, and criminally have done, shall agree to renounce this right! Without this right and the actual exercise of it, the very name of a *church* court is a contradiction in terms. A government by ministers alone, ("lording it over *God's* heritage," 1 Pet. 5: 3,) is not *church* government. And who needs to be told, at this age of the world, that such a government leads naturally and with the same certainty that the needle veers to the magnet, first to modern Episcopacy, then to Prelacy, and then, by a short transition, to Popery; producing, in its progress, appropriate degrees of humiliation, guilt and wretchedness, in the church of God, and in its consummation, the perfection of abomination?—If it be important that the balance of power be preserved between the people and their rulers, in the state, how much more in the

church, where spiritual liberty, temporal interests and eternal destinies, are all at stake! Antagonist muscles are as necessary in church and state, to hold these bodies in their due proportions, as in our physical organizations. And all who understand the Presbyterian mode of church government, must and do agree how happily they are here secured; and it seems to us that all who understand the science of government in general, must agree that the mode here adopted is the only one by which they can be secured, and the balance of power maintained.

5. That the apostolic churches were abundantly furnished with officers and teachers, who were endowed with gifts, fitting them for their respective offices, is clear from Rom. 12: 4—8; 1 Cor. 12: especially v. 28; Eph. 4: 4—16, especially v. 11. Some of the officers here mentioned were extraordinary and temporary, others ordinary and designed to be continued in the church. Of the latter, there are those mentioned whose *leading* business was to “rule” and to serve as “helps and governments in the church.” But we have seen that the *leading* business of ministers is to *preach* the gospel. There is, therefore, a distinct order of officers here authorized, whose business it is to co-operate with ministers in the rule and government of the church. Accordingly we find that the only ecclesiastical court, mentioned with particularity, in the New Testament, was composed of apostles, ministers and brethren, and that their decrees were sent forth to the churches under the authority of these three different classes of members, sanctioned by “the whole church.” Acts 15: 2, 22, 23.

Finally, although the *office* of ruling elder is *perpetual*, yet the eldership themselves may be called to the service of this office for a limited period, in full accordance with genuine Presbyterianism: and the writer confesses himself favorable to this course. 1. It would accord better, in all possible cases, with the right of representation on the part of the churches. 2. It would create a more energetic eldership. 3. It would enable the church, without difficulty, to get rid of incompetent, inefficient, superannuated, or objectionable rulers, while the worthy and efficient might be continued through life, by re-election—a course which would greatly encourage them and increase their usefulness, being re-elected by their brethren, from time to time, as new members entered to constitute the church and old ones pass-

ed away. 4. It would encourage worthy men to accept the office for a limited period, who would not be willing to accept it for life.

PRESBUTEROS.

Perseverance Proved.

I have occupied more of your time in these explanatory remarks than I intended, because the illustration makes the proof of our position more intelligible and easy. Our position is, that there is no such thing as finally falling away from the Cross.—Once in Christ, always in Christ: once justified, always justified. The final perseverance of every true believer is certain. The reasons for this position I will state with as much brevity and simplicity as I can.

We find one of the fallen children of Adam at the Cross; penitent, humbled, and believing, at the foot of the Cross. He came there, not because it was naturally in his heart to come, for he was once a totally depraved being, and hated nothing so much as the holy salvation procured by God's crucified Son.—Salvation was freely offered to him through the Cross, but he would not accept it; nor did he accept it until God, by his own almighty power, created within him a new heart and a new spirit, and transformed his character from death in trespasses and sins to spiritual life. "He is God's workmanship created anew in Christ Jesus, after the image of him that created him." Now, is there any reason to believe that God would thus have made bare his arm to awaken, convince and renew this once depraved creature, and conduct him to the Cross of his Son, and give him joy and peace in believing, only to suffer him, at some future period, to break away from the Cross and perish? Is it thus that the God of heaven honors and magnifies the riches of his grace toward guilty men? Would he do all this, unmoved and uninduced by a single trait of excellence in the sinner, and from mere compassion toward him as self-ruined and condemned, and, now that he has imparted to him a portion of his own comeliness, leave his work unfinished, and suffer him to sink unrecovered, and irrecoverably, into deeper sin, and a deeper damnation? Is such the method of grace revealed in the Gospel? Is this the extent

of God's compassions? Does he do no more than introduce men, in all the weakness and ignorance of their spiritual infancy, into his own family, and then leave them to go alone, and stumble and fall, and perish? Or does he, now that he has led them so far, pledge himself "never to leave nor forsake them?" to keep them as the apple of his eye, to nourish and bring them up as children, and fit them for his heavenly kingdom? Which were the most like God? I read in the Scriptures such declarations as these:—"Whom he loved, he loved to the end." "The gifts and calling of God are without repentance." "The Lord forsaketh not his saints; they are preserved forever." "In whom also, after that ye *believed*, ye were *sealed* with that Holy Spirit of promise, which is the *earnest* of your inheritance until the redemption of the purchased possession." "Being confident of this *very thing*, that he which hath *begun* a good work in you, *will perform it* until the day of Jesus Christ." And what do they teach us, if not that the God of love never leaves his own work unfinished, and that what he begins with grace he ends in glory? It would be a new view of God, to my own mind, that he ever abandons those whom he has once united to his Son. It is, I am persuaded, a view unauthorized by the Scriptures.—There is joy in heaven over one sinner that repenteth; but the joy would be premature, if he had entered on a course that might, after all, terminate in the chambers of death. Strange that the dream should ever have been told, that the grace of God, so wonderful and so unchanging, does not preserve and secure the triumphs it has once achieved.

Take now another view of this same general thought. This regenerated and believing sinner, so lately brought to the Cross, is *pardoned and justified*. By faith in the Cross of Christ, he not only possesses a different character from that he once possessed, but is brought into *new relations*. He is no longer under the law, but under grace. He is in a state of grace—a justified state.—From the moment of his believing, the sentence of condemnation which he had incurred by his transgressions is removed; he is judicially absolved from punishment; his debt to divine justice is paid; and a righteousness is imputed to him which answers every demand of the law of God. He is reinstated in the favor of his once offended Sovereign, and entitled to all the immunities of his kingdom. He is united by a living faith to the Saviour, and

has become one with him, as the branches are united to the vine, and the members of the body to its head. The precious faith by which he is thus united to the Living Vine he "obtained *through the righteousness* of God, even our Saviour Jesus Christ." Now, how does the notion of falling away from the Cross accord with this *justified state* of every believer? Paul, in speaking of this condition of all true believers, uses the following language: "Therefore, being justified by faith, we have peace with God, through our Lord Jesus Christ; by whom also we have access by faith unto *this grace wherein we stand*, and rejoice in the hope of the glory of God." He regards the believer's justification as a *permanent* reinstatement in the divine favor; and he goes on to reason strongly and conclusively in support of his position. His argument is this: If God gave his Son to *die* for men, while they were yet *enemies* to him, how much rather, now that they are become his *friends*, shall he save them *through his death*? "God commendeth his love toward us, in that while we were yet *sinners*, Christ died for us. Much more then, *being now justified by his blood*, we shall be *saved* from wrath through him." In perfect accordance with this are all the representations of justification which are given in the Bible. God never forgives one of the sins of his people, without forgiving them all. When he once forgives them, there is no more condemnation. "Their sins and iniquities will I remember *no more*." Justification is represented as being *unto life*, to life eternal. "There is *no condemnation* to them which are in Christ Jesus; for the law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me *free* from the law of sin and death." Is the hypothesis to be allowed, that those who bear so near a relation to Jesus Christ as to be the members of his own body, will ever perish? or is it more in accordance with what we know of him to believe the encouraging assurance, "Because I live, ye shall live also!"

The faith which was at first through his righteousness, will, through his righteousness, be perpetuated to the last; and the union which it once forms with him will never be dissolved.—Such is the obvious teaching of the Scriptures. "He that *believeth* shall be *saved*." If, as we have already seen, none will be saved without persevering in holiness, and if all who believe shall be saved, then all who believe shall persevere in holiness. God has given this promise the solemn and emphatic form of a *co-*

venant—a covenant “ordered in all things and sure,” and pledging to his people “the sure mercies of David.” Read his own interesting description of that covenant: “Behold the days come, saith the Lord, that I will make a *new covenant* with the house of Israel and the house of Judah, not according to the covenant I made with their fathers; but this shall be the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel: After those, saith the Lord, I will put my law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts, and I *will be* their God, and they *shall be* my people.— And I will make an *everlasting* covenant with them, and I will *not turn away* from them to do them good, but I will put my fear in their hearts, and they **SHALL NOT** turn away from me.” In writing to the Hebrews, Paul speaks of this covenant not only as a *new covenant*, but a “*better covenant*,” and established upon “*better promises*,” than the covenant of Sinai. The covenant at Sinai was a pledge of the divine favor *so long as the Israelites persevered in their obedience*, but did not promise *persevering obedience itself*; but this new covenant contains this “*better promise*,” and this promise constitutes its great pre-eminence. A *justified state* is one of the promises of this covenant—a promise made to faith as the revealed condition of its blessings.— The great and primary condition of that covenant was the sufferings of the Cross; and it has been fulfilled, and “by one offering he hath *perfected forever* them that are sanctified.” But there is a subordinate condition fulfilled by believers themselves in those transactions into which faith enters with their great Surety, and this also has been fulfilled. Nothing can be more to our purpose than the declarations of the apostle, urging the encouragements of this gracious covenant, when he says, “The just by faith *shall live*; but if any man *draw back*, my soul hath no pleasure in him. But *we are not of them who draw back unto perdition*, but of them that *believe to the saving of the soul*.” If there be such a final falling away from this *state of justification*; what is the import of such declarations as the following?—“He that believeth on the Son *hath everlasting life*, and shall *not come* into condemnation, but *is passed* from death unto life.” “This is the will of him that sent me, that every one that seeth the Son, and *believeth* on him, may have *everlasting life*, and I will *raise him up at the last day*.” “Whom he called, them he also justified, and whom he *justified*, them he also *glorified*.”—

“Faithful is he that calleth you, who also will *do it*.” “For the mountains shall depart, and the hills shall be removed, but my kindness shall not depart from thee, nor shall the covenant of my peace be removed, saith the Lord God, that hath mercy on thee.”—*Dr. Spring's Attractions of the Cross.*

The Puritans.

We would speak first of the Puritans, the most remarkable body of men perhaps, which the world has ever produced. The odious and ridiculous parts of their character lie on the surface. He that runs may read them; nor have there been wanting attentive and malicious observers to point them out. For many years after the Restoration, they were the theme of unmeasured invective and derision. They were exposed to the utmost licentiousness of the press and of the stage, at the time when the press and the stage were most licentious. They were not men of letters; they were as a body unpopular; they could not defend themselves; and the public would not take them under its protection. They were therefore abandoned, without reserve, to the tender mercies of the satirists and dramatists. The ostentatious simplicity of their dress, their sour aspect, their nasal twang, their stiff posture, their long graces, their Hebrew names, the Scriptural phrases which they introduced on every occasion, their contempt of human learning, their detestation of polite amusement, were indeed fair game for the laughers. But it is not from the laughers alone that the philosophy of history is to be learnt.—And he who approaches this subject should carefully guard against the influence of that potent ridicule, which has already misled so many excellent writers.

Those who roused the people to resistance—who directed their measures through a long series of eventful years—who formed, out of the most unpromising materials, the finest army that Europe had ever seen—who trampled down King, Church, and Aristocracy—who, in the short intervals of domestic sedition and rebellion, made the name of England terrible to every nation on the face of the earth, were no vulgar fanatics. Most of their absurdities were mere external badges, like the signs of freemasonry, or the dresses of friars.

The Puritans were men whose minds had derived a peculiar character from the daily contemplation of superior beings and eternal interests. Not content with acknowledging, in general terms, an overruling Providence, they habitually ascribed every event to the will of the Great Being, for whose power nothing was too vast, for whose inspection nothing was too minute. To know him, to serve him, to enjoy him, was with them the great end of existence. They rejected with contempt the ceremonious homage which other sects substituted for the pure worship of the soul. Instead of catching occasional glimpses of the Deity thro' an obscuring veil, they aspired to gaze full on the intolerable brightness, and to commune with him face to face. Hence originated their contempt for terrestrial distinctions. The difference between the greatest and meanest of mankind seemed to vanish, when compared with the boundless interval which separated the whole race from him on whom their own eyes were constantly fixed. They recognised no title to superiority but his favor; and confident of that favor, they despised all the accomplishments and all the dignities of the world. If they were unacquainted with the works of philosophers and poets, they were deeply read in the oracles of God. If their names were not found in the registers of heralds, they felt assured that they were recorded in the Book of Life. If their steps were not accompanied by a splendid train of menials, legions of ministering angels had charge over them. Their palaces were houses not made with hands; their diadems crowns of glory which should never fade away!—On the rich and the eloquent, on nobles and priests, they looked down with contempt: for they esteemed themselves rich in a more precious treasure, and eloquent in a more sublime language, nobles by the right of an earlier creation, and priests by the imposition of a mightier hand. The very meanest of them was a being to whose fate a mysterious and terrible importance belonged—on whose slightest action the Spirits of light and darkness looked with anxious interest—who had been destined, before heaven and earth were created, to enjoy a felicity which should continue when heaven and earth should have passed away.—Events which short-sighted politicians ascribed to earthly causes had been ordained on his account. For his sake empires had risen, and flourished, and decayed. For his sake the Almighty had proclaimed his will by the pen of the evangelist, and the harp of the prophet. He had been rescued by no common deliverer from the grasp of no common foe. He had been ransomed by the sweat of no vulgar agony, by the blood of no earthly sacrifice. It was for him that the sun had been darkened, that the rocks had been rent, that the dead had arisen, that all nature had shuddered at the sufferings of her expiring God!

Thus the Puritan was made up of two different men, the one all self-abasement, penitence, gratitude, passion; the other proud,

calm, inflexible, sagacious. He prostrated himself in the dust before his Maker; but he set his foot on the neck of his king. In his devotional retirement, he prayed with convulsions, and groans, and tears. He was half maddened by glorious or terrible illusions. He heard the lyres of angels, or the tempting whispers of fiends. He caught a gleam of the Beatific Vision, or woke screaming from dreams of everlasting fire. Like Vane, he thought himself intrusted with the sceptre of the millennial year. Like Fleetwood, he cried in the bitterness of his soul that God had hid his face from him. But when he took his seat in the council, or girt on his sword for war, these tempestuous workings of the soul had left no perceptible trace behind them. People, who saw nothing of the godly but their uncouth visages, and heard nothing from them but their groans and their whining hymns, might laugh at them. But those had little reason to laugh, who encountered them in the hall of debate, or in the field of battle. These fanatics brought to civil and military affairs a coolness of judgment, and an immutability of purpose, which some writers have thought inconsistent with their religious zeal, but which were in fact the necessary effects of it. The intensity of their feelings on one subject made them tranquil on every other. One overpowering sentiment had subjected to itself pity and hatred, ambition and fear. Death had lost its terrors and pleasure its charms. They had their smiles and their tears, their raptures and their sorrows, but not for the things of this world. Enthusiasm had made them Stoics, had cleared their minds from every vulgar passion and prejudice, and raised them above the influence of danger and corruption. It sometimes might lead them to pursue unwise ends, but never to choose unwise means. They went through the world like Sir Artegale's iron man Talus with his flail, crushing and trampling down oppressors, mingling with human beings, but having neither part nor lot in human infirmities; insensible to fatigue, to pleasure, and to pain; not to be pierced by any weapon, not to be withstood by any barrier.

Such we believe to have been the character of the Puritans. We perceive the absurdity of their manners. We dislike the sullen gloom of their domestic habits. We acknowledge that the tone of their minds was often injured by straining after things too high for mortal reach. Yet when all circumstances are taken into consideration, we do not hesitate to pronounce them a brave, a wise, an honest, and a useful body. The Puritans espoused the cause of civil liberty, mainly because it was the cause of religion.—*Macaulay's Miscellanies,*

THE
Calvinistic Magazine.

[NEW SERIES.]

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

Vol I.

August, 1846.

No. 8.

[EDITORIAL.]

Methodist Episcopalian.

REV. E. F. SEVIER.

"Admit nothing, deny every thing, and call for proof."—
[*Maxim of the pettifogging Lawyer.*]

"The King can do no wrong."—[*Legal fiction of the British Constitution.*]

"Let all things be done decently and in order."—[*I Corinthians, 14: 40.*]

In the March number of the Calvinistic Magazine, the following article appeared as an extract from the "Home Missionary," one of our most respectable publications:

"METHODIST ADMISSIONS TO THE CHURCH.

"This leads me to speak of one of our difficulties as Presbyterians. We receive none to our church, *till they give satisfactory evidence of conversion.* Not so, our brethren of the other denomination. When sinners are awakened, alarmed, and in distress, they begin anxiously to inquire 'what shall I do? where go?' The preacher tells them, 'join the church, for almost all who join the church, and attend meetings regularly, get converted; the old ship of *Zion* has carried many a full cargo safely into the port of everlasting happiness; she will carry you; come, get aboard. To join the church is no disgrace, for all men will think the better of you for it; and if you can't hold out, your name will just be scratched off the class-book, without any disgrace whatever. Come join the church.' Then the church sing, shout, clap and shake hands; while the preacher still exhorts, raising his voice above the noise, they go through the congregation, taking the anxious by the hand, and lead them

to the stand; shake hands with them, and often kiss them; and welcome them as *brethren* into the church. This kind of exercise they often keep up for hours. Now, that sinner who has confidence in the church, and in the preachers, and who does not join under such circumstances, must be stubborn indeed. Thus they swept our sixty anxious or converted sinners into the church.—*Home Missionary.*”

The ninth number of the Methodist Episcopalian contains the following notice of the above, over the signature of E. F. Sevier:

“METHODIST ADMISSIONS TO THE CHURCH.

“The March number of the ‘Calvinistic Magazine’ presents its numerous readers with a short article under the above caption, purporting to be an extract from the ‘Home Missionary.’ Who the writer is, we know not; it is sufficient for the present that its statements and declarations are endorsed by the editorial corps of the Magazine. Some of its statements are true, and some are false. That our Presbyterian brethren receive none into their church but such as *they declare* to be converted, I believe is true, but that the persons themselves are genuinely converted I verily believe is exceedingly doubtful, for some of them say they have no religion, and in many instances their conduct gives sad proof of it. When sinners, who are awakened and in deep distress, ask of Methodist ministers ‘what shall they do’—‘where go;’ amongst other things, we advise them to join the church, assuring them if they are faithful it will prove a blessing to them, as it has to thousands. And here we would ask, do not our Presbyterian brethren do the same? do they not go to the anxious and persuade them to join their church, assuring them it is both their duty and privilege? Do not Methodists and Presbyterians both, assure the people that ‘it is no disgrace to join the church?’ and that all men who think correctly, ‘will think the better of them for it?’ Why then reproach the Methodists for doing that which the Presbyterians as constantly do?

“It is not true that Methodist preachers say, ‘if you can’t hold out your name will just be scratched off the class-book, without any disgrace whatever.’ All persons are received into the M. E. Church on six months probation; at the close of which any are at liberty to withdraw without censure, if they are not satisfied: whilst on the other hand, if their conduct is not acceptable to the church, they can be discontinued. But all this is previous to their being admitted into full communion or membership, in the church. But after they are received into full communion, should they be guilty of immorality, their names are not ‘just scratched off the class-book,’ as the writer says, but they are regularly brought to trial, and if found guilty,

expelled from the church. Also, should any, for reasons satisfactory to themselves, desire to leave our church, they are permitted to do so, without censure or reproach. We ask if persons are not permitted to withdraw from the *Presbyterian* church, without censure or reproach, when there are no charges preferred against them?

“Again, it is not true that the Methodist church *always* ‘sing, shout, clap and shake hands,’ while the ‘preacher invites the people to join the church.’ Again, it is not true, but utterly false, that Methodists ‘*often kiss them*’ who come forward to join the church. The writer of the article knew it was false when he penned it—the editors of the Magazine knew it was false when they endorsed and published it, and it is known to be false by the whole community. It is a slander upon a numerous and highly respectable body of christian ministers: it is a slander upon a large and respectable number of christian females. We challenge the editors of the Magazine to the proof; when and where did it ever take place? If it is of frequent occurrence, it is easily susceptible of proof. Come, Messrs. Editors, bring forward your witnesses; give us times, places and persons: and sustain your declarations, or confess you have misrepresented and slandered the ministers and members of a sister church. We call upon the pious and candid of all churches, and upon the candid who are not of any church, to say whether they have ever witnessed this ‘kissing’ between preachers and people, at the time of their joining the church? We anticipate your answer. Not one solitary case have you ever beheld.
E. F. SEVIER.”

Our Rev. brother seems to be angry—but at what? Jonah thought he did well to be angry for the gourd. And from Jonah down to Mr. Sevier, many good people have thought it well to be angry for a gourd. Mr. Sevier is angry, especially, because he understands our article to be “a slander upon a numerous and highly respectable body of christian ministers; and a slander upon a large and respectable number of christian females”—in the particular of “*this kissing between preachers and people.*”

Now, we intend to make it appear, presently, that Mr. Sevier has forgotten his grammar while reading the Calvinistic Magazine, and so has misunderstood the King’s English. But as we want our readers to know Mr. Sevier’s views, touching his brethren in the premises, we will suppose, merely for that purpose, that he read our extract right. And in reply we remark,

I. That Mr. Sevier is mistaken in thinking his opinion of Methodist preachers is that of the public.

He vouches, as we read him, for the immaculate practice of every Methodist minister, in the matter in question! Observe: the writer in the Home Missionary, (from Illinois, as we find in the original work,) asserts, *as Mr. Sevier understands him*, that "this kissing between preachers and respectable females," often occurs in the region where he labors. This statement Mr. S. repels, and says—"the writer of the article knew it to be false when he penned it." But how does Mr. S. know this? Was he present in Illinois on those occasions, and does he on his eye-sight assure us, that the writer wrote wilful falsehood? Mr. Sevier was certainly not there. How then can he be sure these things did not happen in Illinois?

There is only one way to explain such a denial. Mr. Sevier must believe *that it is an absolute fact*, that Methodist ministers in this particular are immaculate. And he must believe this only of Methodist preachers! Because, he will not say that such a thing as kissing a female, when admitted into the church, never, in "one solitary case," has occurred under the priestly ministrations of Rome. Neither do we believe he will vouch for every Rt. Rev. Bishop Onderdonk in the Episcopal church in the United States. Nor can we persuade ourselves he will pronounce it a slander, if he should see in the Methodist Quarterly Journal, that such a thing had been at a Presbyterian sacrament in Illinois. It is clear, we think, that Mr. S. confines his belief on the subject to his brethren—and that it is a fixed fact, in the absolute sense, that this thing has never been beheld, under Methodist ministry, any where, at any time. Mr. S. must believe this. For, if he allows there have been exceptions, then those exceptions may have been the cases seen by the Home Missionary in Illinois, and the writer did not pen what he knew to be false—then the editors did not endorse what they knew to be untrue—then the whole community do not know the statement to be a slander. No. It is clear Mr. S. holds there can be no exceptions; and that the universal proposition is true, that Methodist ministers on the point in question can do no wrong, and that every body knows it.—Why, then, does he call for proof? Where is the proof to come from? If a man ever so respectable says—"I saw this kissing," Mr. S. replies—"You know it to be false." If a corps of editors publishes the statement, Mr. S. avers "You know it to

be false." Nay, if the whole community should avow their belief, Mr. S. affirms, "*You, the whole community, know it to be false.*" Evidently he denies the possibility of proof, and we are shut up to the conclusion that Mr. S. has applied in sober earnest, to Methodist preachers in the premises, the legal fiction of the Constitution of Great Britain,—"*The King can do no wrong,*" and he seems sure the whole world agrees with him!!!

We admire Mr. Sevier's ambition. His motto must be *Excelsior*. He certainly has climbed higher than Romish priest ever dared to stand—for the priest only claimed infallibility in doctrine. He never claimed to be immaculate in practice.—But Mr. S. has reached that elevation. Well, as he is up so high, we, the editors of the Calvinistic Magazine, must needs make allowance for what he has said of us. When a man's head is turned by his elevation to a precipice, we feel for his dizziness. And "should a wise man utter vain knowledge, and fill his belly with the east wind," we can, like Job, bear his rebuke, and live.

We have proved that Rev. E. F. Sevier thinks his brother ministers are immaculate in the decency and order of their mode of admission to the church. We have said, public opinion is not with him. So far from it, the public mind is prepared to believe statements of disorder and indecency in Methodist preachers touching this very subject. For, we have the *positive* and the *comparative* degrees of disorder in Methodist practices all around us in East Tennessee. It would be, then, no stretch of faith to think that the *superlative* degree had been reached by the progressive Methodism in Illinois, or other places, more favorable to the developement of fanaticism. And we believe that had the statement been made in the Home Missionary just as Mr. S. reads it, the community would have been as far as ourselves from *knowing* it to be false, or even *thinking* it untrue. But,

II. Mr. Sevier is mistaken in the meaning of the passage in the Calvinistic Magazine, which so offends him.

The objectionable paragraph, especially, is that which contains "this kissing"—beginning "then the church," &c. Now let the reader turn to it, and say if the following is not the plain grammatical meaning of the words:—"Then *the church* sing,

shout, clap and shake hands; while the preacher still exhorts, raising his voice above the noise, *they* [*the church*] go through the congregation, taking the anxious by the hand, and lead them to the stand; shake hands with them, and often kiss them; and welcome them as brethren into the church." No grammarian will dare deny that construction, nor assert it can have any other. And we ask, does the writer say there was "this kissing between the preachers and people?" No. Does he use the word *female* in the whole article? No. Where, then, is the "slander upon a numerous and highly respectable body of christian ministers, and a large and respectable body of christian females?" No where. For, the assertion is not made, nor intended to be made, which Mr. S. denounces as a slander. He forgot his grammar. He misunderstood the King's English. He had been "nursing his wrath to keep it warm" against the editors of the Calvinistic Magazine, and tortured the sense of the passage to justify the expression of his feelings.

Will Mr. Sevier stand corrected? or will he denounce even our sense of the words, and affirm that it is a slander to say that Methodist church members—the men on their side of the aisle, and the women on the other, ever did, in a single case, any where, "shout, clap and shake hands, and go through the congregation, and lead the anxious to the stand, shake hands with them, kiss them, and welcome them as brethren into the church?" Will Mr. S. deny that this ever occurred in Illinois? Will he deny it ever occurred in East Tennessee? Then let him deny that the Arab on the desert of Zahara travels over sand—that the sailor at sea floats on water;—then let him deny that Methodists have camp-meetings and altars of straw—that they clap hands and shout;—or will Mr. S. tell us that on all such occasions of disorder and indecency, *he shuts his eyes, and chooses not to see?* Well, if Mr. S. should shut his eyes to what he may not wish to see, he would only imitate his God, according to Dr. Clark, the Methodist Commentator. For Dr. C. assures us that God *knows only what he chooses to know!!!* We pause to ask—How does such a God differ from Baal?—"Cry aloud," said Elijah to the prophets of Baal on Carmel—"Cry aloud, for he is a God—in a journey, or peradventure he sleepeth, and must not be awaked." What is the difference between Baal asleep, and Jehovah knowing only what he

chooses to know? Truly, we see not why a Methodist preacher might not follow the example of his God, if he holds with Dr. Clark, and KNOW ONLY WHAT HE CHOOSES TO KNOW!

Will Mr. Sevier stand corrected, and confess his wrong?—We believe he will not. Solomon wondered at three things—“The way of an eagle in the air; the way of a serpent on a rock; and the way of a ship in the midst of the sea.”—Prov. 30: 19. Had Solomon lived the last hundred years, he would have added two more things to his list of wonders.—*First*, that Methodist preachers have hardly been known fairly to state a Presbyterian fact, or honestly to meet a Calvinistic argument. *Secondly*, that Methodist preachers have been still more reluctant to acknowledge wrong when they have been convicted of having used words of personal abuse towards Presbyterian ministers.

III. Mr. Sevier is mistaken in supposing he is qualified to rebuke, or to decapitate at one blow, a whole editorial corps of Presbyterian ministers.

An elegant writer on the power of REBUKE says, that “an indispensable quality in the *Reprover*, is that prompt and vigorous intelligence, to which the epithet Good Sense is applied;”—just the opposite of that “contempt of common sense which has been the special characteristic of debauched pietism in every age.” This is just to the point. For, we ask, from whence but from the region of a debauched pietism, lacking common sense, could have come such a *rebukey*, as this awarded to us by the Rev. E. F. Sevier? Just look at the thing.—The senior editor is perhaps seventy years old, with a reputation claiming more respect than his gray hairs, and living a hundred and fifty miles from the press—another editor lives forty miles—a third fifteen miles. Now Mr. S. had no moral certainty that three of the editorial corps knew any thing of this little extract, before it was published. Yet at once, showing he had been waiting impatiently to strike at the first possible pretext, he lifts his cleaver at the neck of the whole editorial corps, and declares positively to the world that they have endorsed and published what *they knew to be false!* Caligula, the Roman Emperor, wished in his fury that the whole people had just *one neck*, that, at a blow, he might behead the empire.

The Rev. E. F. Sevier seems not to have been quite so hor-

ribly sublime in his desire—yet he appears to have thought he had Caligula's wish on a small scale;—he had four Presbyterian heads on one editorial neck; and, certainly, his cleaver has fallen with the spirit of Caligula. But, Mr. Sevier has never studied how to decapitate. And if we might protest, we would cry out against execution being done upon us by a weak man hewing with a dull axe. How Caligula would have wielded his blade, we do not know; but we have the following account of a splendid decapitation, at the hands of Saladin, the Saracen Sultan, which we give for Mr. Sevier's benefit:—A Grand Master of the Knight's Templars, during the Crusades, had assassinated a companion in arms: but a Dwarf saw him, and heard him say "*take that,*" as he stabbed his victim. Saladin was informed of this during a truce, and a feast given by him to the Crusaders. He told the Dwarf to say *those words* at a certain sign. The pavilion was filled with Christian and Moslem warriors—and Richard was there—all in robes of peace. The sherbet bowl went round. The Templar took the cup.—Alas! if he drinks, according to Saracen hospitality, he cannot be slain. But, ere the cup reached his lip, "*take that!*" said the Dwarf. "The Templar started, as a horse that sees a lion by the path. The sabre of Saladin left its sheath, as the lightning leaves the cloud, and the head of the Grand Master rolled to the extremity of the tent—the trunk yet standing, and holding up the untasted goblet."

We, the editorial corps, might have been gratified, had we suffered execution in that style. Saladin is dead, it is true, but Mr. Sevier may study how to decapitate, even yet, at Constantinople. The Turk, it is said, can take off a man's head so mercifully, that the poor fellow don't know it, until it drops off, when he stoops to spit. The editors of the Calvinistic Magazine are satisfied they are not dead after that sort—having made sufficient trials to ascertain the fact of life.

IV. Rev. Mr. Sevier is mistaken in thinking he can prevent the editors of the Calvinistic Magazine from exposing disorder and indecency in religious practices.

See here, sir, are some altar pictures, taken, not from a Roman Cathedral, but appertaining, especially, to camp-meetings, and kindred excitements. The pictures are not oil paintings. We give them only as charcoal sketches.

Look! here is the first picture:—There are three preachers seated in the pulpit, and one, with a *crazy eye*, standing up.—Another, a *little sober man*, with bent brow, is on a bench upon the ground, just under the desk. There are some twelve hundred people. A few seem to have risen, together, to their feet. The rest are seated and look dissatisfied. *What does this picture mean?* It represents a scene, one Saturday, at a camp-meeting. Two dull discourses have been preached. It is past 1 o'clock. The man standing with the *crazy eye*, wants to deliver himself of a Rig-ma-role sermon; but he sees the people look hungry, not for what he has to say, but for their dinner, and he cries with a loud voice—"Who, for the sake of the Lord Jesus Christ, will lose his dinner?" And some are on their feet to oblige the preacher; and the many keep their seats, for they have some common sense, and are hungry. *The little sober man* has his brows knit, because he regards the thing with grief and shame.

Second Picture.—A dining-room. The table set and covered with food. A man on one side of the fire-place. His right hand on his cheek. His eyes half shut, the lids trembling.—A lady standing near the table, with compressed lips and swimming eyes; and the same *little sober man*, also at the table, talking, with mock gravity, to the man with his eyes half shut.—*What does this picture describe?* It signifies a thing which happened after the *fast* which was proclaimed by the preacher with the *crazy eye*. The man by the fire-place with the half shut and trembling lids, is the presiding minister, trying hard to forget the table and *keep the fast*. The lady is his wife, trying as hard to keep her laughter. *The little sober man* is saying to his brother preacher, that, as he had only promised to lose his *dinner*, and as the table was now set for the evening meal, as well as for dinner, he had better draw up, and *take some supper!!!* And did he? Aye, did he!!!—and his *supper* was so ample, we have serious doubts if there was much self-denial in his abstaining from *dinner*.

Third Picture, in two scenes.—*1st scene*—a wood—time, sun-down. A crowd of women, on their knees and in other positions—shouting, clapping hands, losing caps, neckerchiefs, combs, reticules—hair flying, necks and feet exposed,—men and boys looking on. Then, in a stream of excitement, return-

ing to the camp-ground. *2d scene*—a tent, full of people, all in confusion. A female on the floor. The man with the *crazy eye* mumbling over her. A lady of fine appearance, with disordered locks, is shaking the *little sober man* soundly by the shoulders. He stands as cool as a judge—says a word or two, and then goes away. *What does this picture reveal?* It is a shouting exercise in the woods, and a continuation of the same thing in the tent. The female on the floor is exhausted from animal excitement. The man with the *crazy eye* is exhorting. The lady of fine appearance with flowing hair, is shaking the shoulders of the *little sober man*, in her eager desire to know why he does not shout, and enjoy religion. The *little sober man* looks cool as a judge, because he is so. And he says he does not worship God after that way, and he is refusing to pray for the exhausted woman on the floor, because he will not give that sort of thing his encouragement. But he promises to return when they are themselves again. He begs them to be composed, that they may hear the word of God at the shed, and goes away, grieved, that some say they had rather shout than hear preaching. Well, did the *little sober man* go back there again? Yes, he did. And he found all quiet. And the lady of fine appearance “clothed and in her right mind.” And he said to her, “How do you feel now, madam?” And she answered—“Very much ashamed, sir.” And the *little sober man* said to himself—Amen!

Fourth Picture.—Many persons on the anxious seat—the sun is shining, and then the stars come out, and then the sun rises again. The *little sober man* is on his horse, and seems to say good-bye. What does this picture mean? It shows those who are excited on the subject of religion under the shed. The sun shines, and the stars come out, and the sun rises again, to represent the fact, that, on that occasion, some persons seriously proposed to keep those *mourners*, as they called them, there, on that bench, *all night*, until THEY GOT THROUGH! The *little sober man*, grieved and disgusted, is on his horse, and does say good-bye.

Fifth Picture. A sheep-fold. And, lo! some of the *sheep* are changing to dogs, who jump over the fence, and run with uncommon readiness, to certain nasty places. Other *sheep* are turning to swine—they squeal, and squeeze through the en-

closure, and go grunting back to their muddy places. The shepherd stands and looks on with astonishment and horror.—*What does this picture teach?* It reveals the fact, that in twelve months from that camp-meeting, the minister who presided, told the *little sober man*, that he admitted some sixty members to his church, under that excitement, and he believed *every one* had gone back, like “the dog to his vomit, and the sow to her wallowing in the mire.”

Will Mr. Sevier cry out—False! False! Slander! Slander! Softly, good brother—this was a Presbyterian camp-meeting—these were Presbyterian preachers—aye, Old School as well as New—and Presbyterian doings. The pictures, moreover, are not highly colored. They do not by any means exhibit to the life the indecency and disorder of the occasion. Thank God! it was the last camp-meeting ever held at that place.

Now, if these things were done in the green tree, what will be done in the dry? If the very *asbestos* of religious decorum can thus be burnt up, what will become of the *tow linen*? If sober Presbyterians can thus run into wild-fire, what will be the flame of Methodism?

Let us take down these pictures, and hang up others. The sketches now to be shown will hardly need the interpreter.

No. 1.—A shouting scene in full hurrah. A woman throws her arm over the shoulder of the preacher. This is an innocent and unconscious act, doubtless—she is old, and he is venerable.

No. 2.—A prostrating excitement kept up for weeks. A girl falls into the arms of a youthful preacher. She is senseless—but she desires his esteem, it is thought, at other times.

No. 3.—A young man jumps from the straw of the altar—embraces the preacher—calls him his angel, and says—I have got religion by a neat calculation. This is a conversion.

No. 4.—A man exceedingly warm in the altar. He shouts and blesses the Lord, that he has brought him to a moist sweat. This is another *conversion*.

No. 5.—A woman in the altar—she shouts glory! glory! glory! to John McMullin—glory! to John McMullin. “Sister,” says another, “give glory to God.” “I say,” shrieks the woman, “glory be to John McMullin!” This is another *con-*

version. And that woman tells the truth—John McMullin has *converted* her, and she has no notion of giving the glory to God.

No. 6.—A man singing—a lady of commanding presence comes up and shakes hands. The man sings on, and says,—“We have caught the big fish—now for the minnows.” This is a *taking in* on trial. We wonder if Peter fished for *men* after that manner?

No. 7.—A man singing—young girls and boys weeping—women going through the crowd and leading some of these children up to the stand, and placing their hands in those of the singer. This is the way, sometimes, Methodist preachers sing Presbyterian children into their church.

No. 8.—A man talking at a bench where there are very young persons weeping—another is noticing what is going on. We will interpret this picture.—On a certain occasion, the Methodists held a protracted meeting in a Presbyterian church, immediately after there had been some excitement amongst the children of the congregation. The children are those on that Methodist mourners’ seat. The man talking, is saying, very courteously, that “it will give him great pleasure to call at the houses where these young people live, and pray with them there.” The other man noticing what is going on, is that *little sober man*. He observes what is said. He remarks, also, the movements of certain private members. He remembers, besides, what has been done in other places, and he is determined these children shall not be sung into the Methodist church—so he wrote the following letter:

KINGSPORT, March 19, 1845.

To Christian Parents of different Denominations.

The undersigned beg leave to present the following truths for your consideration:

God has established the relationship of parents and children, and he has commanded parents to train up their children in the way they should go.

This being the obligation upon parents, they should understand and perform their duty to their children, and children should submit to the training of their parents.

Again—Parents, under this obligation, should seek such helps as *they prefer*, and they should discountenance and resist all interference with the duty God has laid upon them.

Lastly—It is the duty of all, in society, to acknowledge the obligations which God has imposed on parents and children, and not interfere, in any way, with the performance of these obligations.

The truths above stated, we think, will not be denied by Christians; and if they are not denied, then there are practical applications of them of great importance to the well-being of Christian families.

1st. Methodist fathers and mothers are, according to the above principles, placed by the Lord over their children, and commanded to train them up in religion. Of course, then, Baptist or Presbyterian ought not, in any way, to interfere with Methodist families, in this solemn duty.

2d. Baptist fathers and mothers are placed in like obligation over their children, and commanded to teach them the ways of God. Of course, then, Methodist or Presbyterian ought not, in any way, to interfere with Baptist families, in this solemn duty.

3d. Presbyterian fathers and mothers, are placed by God over their children, and commanded to train them up in the fear and admonition of the Lord. Of course, then, Methodist or Baptist ought not, in any way, to interfere with Presbyterian families, in this solemn duty.

4th. It is a clear interference with, and violation of, the relationship which God has established between parents and children, whenever, without consent of parents, any minister of the gospel, or any other person, invites children to join a different church from that of their parents, or uses any measures with them, to interfere with their obligations to their father and mother. Because, children thus invited into a different church from that of their parents, are necessarily placed in sectarian opposition to the very teachers God has placed over them.—They are taught to disregard the religious instruction of their own parents. And this is clear interference with, and violation of, the family relationship which God has established.

5th. Consequently, such interference is all wrong, of evil tendency, going, in the end, to destroy family instruction, and ought to be fully understood, resisted, and prevented, by all proper means.

6th. When parents are in different churches, it is their duty to settle the matter between themselves—either that all the children be in one church, or divided as may be agreed.

7th. Parents are bound to give perfect liberty of choice to

their children, when that choice can be properly exercised; and the same *discretion* which is sought in other things, should be the rule, in this important duty.

Your brethren in the Lord,	
FRED. A. ROSS,	} Ministers.
DANIEL ROGAN,	
I. C. ANDERSON,	} Rul. Elders.
JOHN LYNN,	
GRIFFITH ROGAN,	
STEPHEN THOMAS,	
AARON HOFFMAN,	
JOHN PATTON,	

This letter, thus signed by two ministers and all the ruling elders, was circulated through the community. And it accomplished its object. Holston Presbytery afterwards approved the letter, by the following minute:

Extract from the minutes of Holston Presbytery, at the meeting in Jonesborough, 5th April, A. D. 1845.

“A paper was presented by the Rev. Mr. Ross, signed by two ministers and six elders, on the subject of parental rights and duties in the training of children, which was ordered to lie on the table for further action, until the meeting of Presbytery this evening.

“EVENING SESSION.

“The communication from certain ministers and elders, on the subject of parental rights and duties, was taken up and discussed. Thereupon it was moved and seconded, that the general principles contained in said communication, meet the approbation of Presbytery, and that the subject therein discussed, be recommended affectionately to the consideration of all parents.”

The above is a true extract from the minutes of Holston Presbytery. Attest,
PHILLIPS WOOD,
Stated Clerk.

Thus sanctioned, we recommend the subject to our readers, and warn them to watch the proselyting arts of Methodism, in regard to their children.

We remark, in conclusion, that it is the duty of Presbyterians, and the sober of every denomination, to understand the subject of Methodist excitement. And to aid them to comprehend the matter, we say, that

Presbyterian Calvinism, presents the gospel supremely to the moral sense—making the imaginative emotions subordinate. That is to say, it professes to bring the Truth, Justice, Mercy and Holiness of God, to bear on the understanding, conscience, and heart, so as to create, through the Holy Ghost, *moral character*, and NOTHING ELSE. Hence the passions and bodily sympathies, which belong to the imagination, are *necessarily* kept under—they must be in a subdued and tranquil action. Fanaticism, or any undue excitement, cannot exist, consistently, with that system of faith. The gospel was intended to cultivate all the powers of the soul, under the influence of the life given in the new heart, and thus to exhibit a properly balanced character—*the understanding and conscience guided by that new heart, being supreme.*

Methodist Arminianism, on the contrary, in its practical influence on the people at large, exhibits the gospel supremely to the imaginative emotions, and makes the character which belongs to the moral sense subordinate. That is to say, while it brings the Truth, Justice, Mercy and Holiness of God, to bear on the understanding, conscience and heart, and thereby, through the Spirit, creates moral character, yet it keeps this moral character under, and degrades it, by giving entire ascendancy and control to the imagination, the passions, and bodily sympathies. This Methodist Arminianism does, *first* by tampering with the doctrines of the gospel—and *secondly*, by the infusion, in various ways, of Mr. Wesley's delusions of the Direct Witness and Christian Perfection. Hence Methodism has, to a lamentable degree, made void the proper influences of the gospel. The powers of the soul are inverted. The balance-wheel is broken, and all runs riot. Grace in the heart is smothered by wood, hay, stubble—the moral man is a monster, bloated and disgusting, in huge misshape—or a wretched atomy, with hardly the flesh and blood of spiritual life at all—to say nothing of the counterfeit of all this, where there is no grace at all. Let sober men look and say if this is not a true picture. Yes, the Jews did not make void the law by their traditions, nor has the Roman Catholic perverted the gospel by his glosses and mummeries, more really than Methodism has begun the same work by the combined influences of Arminian and fanatical perversions of the word of God.

Will it be said there are piety and zeal in the Methodist ministry and people? We acknowledge this, to all proper extent—but that proves nothing, because there were piety and zeal among the Jews, notwithstanding their traditions; and there have been and are examples of piety and zeal in the Roman church. How is this? Why, God can, and does, in his sovereign pleasure, send his grace where converting truths are proclaimed, even when perverted by error, and overlaid by traditions, mummeries and fanaticism. But the broad fact remains, after all concessions, that Methodism is a debauched pietism, in which the imagination has run wild, and passion, bodily sympathy and mysticism, are supreme, while true moral character is subordinate and degraded. We speak out, and challenge examination. We speak out, and say, that rottenness is in the very bones of the moral system created by Methodism, to an awful extent. In that church, the cry ever is, as Solomon teaches—Give! give! Give what? Give us excitement—give us the shout—give us the holy laugh—give us the dream, the vision, the trance, the miraculous witness—give us the joys and raptures of sanctification. What wonder that camp-meetings and other protracted services are little better than religious frolics, attracting the young as to the theatre, the ball, the circus or the race-course, stripped of all that is attractive to intellect or taste, and leaving so much of all that is an abomination and a nuisance! What wonder that the public mind, after such scenes, undergoes the torpor and deadness of reaction! What wonder that hundreds and thousands, supposed to to have “*got religion*” under such influences, *fall from grace*, and become two-fold more the children of hell—or, hold on, with “a name to live while dead in trespasses and sins!”

In religion, the only way to prevent *going backward*, is to keep *going forward*.

A Sermon.

"Surely the wrath of man shall praise thee; the remainder of wrath shalt thou restrain."—Psalm 76: 10.

The event celebrated in this Psalm, is, most probably, the deliverance from the Assyrian army under Sennacherib, the history of which is recorded in the 18th and 19th chapters of II Kings. This haughty monarch sent a great host against Jerusalem, under three chosen commanders. Rabshakeh, one of these commanders, delivered his master's first message to four of Hezekiah's officers, in language full of wrath, and even pretended that he was sent by God.—"Am I now come up without the Lord? The Lord said to me, go up against this land and destroy it." He sent a second message to Hezekiah, full of vaunting and blasphemy. The pious Hezekiah rent his clothes, and covered himself with sackcloth. He sent to Isaiah the prophet, asking him to "lift up his prayer for the remnant that are left," for it was a day of trouble, and of rebuke and blasphemy. Isaiah's answer to the king was full of encouragement. The king went into the house of the Lord, and spread Sennacherib's letter before the Lord, and prayed most fervently for the Lord to interpose and save his people. "That night, the angel of the Lord went out, and smote in the camp of the Assyrians an hundred four score and five thousand. The Psalm has great force and beauty, when referred to this interesting history;—the psalmist exclaims in our text, "Surely the wrath of man shall praise thee; the remainder of wrath shalt thou restrain."

"The wrath of man" comprehends all the opposition of the heart against God, its irreconcilable hatred of the holy law of God, and its unyielding hostility against the gospel. Out of this depraved heart are the issues of a life of disobedience to God, a disregard of divine authority, and of transgression.

"Shall praise thee." The crimes of men have been, and will always be, the occasion of the manifestation of the perfections of God, his wisdom, power, justice and mercy. This display of God's perfections, could not be made to the same degree, and so advantageously to the universe, had not sin existed in every instance in which it has existed, or ever shall exist.—

This is not owing to the nature and tendency of sin, or the wrath of man. Its nature and tendency are to dishonor God, and produce confusion and misery. It is the over-ruling and controlling providence of God alone, that makes use of the wrath of man to praise him.

“The remainder shalt thou restrain.” That wrath of man, which is not suited to be so over-ruled as to praise God, and advance the interest of his kingdom, he will effectually restrain, and not suffer to exist.

If we have interpreted the language of the text aright, which will hardly be doubted, then the sentiment of the text is,

That the sins of men in every instance are made subservient to the glory of God, and the best interest of his kingdom; and all the sins that infinite wisdom sees could not be made subservient to these ends, he will restrain, i. e. prevent their existence.

I. This is not the doctrine of a solitary text, it pervades the pages of the inspired oracles. It is the doctrine of right reason, taught by the light of nature. It places Jehovah on the throne of his own universe, as the Sovereign Disposer of all events, ordering what shall exist, and what shall not, from the greatest to the least, and directing the will and actions of all men.

II. That the existence of the wrath of man, its continuance, the height to which it shall rise, with all its consequences, depend on the holy will of God, and are made subservient to his glory, is evident from the plainest declarations of God in his Word. “The Scripture saith unto Pharaoh, even for this same purpose have I raised thee up, that I might shew my power in thee, and that my name might be declared through all the earth; therefore hath he mercy on whom he will have mercy, and whom he will he hardeneth.”—Rom. 9: 17, 18.

III. This consoling doctrine is not only taught in the plainest and most direct terms, but it is interwoven into the narratives of facts, and the history of individuals and nations, throughout the Bible.

1. The first sin of the first man, which brought death and wo on our race, was ordered and directed by God’s unerring providence, as an event that would furnish the proper occasion for displaying the being, perfections, and purposes of God, as they are displayed in the scheme of redemption.

Had not man voluntarily apostatized from God, for any thing that created wisdom can see to the contrary, we had never heard of three coequal, coessential and coeternal persons in the one undivided Godhead. Yet this doctrine is at the bottom of the whole scheme of wisdom and mercy revealed in the Bible. Take from the Bible the doctrine of the Trinity, and you divest it of most of its glory and value.

Had not man voluntarily rebelled against God, our race, or for any thing we can see, the universe, had never known the greatest and most glorious of all mysteries, a God incarnate. "Great is the mystery of Godliness, God manifested in the flesh," &c.—I Tim. 3: 16. God's intelligent kingdom had never heard of the scenes of Calvary, the sufferings, the death, the resurrection and exaltation of God's coequal Son; of an atonement of infinite merit, as extensive as the sin and misery of our race; on which God can take his stand and proclaim pardon and salvation to all men, consistently with all the claims of his law, the honor of his crown, and the safety of his government; on which all his perfections can meet and harmonize, in saving law-condemned and hell-deserving sinners. On this atonement God has built, and continues to build his church, and on it the redeemed church will stand for ever and ever, while it makes the holiness and happiness of the glorified millions as sure and permanent as the throne of God. Through this atonement God has an opportunity to exercise his wisdom, justice, goodness and mercy, and thus perpetuate his own infinitely full felicity. By the atonement, a way is opened for God to make his kingdom unspeakably more holy and happy than could have been done by the administration of his government on the principles of mere law.

Again, in order to save man from the ruin of his apostacy, the Son of God, as Mediator, must exercise the offices of Prophet, Priest and King, and send the Holy Spirit to regenerate the hearts of sinful men, to make the dead alive—a work that will display the glory of God much more than the works of creation. But for this scheme of mercy to redeem fallen man, the plains of glory could never resound with the song from "a multitude that no man can number," "Unto him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood, and hath made us kings and priests unto God and his Father, to him be glory and

dominion for ever and ever.”—Rev. 1: 5, 6. God is glorified in the highest degree—“Glory to God in the highest”—his infinite blessedness perpetuated, his intelligent kingdom made unspeakably more blessed by the plan of grace, than it could otherwise have been; but, in order to the existence of this scheme, there must be sinners to redeem. Then was it not worthy of God so to order and manage his creatures, that man would voluntarily sin, and need the scheme of mercy? God’s ordering and directing the fall of man, did not interfere with man’s free agency, by suspending it, by crippling it, or infringing upon it; man exercised all possible liberty and free agency; the fall was a voluntary act, and every other sin is a voluntary act.

2. The history of Joseph is in point. God had predicted the event in dreams to Joseph, yet its accomplishment depended on the voluntary sinful exercises and actions of Joseph’s brethren. They envy him, they hate him, design at one time to murder him, and at length inhumanly sell him to strangers, and he is carried into Egypt and sold into slavery. All this was ordered by God for his own glory and the good of the church. “Joseph said, as for you, ye thought evil against me; but God meant it unto good, to bring to pass as it is this day, to save much people alive.”—Gen. 50: 20. “Be not grieved nor angry with yourselves, that ye sold me hither, for God did send me before you to preserve life—to preserve you a posterity in the earth, and to save your lives by a great deliverance.” Gen. 45: 5—7. See Gen. 35: 7—10. The wrath of Joseph’s brethren accomplished God’s will, purpose or decree, respecting Joseph. The remainder of their wrath, for they designed to murder him, God restrained.

God had not yet accomplished his wise purpose by merely sending Joseph into Egypt, he must be raised to greatness and power. What means does God employ? The lasciviousness and falsehood of Potiphar’s wife, his imprisonment, the misdemeanor and dreams of the baker and butler. Had Potiphar put Joseph to death, God’s purpose would not have been executed. But all the wrath in this whole affair, that would not have praised God, was restrained.

3. God had foretold by the prophet Abijah, that he would rend ten tribes from the house of David; yet had Rehoboam followed the counsel of the old men, this prediction must have

failed of accomplishment; but Rehoboam voluntarily followed the foolish and wicked counsel of the young men. This act of the king, rent from the house of David, the ten tribes. It was decreed by Heaven, that the ten tribes would revolt, which they did voluntarily. Now, did God intend this event, without decreeing the means? Was it to be left to mere chance, or to some means of which God knew nothing, or about which he had no purpose? These questions are all answered by the inspired writer of I Kings, 12: 15.—“Wherefore, the king hearkened not unto the people; for the cause was from the Lord, that he might perform his saying, which the Lord spake by Abijah.”

4. The most remarkable instance of the wrath of man praising God, is the voluntary betrayal of the Savior by Judas, his unjust condemnation, and his crucifixion. This was an instance of the wrath of man carried to the highest pitch. His murderers had evidence that he was the Son of God, equal with the Father—evidence which they knew was the testimony of God himself—namely, miracles. But this conviction only inflamed their wrath; nothing will satisfy it, but the imbruing of their hands in his blood. Pilate was convinced of his innocence. “He knew that the chief priests had delivered him for envy.”—Mark, 15: 10; Matt. 27: 18. This was all particularly determined and appointed by God, and foretold by prophets. “They lifted up their voice and said—Lord thou art God, who by the mouth of thy servant David, hast said, why did the heathen rage, and the people imagine vain things? The kings of the earth stood up, and the rulers were gathered together against the Lord, and against his Christ, whom thou hast anointed, both Herod and Pontius Pilot, with the Gentiles and the people of Israel were gathered together to do whatsoever *thy hand and thy counsel determined before to be done.*”—Acts 4: 24—28. Peter appeals to the murderers of the Savior, in the following language:—“Ye men of Israel, hear these words: Jesus of Nazareth, a man approved (*apodedeinmenon*—from a verb that means to prove, evince, demonstrate, point out, shew plainly,) of God among you, by miracles, and wonders, and signs, which God did by him in the midst of you, as you *yourselves also know; him being delivered by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God, ye have taken and by wicked hands have cru-*

cified and slain.”—Acts, 2: 22, 23. No language can be plainer, and no sophistry can evade its obvious meaning. But had Herod killed the infant Saviour, or the Jews, who had often planned to kill him, he had never made an atonement for the sins of the world on the cross. But this wrath God restrained, and reserved to himself to make the highest pitch of their wrath praise him, and accomplish his most benevolent designs of mercy.

Not only the first sin of the first man, but the sins and universal depravity of man, were all necessary to there being such a character as Jesus Christ, and to all the glorious events which have and will take place, in consequence of what Christ has done and suffered. God is thus glorified more than he is by all his other works—“Glory to God in the highest.” The holiness and happiness of his intelligent kingdom will be unspeakably promoted above what it would have been, by the operation of law, although the law is infinitely holy, just and good. “There is more joy in heaven over one sinner that repents, than over ninety and nine just persons, that need no repentance,” for the obvious reason that God’s perfections are thereby more displayed, and his holy universe, of course, can know more of God and feel proportionably more blessed in the enjoyment of him.

“God, in the person of his Son,
Has all his mightiest work outdone.”

The doctrine of the text is not only taught by revelation, but by reason.

1st. God’s wisdom is infinite,—he sees, with unerring certainty, what would be wisest and best upon the whole from eternity to eternity. His goodness is boundless, and will most certainly choose what wisdom dictates is best. He is almighty, and can and will do what wisdom dictates, and goodness chooses. Now all things depend on the will of God for their existence, and the manner and circumstances of their existence, His plan contains all the good that his wisdom can devise, and that his goodness can desire. This plan of divine wisdom and goodness cannot be altered, and if it could, the change would be infinitely disastrous and ruinous to the best interest of the universe. If such are the perfections of God, and such the wisdom and goodness of his plan, then such a being must

be infinitely opposed to the existence of sin, had he not seen upon the whole it was best, as furnishing the occasion for such an exercise of divine wisdom, justice, goodness and mercy, as would best perpetuate God's own infinitely full felicity, and promote the highest holiness and happiness of his kingdom.— Then had not the existence of sin been best, as now explained, then unbounded wisdom and goodness must not only have opposed its existence, but must have effectually prevented it by his almighty power; and the contrary supposition would not only divest God of his wisdom, goodness and power, but undeify him entirely.

But, it may be said, God is not able to prevent sin consistently with man's free moral agency.

1st. If so, then it follows that God is not able to govern his moral system according to his will, and that he is thwarted, crossed and disappointed; of course is not infinitely happy, but infinitely miserable, as he cannot prevent sin and misery from existing to a fearful degree in opposition to his desire.

2d. If God could not have prevented the sin that has taken place, then there is no reason to suppose that he may be able to prevent sin in future in any moral agent; consequently, there can be no ground of assurance, either from the character of God, his purposes and promises, or from moral agents, that sin will not take place in every moral agent, even in holy angels and glorified spirits.

3d. God could not know what would take place among his subjects, as there would be no ground on which knowledge could exist. He could not know, on the ground of his own design and desire: for he could not prevent their course of conduct, for they are free moral agents. He could not know from any quality or attribute of the moral agent; of course he could not have safely promised that sin should be excluded from Paradise; nor can he promise on any sure ground, that sin shall be excluded from Heaven forever; and, for aught God can know or do, every holy angel and glorified spirit may, at some period in eternity, rebel against God, and sin make Heaven one boundless waste, without one holy inhabitant.

4th. According to the objection, there is no ground for any one to pray, or to trust God, that he may be preserved from sin and formed to holiness. The objection would rob the christian

of his best hopes, his trust in God "that he will be kept by the mighty power of God through faith unto salvation;" but would if he could—but alas! he is not able, and I dare not trust myself. The christian would have no ground to pray with any hope for the conversion of sinners, not even for the conversion of his own children, although God has promised to circumcise their hearts, and has ordered his covenanted promise to be sealed by the sprinkling of clean water, the symbol of the Holy Spirit's influence. But God has promised what he cannot perform, for my children are moral agents.

It is objected, that the doctrine we have been illustrating, takes all blame from sin, and if so much good comes out of sin, the more sin the better; of course there is no good sense in repenting of sin, as so much good is connected with its existence.

A distinguished Doctor of Divinity once gravely made this objection to the writer. We replied, our school distinguishes between sin as an event, and as a voluntary action of a moral agent—as an event, God will make it praise him, while all the turpitude and guilt of the voluntary act remains. Sin has no good tendency in its nature, nor has the sinner any good design. It is wholly owing to the over-ruling agency of God, that it is made to praise him, and result in good to his kingdom. Had Joseph's brethren killed him, as they at one time intended, and then gone to their father's dwelling and killed him for losing Joseph, God's wise and benevolent purposes would have been defeated. Had the wrath of Herod, in designing the death of the infant Savior, not been restrained, there never would have been a propitiation for the sins of the whole world. Our race must have been lost, and even those who had gone to Heaven on the faith of an atonement to be made in due time, must have been driven from the abodes of glory, down to hell.

I N F E R E N C E S .

1st. This doctrine affords divine support, joy and comfort, to all the friends of God, amidst the confusion, sin, guilt and misery, that abound in our fallen world. There is a God on the throne, who will bring order out of confusion, and make that which sinners intend for evil, and evil only, in their murders, robberies, oppression, cruelty, infidelity, atheism and debaucheries, as in the case of Joseph, result in good.

2d. The doctrine is an all-sufficient support to the honest, faithful and diligent minister, who, like Jeremiah, may have no success in turning sinners to God. "And now saith the Lord that formed me from the womb to be his servant, to bring Jacob again to him, though Israel be not gathered, yet shall I be glorious in the eyes of the Lord, and my God shall be my strength." Isaiah, 49: 5.

3d. How disappointed will all infidels, athiests, wicked men and devils be, whose rebellion and rage aimed at the overthrow of God's kingdom, when they see that God's over-ruling agency has made that very wrath promote the cause they designed to destroy! The devil, no doubt, thought that his agency in the apostacy of man, and in the crucifixion of Christ, would inflict irreparable injury on the government of God. He now sees, with unutterable rage and disappointment, that God made the first the occasion of the brightest displays of his Godhead and perfections, to the endless advantage of his kingdom, and the latter the direct means of saving millions.

4th. Let the heavens rejoice, and let the earth be glad, and let men tell it among the nations, "*the Lord God Omnipotent reigneth*" to do good on the largest possible scale, even all the good that almighty power can do under the direction of unerring wisdom. And he will make heaven, earth and hell, contribute to his godlike and benevolent purpose. C. N.

Short Practical Sermons—No. 1.

ATTENDANCE AT CHURCH.

"I was glad when they said unto me, let us go into the house of the Lord."—Psalm 122: 1.

The want of regularity and punctuality (too common among members of the church) in attending public worship, shows that by many it is regarded as a privilege which may be enjoyed or not, as inclination or convenience shall direct, rather than as a duty, the neglect of which involves sin. This is evi-

dent from the pitiful, childish excuses that are often rendered for absence from the house of God—such as would not be thought of for failing to attend an appointment for business or pleasure.

The precepts requiring our attendance on public worship are derived from the same high authority with those that forbid us to kill, to steal, and bear false witness, and though the offence may not be of the same magnitude, it is of the same character. It is disobedience—and disobedience fraught with the worst consequences: for it tends directly to put a stop to God's chosen means for the conversion of sinners, and thus to bring the church not only to a stand, but to extinction.

Think of this, you who loiter away the hours of the Sabbath, feeling that the day has been sufficiently kept if your ploughs are standing and your shops closed, though it's only effect has been to prepare you to pursue through the ensuing week the things of the world, with recruited energies and keener appetite,—thus turning the blessing of God into a curse.

Think of it, too, you who are more conscientious upon the subject, and feel that the day is not to be dozed away in idleness—but that the Bible and sermons and other good books are to be read, and that you will give yourselves to self-examination, meditation and prayer.

Our duties can never conflict; nor are we at liberty to substitute one for another. There is "a time for all things," and a proper time for each. The time for public worship, is not the time to read the Bible. The time to visit the sick, is not the time for private devotion;—and he who would substitute any round of duties for those appropriate to the house of God, sins in doing so.

Since it has pleased God through the "foolishness of preaching to save them that believe," it is a leading, if not the foremost christian duty, to promote attendance at church, by every means in our power—and all other means will be comparatively ineffectual, if we do not lend to them the influence of our example,—if we do not attend the sanctuary in person, and show how highly we appreciate it.

But it is our design to be wholly practical in these remarks. We will go on to notice the excuses most frequently given for neglecting this duty.

1. We will speak of weariness. This is usually the result of over-exertion through the week; and if with the knowledge that the Sabbath was at hand you have gone on so far to exhaust yourself as to be incapable of attending to its duties, I submit it to yourself to say, whether you are not a Sabbath-breaker in advance. That you are in the spirit, if not in the letter, is beyond all question. There is a "preparation" for the Sabbath, and the Jew was doubtless as scrupulous in his observance of the one as of the other.

2. The weather is often an excuse. Take care that your church is comfortable, and the weather will rarely, very rarely, interfere with your going to church; and so far from preventing your attendance, you may find *a reason in it why you should attend*, as some will necessarily be kept away, and your preacher must not be left without hearers; besides, you will show your zeal, and prevent others excusing themselves on similar grounds. Your minister will be encouraged in his preparations, under the assurance that his labors will not be dispensed to empty benches.

3. Distance keeps many from the house of God. To enable you to overcome this, you are to remember that every neighbor whose door you pass, is at least in a measure deprived of that excuse, and receives a silent rebuke as you pass him, but one which he will not fail to feel. If required to give a rule to determine how far we should go, I should say just so far as it is to the nearest church of your own denomination—and if that is too remote, then change your residence, upon the same principle that you would not live where you could not procure the necessaries of life.

4. Incapacity of the minister to instruct, is plead as an excuse for absence from the sanctuary. Instruction, though an important, is not the primary object of God's house. You go to worship God, and unite with others in a public tribute of respect for his ordinances. You will be giving, under such circumstances, higher proof of your sincerity, than if attending the ministrations of a Whitefield, and may receive the approbation and blessing of God, as effectually in the one case as the other. I have yet to hear a Presbyterian minister who was not capable of instructing, and who did not actually instruct, one half, at least, of his congregation.

5. Untimely visits of neighbors and friends, sometimes pre-

vent attendance on public worship. He who receives these visits, may safely conclude that his piety is held in low estimation, or he would not be thus intruded upon, and the best service he can render the intruder, and the best vindication of his own character, will be to leave him, and by no means should he join with him in his desecration of the Sabbath.

6. The last reason I shall notice, and I verily believe the worst, notwithstanding its plausibility, is that of going to hear some other denomination. This is a serious evil in our church, and I shall therefore give it the more extended notice.

It is very common, when there is to be a Baptist dipping, or a Methodist quarterly or camp-meeting, or some novice arrives in the neighborhood, to find the congregation thinned by the absence of many who have gone off to see the sight, or hear the shouting, or to learn "what the babbler has to say."

It will not be denied that the obligation between a regularly engaged minister and his congregation is mutual—the one to preach, the other to hear—and it is one which should not be violated for slight causes on the part of either. The minister so feels it. He feels that he must be in his pulpit at the appointed hour; and why does he feel so? It is because he expects his congregation will be present. This is the sole ground of the obligation, for he did not engage to preach to naked walls and empty benches. And I have yet to learn why the congregation should not feel the obligation equally strong upon their part.

There are causes, it is true, which may exonerate both, but they are of rare occurrence. It would be taken as a strange apology from the preacher for failing to keep his appointment, that he had found a congregation elsewhere. In ninety-nine cases out of a hundred, it is no better for the hearer, that he had found a preacher elsewhere. What multitudes will flock to Bond's camp-ground, because there it is understood the uproar is the wildest and the confusion the greatest—because the roar of the camp when in full blast can be heard over all the surrounding country. It would be well for the Presbyterian to ask himself, why does he desire to witness such scenes? Is it because he thinks them consistent with the order and solemnity of God's worship? Is it that he really believes they are calculated to do good? If he does not, can he properly lend the

sanction of his presence to them? Does he not know that while mingling in the uproarious throng, he is regarded as aiding and abetting in their folly? He that can relish such scenes, must, to say the least, have a vitiated taste, and forget, for the time, that God is not "the God of confusion."

I would say to every Presbyterian, (and it is for them I write,) before deserting your own church to visit such places, examine the motives that influence you. You may find that you are leaving the worship of God to indulge in a disposition for mere novelty—that you are using the day of God for recreation—that it is itching ears, and a disposition "to heap" to yourselves teachers, rather than a spirit of devotion which actuates you,—that you are defrauding yourselves and defrauding God, because you have a plausible pretext for it—because the place you go to is called a place of worship, not that you expect to be in a suitable frame for it while there.

In leaving your own worship on these occasions, the Sabbath is not only lost, but desecrated. Your standing in your own church is impaired, because your preference for it may be called in question, and your stability doubted—to say nothing of the feelings of your pastor, which should be always taken into the account. It argues nothing to say, you can worship as well with one denomination as another—for if that be true, it is evident your religious views sit very loosely, and that in the choice of your church, you have been governed more by whim and accident than by principle—for it is not possible that all should be equally right. You will, besides, be making the impression upon your children and others, that it matters little with what church they should connect themselves—an impression that may result in consequences that will be painful to you and disastrous to them.

I would say in conclusion, make it a matter of conscience, not only to go to church, but to go to your own church—and not only go yourself, but take your children with you, for in nine cases out of ten, when they want to go to some other preaching, their motives are wrong. How cheering to your minister to see you come and bring your family, and to know that let who will fail, you are seen to be there. Its influence can only be known by those who have felt it. Nor is it confined wholly to the minister—it is felt and shared in by every

member of the church. Nor are you to suppose that your absence will not be noted. It will be noted and felt too, by one at least—by him who has, in an important sense, the care of your soul, and who has come prepared to “break to you the bread of life.” Painful thoughts must and will intrude, either that you are neglecting your duty, or he is incompetent to fill his. And say not that you pay him punctually, if you do not go to hear him. His reward is in doing you good, and though painful necessity may compel him to receive your charity, his feelings revolt at it.

A single inference shall close, and that is, that the proper observance of the Sabbath, the proper training of your families, the necessary encouragement of your minister, the number and size of the congregation, the conversion of sinners, and the consequent increase and prosperity of the church—all depend upon a prompt and regular attendance on public worship.

J. K.

Dedication and Installation.

The new and beautiful Presbyterian church of Kingsport, Sullivan county, Tenn., was dedicated to the worship and service of Almighty God, on the 18th of last month. The next day, the Sabbath, Rev. F. A. Ross was installed pastor of the church and congregation. The occasion was one of great interest, solemnity and rejoicing.

The edifice dedicated to the Most High, was looked upon by all, with high admiration, and pronounced a pattern well worthy of imitation for the beauty, taste and convenience of all its parts and arrangements. On the morning of the dedication, the church was well filled with an audience, among whom were not a few from adjoining counties and a considerable distance. There were also present eleven brethren in the ministry, drawn together by the interest and importance of the occasion.

The introductory services were conducted by the Rev. F. A. Ross, after which he preached a most appropriate and feeling dedicatory sermon. The discourse was principally occupied with the history of the church and congregation, and the reflections thus suggested. Though many of us knew not per-

sonally the noble men and women whose lives and deaths were so graphically and touchingly depicted, but few, we presume, could refrain from paying to their memory the tribute of their tears.

After a piece by the choir, happily chosen and delightfully sung, the Rev. James King delivered a very appropriate address, congratulating the congregation and minister in view of what they were thus witnessing, and of what they were to engage in on the morrow, the installation of a pastor. The dedicatory address and prayer were then made by the Rev. James McChain, by which the house was solemnly dedicated to the worship and service of the Triune Jehovah, God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost.

We feel that it is no more than justice to notice the peculiar pleasure, with which the congregation listened to the excellent singing of the choir, trained and conducted by Mr. Jones.

On the next day, the Sabbath, the Rev. F. A. Ross, having been the stated supply of this people nearly twenty years, was installed their pastor, by the Holston Presbytery. The Rev. Daniel Rogan presided and put the constitutional questions. The venerable father McCampbell preached the installation sermon, and the Rev. Phillips Wood gave the charge to the pastor and people.

We are rejoiced to see that our churches are getting tired of the system of stated supplies. In less than a year, three pastors have been settled over three of our churches—the Rev. Daniel Rogan at Blountville, Rev. James McChain at Abingdon, Rev. F. A. Ross at Kingsport. We trust the good work will go on.

We also notice, with pleasure, the erection of new houses of worship, and the repairing of old ones. The spirit of improvement, in this respect, is greatly on the increase among us. We know of no less than six new churches of our denomination that have been lately or are soon to be put up within little more than one hundred miles. May all the churches, where improvement is needed, catch this spirit. We are also pleased to observe the growing interest in the dedication of churches, the installation of pastors, and in sacramental meetings. At Kingsport there were eleven ministers present, and many who had come a day's journey or more to be there. This was also observable at our camp-meeting on Beaver creek, which has just closed. Within proper limits, we like this spirit of the olden time.

We must also speak of the improvement in singing in some of our churches. May it extend and become universal.

Missionary.

Rev. Wm. Potter, the agent of the A. B. C. F. Missions, has been visiting our churches in this region, and exciting much interest by lecturing from Colton's large map of the world, more than six feet in length, showing most graphically the religious state of the world. Our contributions seem to be somewhat on the increase. At Abingdon, about \$70 were raised, at Kingsport \$150, and on the camp-ground \$200. We hope that we will show an increased interest in the cause by increased contributions from year to year.

Card.

The conductors of the Calvinistic Magazine are gratified in presenting the work to their readers, enlarged to the old size; 32 pages; and in its appropriate, sober Presbyterian cover. The price will be the same it is now, and we believe there is no monthly magazine so cheap. The back numbers are exhausted, but will be re-printed at a suitable time. In the mean while, new subscribers from the middle of the year will receive the work for the half year to come, at 50 cents. A large additional number of copies will be printed, so that all who desire the numbers from July, will not be disappointed.— Ministerial brethren at a distance who receive this, as their first number, will, we trust, give their influence to the circulation of the publication.

The character of the Magazine, from controlling circumstances, has not been exactly what was desired—future numbers will more fully come up to its original plan and purpose. And that future course, connected with the enlarged size, will, we trust, equal the expectations of all the lovers of the old work.

☞ We are compelled, for want of space, to reserve for our next number a notice of our interesting and profitable camp-meeting at Beaver Creek.

THE
Calvinistic Magazine.

[NEW SERIES.]

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

Vol I.

September, 1846.

No. 9.

Christian Doctrine Proved by Christian Experience.

Christ said to Nicodemus, "We speak that we do know, and testify that we have seen." Our Master thus asserted his claim to credence, because he "knew whereof he affirmed," and rebuked the Jews, because they received not his witness. The disciples of Jesus may be allowed humbly to imitate their Lord, and modestly, yet firmly and confidently "speak what they know, and testify what they have seen." The converted and the unregenerate have, to some extent; the same means of information and knowledge, respecting the facts and truths of religion. Christians, however, have a source of evidence on some points, which the impenitent do not and cannot have, *the testimony of their own consciousness, their experience in their own souls.* This argument, taken from the hearts and lives of God's people, is an important one, in proving several doctrines of the Bible. We wish, then, "to speak" some things, which, as christians, "we know." My design is to show, *that we know, as christians, in our own souls, from our own experience,* the truth of several doctrines of our religion.

Christian experience is not the dream of enthusiasm, the cloak of the designing, the cant of the vulgar, or the speculations of the philosopher. It is truth—it is reality. It is proved by the strongest evidence. We summon as witnesses to its reality, millions of our race, taken from all ages of the world, every quarter of the globe, and all ranks in life. It is the experience of multitudes, whose intelligence and strength of mind, whose freedom from delusion and enthusiasm, whose character and whose talents, whose lives and whose deaths

entitle their testimony to the fullest belief. We go to Enoch and Abraham and Moses of old; we go to David and Solomon on their thrones; we go to the martyrs for the witness of Jesus; we go to the Greek and the Roman, the Jew and the Gentile, the bond and the free, the most refined and the most barbarous, the learned and the unlettered, the highest and the lowest; we go to the followers of Jesus among all these, and ask them to give in their evidence on christian experience. In many things all differ from one another. They *do not contradict*, they only *differ*. On many points, in all essentials, they *agree as one*. They tell us what, as christians, they have felt and still feel; what they have experienced and known. We ask, nay, we demand, that this testimony, in its points of agreement, of so many and such men, from all ages, all climes, all ranks and conditions in life, be received as fully entitled to credit. All the facts, duly examined, prove that they could not have been deceived themselves, they would not have deceived others.

This then is our starting point, that there are truth and reality in christian experience. I now proceed to draw from the points of agreement in the experience of all christians, proofs of several Bible doctrines.

I. I would first speak of our knowing, from what we have experienced in our own souls, that *there is a God*.

The unconverted as well as the regenerate know that there is a Being of infinite perfections, from whom all things come—upon whom all things depend. We all get our first ideas of this kind from human tradition. We believe this truth because we are taught it. Then, our own reasonings and observation prove the correctness of this belief. All may know, from creation, providence, the moral government over us, and the Bible, that there is a Supreme Being, infinitely perfect.

Now, the christian has another source of knowledge upon this subject, which no unconverted man can have, a source as satisfactory as any or all of those just mentioned. He is assured that there is a God, from his own consciousness—from his experience in his own soul. He knows that he has been the subject of a most astonishing and wonderful change. He sees that a complete revolution, a new-creation has taken place in his heart. He feels that whereas he once hated holiness, loved sin and self supremely, now, he loves holiness, he abhors sin,

he has something of that spirit which loves his neighbor as himself. He knows that this is not merely an *outward reformation* of habits, *but an inward transformation of thoughts and feelings and principles; a radical reorganization, a new-creation of the heart.*

From this fact, known by his consciousness, sometimes seen and felt as really as he sees the light of day, and feels his soul in his body, he has the fullest proof that there must be a God. Who else but such a Being could work such a change? As soon can he believe that himself the heavens and the earth came into being of themselves, as suppose that his soul, *of itself, has wrought upon itself* this wondrous transformation. His heart, selfish, sinful, depraved, has been new-created in the likeness of holiness and benevolence, and this change could never be produced by any but such a Being as we call God. All true christians have thus been "born again," whether they are conscious of it or not. He who thus regenerates the human soul, must be a Being of *infinite power and wisdom*, else he would be unable to do it. He must be *everywhere present in the world*, else he could not carry on this work at the same time in every quarter of the globe. He must be *infinitely benevolent and merciful*, else he would not thus interfere to bless the rebellious. He must be *infinitely holy*, else he would not thus interpose to turn the sinful to holiness. He must be *infinitely just*, else he could not be infinitely benevolent and holy. That benevolence which would be *unjust* in seeking the highest good of the universe, would thwart its own object. This being must be of *infinite truth*, else he could not possess his other perfections. Thus, the regeneration which christians are conscious of in their hearts and show in their lives, proves the being and perfections of God.

II. A second truth which christians know from their own experience is, that *the Bible is the Word of God.*

The impenitent, as well as the converted, have the means of knowing that the Scriptures are of Divine origin. They, in common with the regenerate, can see the conclusiveness of the demonstrations which prove this, the demonstration from credibility of the authors of these writings—from the reciprocal proof of each part to the truth of the rest—from the miracles and prophecies of this book—from the sublimity of its doc-

trines, and the infinite grandeur of its scheme of redemption. From these and other evidences, the unconverted, as well as the renewed, know that God is the Author of the Bible.

Christians, however, have upon this subject, in their own consciousness, their own experience in their hearts and lives, a source of proof, independent of all these and superior to them all. Take this volume to yonder enslaved son of Africa. He cannot read it. All that he has learned about it, as far as human agency is concerned, he has got from the lips of others. He can tell you nothing about the chain of argument which proves the credibility of the various writers of the Sacred Record. He knows but little about the miraculous triumphs of christianity in the early ages of the christian era. He cannot construct an argument to prove its divine origin, from its miracles and prophecies, and the divinity of its doctrines. Yet *he knows* that the Bible is from God. Assail him with your infidel cavils and objections, heap upon him Hume and Gibbon and Paine. You cannot weaken his hold on this volume. He can not answer the least of your objections. You may perplex his mind, but you can not shake his faith. He will only fold this treasure closer to his bosom, as he exclaims, "I feel in my soul, I know in my inmost heart, that this book is from God." Where does he find such satisfying proof? Whence does he obtain this knowledge which cannot be shaken? *Here in his own consciousness—in his own soul.* He knows from experience, that the Saviour of the Gospel is just such a Saviour as he needs. He finds this scheme of salvation just what he wants, to satisfy his mind and his heart. He repents of sin, believes in Jesus, and his conscience is eased of its load. He is told that in the love and service of God he shall find "joy unspeakable and full of glory." He experiences the fulfillment of the promise. He knows that these writings, which thus fill and satisfy him, which do all this *for* him and *with* him, must be from God.

This is the testimony of the humble African's experience. It is the testimony of universal christian experience, to the truth of the Bible. Thanks be to God, that we need not be learned men in order to be assured that this is God's revealed will to man. It speaks for itself. It speaks with the voice of God in the souls of the humblest, the most ignorant, who repent and

believe. If we obey, "we know of the doctrine." To raise my soul above all doubt as to the truth of the Sacred Volume, to place it beyond the reach of all the Humes, and Gibbons, and Voltaires that ever have lived, or ever may live, I care not for the external evidences of the divine origin of the Scriptures; I care not for that accumulation of proof from without, which, should it prove untrue, would be a miracle. With this one argument, *the deep-felt* consciousness of its truth *within me*, my personal experience *here*, of what it has done for and with my own soul,—with this one argument, this single weapon, I will meet every argument and sophism of infidelity, and bid defiance to its power.

III. A third truth proved by christian experience is, that *man, in his natural unrenewed state, is totally depraved, utterly destitute of holiness, of supreme love to God.*

Every regenerated person can say with the Apostle, "I know that in me (that is, in my flesh,) there dwelleth no good thing." This is a doctrine which every one ought to admit, who believes the Bible. Every impenitent man may know, that all men, in their natural unconverted state, are utterly destitute of supreme love to God, and therefore completely subject to sin and Satan, because the Word of Truth most expressly says so. Yet few of the unregenerate assent to this doctrine. The position that, in our unrenewed state, we are covered all over with sin, that there is nothing within us which God can look upon with complacence, is one so humiliating to human pride, that but few will agree to it, till they are forced to do it, under the light and strivings of the Spirit.

Christians learn this truth from their Bibles. They also know it, from *their own souls, their own hearts*. How can this be? Simply in this way. The Divine Spirit has opened their blind eyes, and unstopped their deaf ears, and held a mirror up before them, that they may see themselves in their true light. Once, most of them disbelieved most fully, perhaps rejected with scorn, the doctrine of their utter sinfulness. Some regarded it as a base insult, to bring against them such a charge.—But the Spirit of the Lord took hold upon them. It moved upon their souls. It poured light into their minds. It worked upon their consciences. It opened to them the secret springs of their actions. It set their hearts before them in a mirror.

The consequence was, they were obliged to exclaim with the Apostle, "I know that in me (that is, in my flesh,) there dwelleth no good thing." They confessed that in their natural unrenewed state, they were totally depraved. This is the experience and testimony of all christians.

The *inference* from this is, that *all men*, in their natural unrenewed state, are utterly destitute of holiness, or supreme love of God. All who become christians testify, that they know from their own experience, that before they were regenerated they were totally depraved. Now, many have become christians, whose character, as unregenerate men, was as perfect as any of the unregenerate can lay claim to. As, therefore, the *best* impenitent men know, after their conversion, that they were before totally depraved, all impenitent men must be totally depraved, because none of the unconverted are better than these were, who now know that in their natural state they were totally depraved.

All christians know, from their own experience, that they were utterly without holiness before their conversion. Multitudes of christians were as good unconverted persons as ever lived. Therefore, we have among believers, many who were the best specimens of unconverted man. Now, *these best specimens of the unconverted* testify from their own experience, that before their conversion they were totally depraved. Therefore, the best of the unregenerate are totally depraved. Consequently, *all the impenitent* must be totally depraved, since *the best are so*.

IV. We notice another doctrine proved by christian experience, that *there is a general and particular providence of God over the whole universe*.

That the Supreme Being controls, and governs, and superintends all the affairs of the universe, the least as well as the greatest, the Scriptures abundantly teach. All may learn this there.

The daily experience of christians also proves this truth.— They cannot take a hasty survey of their past lives, without seeing that God "has led them by a way that they knew not." He has caused the most untoward circumstances to work for their good. He has made their greatest *apparent* calamities, prove their greatest blessings. When they have gone astray,

He has brought them back. When they have been perverse, He has chastened them and brought them to repentance. They have seen, too, that often the most important, perhaps the all-important events of their lives, have turned on *seeming trifles*. They know, therefore, that the Divine superintendence over them extends to *all* their affairs, *the least* as well as the greatest. They see clearly enough the hand of God in their down-sitting and their uprising—by night and by day—to show that His hand is still over them, even in those things in which *they do not see it*. This is universal christian experience. This is a fact of common observation and remark among God's people.

This experience of christians, that the great Jehovah exercises a general and particular providence over them, leads to the conclusion, that He exercises such a providence *over all men, all beings, and all things*.

If he controls and superintends one part of his création, the presumption is, that he does so to every part of it. It would seem to be as important and necessary to do this to *the whole*, as to a part.

Again, if it be the Divine purpose thus to superintend and control the affairs of a part, he must control and superintend the affairs of the whole universe. The universe is a whole made up of parts. If *any part* is to be the object of a general and particular providence, then *the whole must be*. In order to take care of *the part*, *the whole* must be superintended and controlled, else some other parts may interfere with that which is the subject of special care. God exercises a general and particular providence over his people. This is proved by the universal experience of christians. The Supreme Being must therefore exercise such a providence over all beings and all things. For, all things are such parts of one whole, that, to control and superintend *one part*, he must do the same *to the whole*.

V. I will speak of but one more truth, which, as christians, we learn from our own experience. We know that the religion of Jesus affords the only real happiness, increases all our lawful worldly pleasures, and supports us under all trials.

We went to the world. We asked of it food for the soul, and it gave us husks. We asked water for the thirsting of our spirits, and it bade us drink of "broken cisterns which could hold

no water." We turned to religion, and she gave us the bread of life to satisfy our hunger, and the water of life to quench our thirst. We have found "wisdom's ways the (only) ways of pleasantness, and her paths (alone) the paths of peace." We knew not what real satisfying happiness was, till religion taught us. This first made us happy, this is the only thing which can do it.

Christians also know, that repentance for sin, faith in Christ, the love and service of God, greatly increase all lawful worldly pleasures. We saw not how beautiful was the green earth, nor how magnificent were the starry heavens, till religion opened our eyes upon them. We knew not till then how "pleasant is the light of day, and how pleasant a thing it is for the eyes to behold the sun." We felt not before how exquisite are the pleasures of knowledge, refinement and taste.— Then we learned how pleasant and easy the toils of a laborious occupation, to obtain an earthly support, may be made. We imagined not how sweet may be the affection and converse of friends; how blessed the tenderest earthly ties, till religion shed over them her ennobling, refining, and sanctifying influence.

We also know that she can support us under all sorrows and trials. We have found the promise fulfilled, "as thy days, thy strength shall be." Underneath have been "the everlasting hands," and they have borne us up as we needed their support. If we have not been comforted and sustained in the hour of trial, the reason has been that we would not secure those consolations and supports which were most freely offered to us, and most earnestly pressed upon us.

All this, christians know in the best way of knowing—by blessed personal experience.

In conclusion, I might draw out from this train of thought many reflections important and profitable to those who are and those who are not, the subjects of this experience. I leave it, however, for each one to make, for himself, the proper deductions and application.

J. McC.

Short Practical Sermons—No. 2.

THE PRAYER MEETING.—PART 1ST:

“Not forsaking the assembling of ourselves together; as the manner of some is; but exhorting one another.”—Heb. 10: 25.

It is no uncommon thing to find a member of the Church, who, in practice, is opposed to all assemblies of Christians for prayer. It matters not what their words may be, so long as they are habitually absent from the social prayer meeting;—that absence virtually declares; that they object to all such meetings. How they can read my text without feeling reproved, I am unable to conceive. “Not forsaking the assembling of ourselves together;”—that is, do not leave the assemblies we have been wont to frequent. Now, what assemblies did the early Christians have? If any but those held on the Sabbath—if any for prayer chiefly; then the Hebrews were cautioned against leaving these assemblies—these being included in the requisition. The context bears me out in this remark; for it certainly bears a very social aspect. “And let us consider one another, to provoke unto love and good works.” Observe: it is a *mutual, reciprocal* considering of one another, and the exhorting required, is not that of the preacher or the evangelist, given by one person and received by the whole assembly, but given and received by one another.

Let it be borne in mind as we proceed, that, if it be found that social Prayer Meetings were held in apostolic times, these assemblies are among the ones alluded to in my text, and this exhortation has all the force of a command. There are two points which claim attention now:

I. The Scriptural warrant for meetings of social prayer.

II. The advantages derived from such meetings.

The first point to be considered, is, the Scriptural warrant for meetings of social prayer.

I. I have already alluded to the first source of light upon this point—the example of Christ and of early Christians.

More than once have the sacred historians presented to us Christ and his Disciples holding a social prayer meeting. The

scene of the transfiguration was such a meeting. Peter, James and John were present,¹ and it was a time not very much unlike some social prayer meetings that have been held since.—The scene that followed the institution of the last supper, is another instance. The disciples only were present, and the prayer of Christ, recorded by the disciple of his love,² shews that tender emotion and social feeling were uppermost in his mind. If I mistake not, it was also a social prayer meeting where our Lord gave his own prayer to his disciples the second time.³ The doxology is omitted, and thereby he seems to say, that it is intended for the more public, as well as the most retired place.

But look at the history of the Apostles of Christ;—their example sheds an abundance of light upon this subject. The first scene that opens before us, as we turn aside from the place of Christ's ascension, and that meets our eyes, weary with intensely looking up into the open heavens, is that of the eleven brethren, continuing with one accord in prayer and supplication, with the women and the mother of Jesus and his brethren.⁴ Then followed powerful sermons, and sounds from Heaven, and gifts of tongues, and flames of fire, and wonders that astounded the multitude. Almost the last you know of these believers in this place, is, that they were steadfast in prayers, as well as in the Apostle's doctrine. Follow the history of these same disciples, till Herod Agrippa spills the blood of James, the brother of John, and casts Peter into prison, and you find the Church praying for him without ceasing.⁵ Now, you cannot say that they merely prayed by themselves, in their closets or families for him, since Luke tells us expressly, that after his wonderful release, Peter came to the very house where many were gathered together for the purpose of prayer.⁶ What an hour of triumph is that, and how must every heart have swelled with confidence in Christ! Here let it distinctly be observed, that the prayer meeting at the house of Mary, does not seem to be an extraordinary resort, to meet the exigencies of the times, but every thing looks as though it were a regular observance. This *conjecture*, if you choose to call it so, becomes a *matter of fact*, however, when you

1 Luke 9: 28.

4 Acts 1: 12—14.

2 John 17.

5 Acts 12: 5.

3 Luke 11: 1—13.

6 Acts 12: 11.

follow Paul and his company to Phillippi of Macedonia.— Out on the river bank they meet, where prayer was wont to be made. Those that resorted to this place, appear to be all women, or nearly so, and it is not unlikely that Paul was the first preacher they had ever heard; yet they had their prayer meeting, and could not live without it. At Miletus also, you find Paul concluding his farewell interview with the Elders of the Ephesian Church, by prayer. In like manner at Tyre, the last act before separating from the Christians at that place, was to kneel down upon the shore and pray.¹ The whole appearance of both these scenes, is very much like a farewell social prayer meeting. This much at least is shown, by the example of Christ and his Apostles, that they did have assemblies for prayer;—these assemblies must have been among the ones which my text requires Christians not to forsake.

II. The text is not a solitary instance where the matter is enjoined, but the command of James, “Confess your faults one to another, and pray one for another,”² seems to require no less than I have said the text requires. “Confess your faults one to another.” To do this, there must be together at least two persons; and it would be very natural to suppose that these two should pray for each other, at the same time that they confessed their faults one to the other—that two persons constitute a prayer meeting. Besides, most faults that obtain among Christians, are usually against more than one individual; generally they are against several brethren, and the whole Church. To those, then, the confession is to be made, and for them the prayer is offered. In other words, the spirit of this command, as well as that of the text, requires the social prayer meeting.

III. The promise of Christ, “For where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them,”³ this promise, without doubt, relates to the prayer meeting, and hence attendance upon it becomes a duty we owe to Christ. This promise has a condition, you will observe, and of course the condition being unfulfilled, the promise is void. That condition cannot be fulfilled, unless there is a *social* meeting, at least. That *social* meeting is a *prayer* meeting; for Christ says in immediate connection, “If two of

1 Acts 2: 15

2 James 5: 16,

3 Matthew 18: 20.

you shall agree on earth as touching any thing that they shall ask, it shall be done to them of my Father."

Just notice here, that there is no ambiguity as to the words; there is a literal gathering together, and that gathering together is for prayer. Christ could not have been more plain, had he said, "wherever you will hold a prayer meeting, I will honor that prayer meeting with my presence."

If I am not mistaken, we are warranted from the Scriptures, then, in saying, that the prayer meeting originated with Christ, the example of himself and his Apostles favor that idea, and his own authority sanctions it. Let us look now to the advantages of the prayer meeting.

R. P. W.

Decrees of God.

We wish to give our readers a full discussion of the Divine decrees. Having nothing original on hand from our contributors, we have concluded to publish two sermons of Dr. DWIGHT on this important and most difficult subject. We do not adopt all the sentiments expressed by the distinguished author in these discourses, but we believe that all who will read them *carefully enough to understand them*, will regard them, on the whole, as a thorough and satisfactory discussion of the subject. We will omit, for want of space, some parts of the sermons. For this reason we will leave out the last head discussed in the first sermon. Omitting the text, we will publish the sermons as a dissertation.

"This doctrine is therefore clearly contained in the text:

"That all things, both beings and events, exist in exact accordance with the purpose, pleasure, or what is commonly called The Decrees, of God.

"Before I begin the direct discussion of this doctrine, I shall make a few preliminary observations.

"It is well known to the Christian world at large, that no

subject has been the foundation of more, or more strenuous, controversy, than this. By various classes of Christians, and some of them very numerous, it has been roundly, and steadily, denied in form. The things which have been written concerning it with heat and obstinacy, would fill many volumes. It has been asserted to be injurious to the divine character, and destructive of all finite moral agency. Those, who have holden the doctrine, have been charged by their antagonists with denying the free-agency of God himself; and with introducing into the Christian system the Stoical doctrine of Fate, and making an iron-handed Necessity, or blind Destiny, the ultimate and irresistible disposer of all things. At the same time, it has been alleged, that they shroud all human hopes in midnight darkness; and prevent, or destroy, every effort of man to become finally virtuous and happy.

“Such things as these, certainly prove, that there is, in the human mind, a strong bias against the doctrine. This appears often in the conduct of those who believe it; many of whom seem desirous that it should either rarely, or never, be brought into the desk. Multitudes appear utterly unwilling even to converse concerning it; and perhaps equal multitudes decline to make it a subject of contemplation.

“It must be acknowledged, that this doctrine has been indiscreetly handled, both in sermons and in other discourses. As many things pertaining to it, are in their nature very abstruse; and many others lie without the reach of the human understanding; so it will be easily believed, that in the ardor of investigation, disputants will, of course, be in danger of asserting many things which are neither satisfactorily evinced, maturely considered, nor well understood by themselves; and extend their inquiries to many other things, about which inquisition is fruitless, because discovery is impracticable. *The bounds* of the human mind, as well as of the human race, *are fixed*; and beyond them it cannot pass. They are, however, distant enough from each other to leave a field of investigation so ample, as to allow of the utmost employment of the greatest talents. Every attempt to push our enquiries beyond them is unwise; both because it is vain, and because it is a waste of that time, which might be usefully employod on things within our reach.

“But, if the doctrine which I have stated, is true; if it is a

doctrine revealed in the Scriptures; it cannot fail to be a proper subject of thought, of conversation, and of preaching: *for all Scripture is given by inspiration of God; and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, and for instruction in righteousness.* Perhaps it is unnecessary, and would not be useful, to make it a subject of very frequent discussion in the pulpit. A considerable number of persons in every congregation must be regarded as being imperfectly competent to judge advantageously of such a subject from such discussions. Such persons, to say the least, would fail of being instructed; and, if not instructed, would probably be bewildered. At the same time, though frequently asserted, it is very little discussed in the Scriptures: and the Apostle *Paul*, alluding to it, breaks out into this exclamation; *O the depth of the riches, both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! how unsearchable are his judgments, and his ways past finding out!*

* * * * *

“In considering this doctrine, I shall attempt,

“I. *To explain it;*

“II. *To prove it;* and

“III. *To answer the Objections, commonly made against it.*

“I. *I shall attempt to explain this doctrine.*

“This is peculiarly necessary; because, if I mistake not, both its friends and enemies have perplexed it, not a little, by the manner in which they have represented the doctrine, and each others opinions.

“It has been frequently said, *that the Decrees of God are the consequence of his knowledge, and that his foreknowledge is in consequence of his decrees;* and it is asked, *how it is possible, that God should foreknow the existence of any thing, until he has decreed that it should exist.* This phraseology, if applied to men, or other finite beings, might be correct. Such beings usually consider; then determine; and then, so far as is applicable to their nature and circumstances, foresee, or foreknow, the event. But, when applied to God, it is necessarily erroneous. In the divine Mind, succession is impossible. There is not, there cannot be, one act, by which God knows any or all things; another following it, by which he determines their existence; and then another, by which he foreknows that they will exist. Whatever exists in the divine Mind, exists co-etaneously, and

co-eternally, with all other things which exist in it. God, in this respect, is no more the subject of *variableness*, or *any shadow of turning*, than in other respects. Whatever is intended by knowledge, foreknowledge, or decrees, all is simultaneous or absolutely co-existent. St. Paul exhibits this subject in a happier manner. *Whom he foreknew*, says this Apostle, *he also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of his Son*. By this declaration we are not to understand, that the predestination spoken of, followed the foreknowledge, any more than that the foreknowledge followed the predestination. The Apostle says, *Whom He foreknew; not, After He had foreknown them*.

“Should it be said, that this phraseology is adopted merely in condescension to human infirmity; and that it is intended to express these things as they exist in the order of nature, and not in the order of time: I answer, that the language is still dangerous, because it is incorrect in itself; and so liable to be misunderstood, that it leads both those who use it, and those to whom it is used, into very serious errors. The act, or *state*, of the divine Mind, which gave birth to the existence of all things, is one; and there never was a period in duration, not even an indivisible moment, in which it was not absolutely and inseparably one.

“*The decrees of God are often said to be general and special; the special decrees being those, which respect the acceptance, or rejection, of mankind; and the general decrees, those which respect other things. This language is, also, in my view erroneous; and leads those, who adopt it, in mischievous consequences. There is no metaphysical; or real, distinction in the nature of the several decrees of God. Nor are they distinguishable from each other, except either numerically, or by means of the objects which they respect. Nor is there any more speciality pertaining to one of them than to another. God wills, or chooses, the existence, conversion, or salvation, of a man, the fall of a sparrow, or the descent of rain, with a volition in every sense metaphysically, or in its own nature, the same. The strict truth is, that one, indivisible act, perhaps it might be as properly called *state*, of the Divine mind, gave birth to the existence of all things.*

“*The decrees of God are frequently styled eternal. They are truly eternal, in the same sense in which God is eternal: viz.*

they are eternally present, and incapable of being compared; metaphysically, with a successive state of being. In this sense they are always; like God himself, possessed of an existence eternally present; being no other than an unchangeable state of the divine mind.

“Further, *the decrees of God are said to be sovereign*: In explaining this term, some persons speak of God, as willing, decreeing, &c., *because he wills, chooses, or pleases, &c.*: while others; on the contrary, suppose that the Decrees of God, in whatever sense understood, must, if they exist, be arbitrary; and therefore unreasonable; and hence they conclude, that there are no such decrees. Both, in my view, think, and speak, erroneously. To say, that God wills a thing, because he wills it; is to speak without meaning. It is impossible that any thing should be the cause of itself; nor can *an act* be any more the cause of its own existence, than *a being*: This doctrine, it is to be observed; is equally true of the *final*, as of the *efficient* cause: Nothing can be the end, for which itself exists: The assertion is also injurious to God; because it exhibits him as choosing, or decreeing, without any reason, and to no end: This conduct in men, if we suppose it possible, would be folly in the extreme: it can therefore never be imputable to *the only wise God*. The Decrees, and the conduct, of God, are sovereign; in the true and Scriptural sense; viz: *that he does according to his will, independently and irresistibly; and that he gives no account of any of his matters, any farther than he pleases*. Still it is equally true; that *he wills nothing without the best reason*; whether the reason be disclosed to his creatures or not. Real glory to himself, and real good to his creation, not otherwise attainable, furnish the Reason of the divine choice, whether it respects the existence or motions of an insect, or the conversion and salvation of a man. The kind, the degree, the manner, and many other things, are either wholly or partially unknown to us; but the good is always in view, and always the reason of the divine determination.

“It is observable, that the Scriptures rarely speak of this subject, under the name *Decree*. This word, and others derived from it, are used in the Old Testament *twelve times with a reference to God*. In each of these instances, a *particular determination, or sentence, concerning a particular thing*, is spoken

of; and in no instance, that general determination, or system of determinations, usually denoted by this term in Theological discussions. In the New Testament, the word, as referring to God, is not used at all. Whenever the subject of this doctrine is mentioned in the Scriptures, the words *counsel, purpose, choice, pleasure, will*, or some other equivalent words, are employed to express it. These words are, in my view, more adapted, in the exact metaphysical sense, to the subject, than the word *decrees*; and naturally lead the mind to more just conceptions of its nature. In accordance with this fact, I shall express my own views of it in this manner. *What is commonly intended by the Decrees of God, is that choice, or pleasure, of the divine Mind, eternally and unchangeably inherent in it, by which all things are brought into being.*

“Having thus explained my views of the Doctrine, I shall now attempt,

“II. *To prove it.*

“Under this head, I shall

“1st. *Allege several direct Arguments in support of the doctrine, and*

“2dly. *Suggest several Difficulties, which result from denying it.*

“1st. *I shall allege several direct arguments in support of the doctrine.*

“It will be admitted by all persons, beside Atheists, that there was a time, when created, or finite beings began to exist; and of course, that, antecedently to this time, there was nothing except God. It will also be admitted, that God was the Cause of their existence; or that all originally derived their being from him in some manner or other. With these things in view, I observe,

“1. *That all things, both beings and events, were eternally and perfectly known to God.*

“By this I intend alike all things *possible*, as well as *actual*, and the *nature, qualities, and operations, of all*; together with *all supposable connections, dependencies, and relations*. I mean also, that these were seen with one single view, and *that* completely comprehensive and perfectly clear, by the Divine Mind; so that nothing pertaining to them in any respect was, in any degree, unperceived in this perfect manner. This view I con-

sider, also, as being absolutely one, invariable, and eternal. It never began; it will never terminate. It never has been, it never will be, in the least degree changed. All this is involved in the Omniscience of God; and has, I flatter myself, been proved to be a part of the Divine Character.

“2. *In the nature and operations of things there is, inherent, a foundation for preference, or choice.*

“By this I intend, that some of the things which were thus known by the Divine Mind, were better, or upon the whole more desirable; and that others were less desirable. This, I presume, cannot be denied. It will not be denied that a multitude of those things which we can imagine, and which God, if he pleased, could create, are much less desirable, and certainly so, even in the view of such minds as ours, than other things which he has actually created. Beyond this, it will, I presume, be admitted without a question, that many things which we can imagine, are absolutely undesirable; and that others, still, would, if brought into existence, be incalculably noxious to the universe. That an individual man, for example, should possess the strength of an elephant, the ferocity of a tiger, the sight and wings of an eagle, and the sagacity of a fiend; or that another individual should possess the power of controlling the elements, with the spirit and invulnerability of a fiend; would be things absolutely fatal to the inhabitants of this world. That the Apostles, when employed to publish the Gospel, and erect the Christian Church, should have possessed the fraudulent and impious spirit of *Voltaire*, would, as every sober man must necessarily see, have been a fact incalculably injurious to mankind. These three instances may serve as representatives of millions more, imaginable even by the limited faculties of the human mind.

“Should it be said, that in the multitude of possible things, *there were many equally desirable*; and that between these, there is no foundation for a choice; I answer, that this is said gratuitously, and cannot be known to be true. Should the person who says it, intend, that the things specified are in all respects exactly alike, and only numerically different; it will be necessary to inquire, whether the object of choice proposed, is *to create only one of these similar things, and for that end to select one only*. If this be the thing intended, I answer;

that he amuses himself with words; for, as the things differ only numerically, one of them, when created, is equally the archetype of each of these images, and no more of one than of any other; and whatever is included in the nature and operations of them all, is completely realized in the existence of one. But, if the object of choice intended be, *whether only one, or more than one, of these similar beings shall be created*; then I answer, that the objector has himself furnished a complete foundation for a preference: the cases now differing from each other, as an *unit differs from two, three, or more; or a single man from many*; a difference not only perceptible, but capable of being important, to any supposable degree. Should it be said, *that things may differ in some minute particulars, and yet furnish no solid foundation for a preference*: I reply that it cannot be wisely, or warrantably, said. We, indeed, may not, and usually do not, perceive why things differing very little, admit of such a preference; but to the intuitive and all-comprehensive view of God, a little difference between two things may, in the eternal progress of his dispensations, be such, as to produce an influence on the Universe, so diverse, as to render one entirely beneficial, and the other wholly noxious. Few differences can be more minute, or trifling, to the human eye, than the existence of one hair more, or one less, on the human head; yet God has informed us, that these are all numbered by him; and that he sees a reason for preferring the number actually existing.

“But, should it be granted, *that things, materially differing, existing in any numbers, and making up, in several instances, complete and diverse systems, or universes, may yet be equally desirable in the view of God*: I answer further, that, in this case, *the object of choice would be to create one of these systems, and carry it into complete execution*; and, it being perfectly indifferent which of them should be brought into being, there would nothing remain to be resolved on, *but the act of creating*. That, which was begun in pursuance of this determination, would thenceforth for this very reason be preferable to the others, and be the most perfect possible system.

“3. *This foundation for choice cannot but be perfectly known to God.*

“As this position will not be questioned by any person, who

admits the doctrine under the preceding head, and plainly cannot, but in defiance of reason, I proceed to observe,

“4. *That God cannot but have chosen the existence of all those things, whose existence was on the whole desirable, and of no others.*

“The benevolence of the divine character furnishes complete evidence of the truth of this position. The benevolence of God is boundless and perfect. It is the nature of benevolence to desire, and delight in, the existence of good; of perfect benevolence, to desire the existence of perfect good; and of boundless benevolence, to desire the existence of infinite good; or, in other words, of all which upon the whole is good. If, therefore, the existence of any thing is desirable, God cannot but have chosen it, because its existence was necessary to this perfect good; which is the supreme object and delight of his benevolence. The existence of any being, or event, is desirable upon the whole, only because it is necessary to the perfect good, which I have mentioned, either by contributing to the existence, or by being itself a part, of that good. It is, therefore, completely evident, that God cannot but have chosen the existence of every thing, whose existence is upon the whole desirable.

“5. *This choice of God, that things should exist, is the only divine energy, and the only cause of existence.*

“The energy of a mind is *its will*; and this is synonymous with *its choice, generally understood*; each act of the will being no other than an act of choice. What is thus true of every *finite* mind, is eminently true of the *Infinite* Mind. In the *Infinite* Mind, there are no successive acts of choice; but one universal and unchangeable pleasure, which gives birth to every thing. It is metaphysically proper to say, *that God wills all things into existence*; or that they are produced by his choice; in the full sense, in which any effect is said to be produced by its efficient cause. This I suppose will not be denied, so far as the existence of *beings* is concerned. The only question will probably respect *events*; and particularly those, which are called *the actions of moral or voluntary creatures*. With respect to these I observe, that it makes no difference, *as to the truth of this doctrine*, whatever difference it may make as to others, whether we suppose God to will the existence of these beings,

furnished with those faculties, which enable them to act in any given manner, and in the possession of which they will really act in that manner; or whether we suppose him to will the existence of their actions immediately. The pleasure, or choice of God, in the former case, is the productive cause of the existence of these beings, and of their faculties. With these faculties, these beings, of course, will certainly, although without any necessity except what is attributable to inclination, act in a given manner in every case. All the actions, of which they will thus be the subjects, were, antecedently to the existence of the beings in question, perfectly discerned by the Omniscience of God; and, so far as they will ever have existence, were objects of his choice or preference. He, therefore, willed into existence such beings, possessed of such faculties, as he knew would certainly give birth to the existence of their actions. Although, therefore, he may have chosen that their actions should be the result of *their* energy, without a direct exertion of *his own*; it is clear, that he chose the existence of such beings, possessed of such faculties, with a perfect knowledge that they would be the authors of such actions; and that the actions would exist. As, therefore, he chose, that beings, who, he certainly knew, would perform these actions, should exist; it is evident, that he also chose, upon the whole, the existence of the actions themselves.

“It may, perhaps, be objected, that *this doctrine makes God the author of sin*: I answer, for the present, that *it makes God the author of an universe, in which he knew that sin would exist*. A further answer will be given, when this subject comes to be particularly considered under the third head.

“6. *The Scriptures directly assert the doctrine of this discourse.*

“The text is a strong example of this nature. As it has been sufficiently illustrated already, I shall leave it to your consideration. In *Isaiah*, xlv. 10, God says, *My counsel shall stand; and I will do all my pleasure*. This will be admitted to be a complete assertion of the doctrine, unless it should be supposed that there are things done, and existing, in the universe, *which are without, and beyond, the counsel of God*. According to this supposition, it must be admitted, that *a part of the system of things in the universe was not contrived by him; was not*

agreeable to his pleasure; nor accomplished with his permission. In *Isaiah* xliii. 13, God says, *I will work; and who shall let it?* and in *Daniel* iv. 35, it is declared, *He doth according to his will in the armies of heaven, and among the inhabitants of the earth; and none can stay his hand, or say unto him, What doest thou?*

“In both these passages it is asserted, that there is no possible opposition, or hindrance, to the universal agency of God; which operates alike in heaven and in earth; and in both according to his will or pleasure. In *Revelation* iv. 11, *The four and twenty elders, falling down before Him, that sitteth on the throne in the heavens, say, Thou art worthy, O Lord, to receive glory, and honor, and power: for thou hast created all things, and for thy pleasure they are, and were created.* In this passage it is asserted, that all things were created, and exist, for the pleasure of God. It is irresistibly inferred, therefore, that they exist according to his pleasure. In *Acts* xv. 18, it is said, *Known unto God are all his works from the beginning of the world:* and, in *Psalms* civ. 31, *The Lord shall rejoice in his works.* It cannot be true, that *God will rejoice in his works,* unless they are agreeable to his pleasure; nor any farther than they are agreeable to his pleasure; for this would be to suppose, that he takes pleasure in that, which is not agreeable to his pleasure; or is pleased with that which does not please him. As *all his works were known to him from the beginning,* so they were certainly agreeable to his pleasure from the beginning: else it could not be foreknown, and foretold, that *he will rejoice in them.*

“*That the actions of moral beings are foreknown by God is unanswerably evident from the fact, that almost all the prophecies in the Scriptures are either predictions of the voluntary acts of such beings; or of events, accomplished by their voluntary actions, or of events, which without these actions could never exist.* The deluge was absolutely predicted to *Noah*, one hundred and twenty years before it took place; but, had mankind repented in that period, the deluge would not have existed. If, then, God had not certainly foreknown, that men would not repent, he could not have certainly foretold the deluge. God predicted the apostacy of the *Edomites*; the sojourning of the *Israelites* in *Egypt*; the refusal of *Pharaoh* to let them go; their

return to the land of *Canaan*; the revolt of ten Tribes from *Solomon*; the ruin of their empire by *Nebuchadnezzar*; their captivity; their return; and their final destruction by the *Romans*; the life and death of *CHRIST*; the erection and progress of the Christian Church; and a vast multitude of other events, which cannot now be mentioned. These events were not only the voluntary actions of men, or the result of them, but involved thousands of millions of such actions, which preceded them, and were necessary to their existence. All these must have been perfectly foreknown by God; or the events could not, with either truth or certainty, have been foretold. These actions, thus foreknown, were either agreeable, or contrary, to the pleasure of God; that is, upon the whole. If they were contrary to his pleasure, it was contrary to his pleasure that they should exist. Either, then, the cause of their existence was sufficiently powerful to bring them into being, when he chose that they should not exist: or he chose that they should exist, contrary to his own pleasure, or, in other words, his own choice.

“Christ is said by *St. Peter* to have been *delivered to the Jews* by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God. If this declaration can need proof, it is found abundantly in the numerous predictions of this event, contained in the Old Testament. *CHRIST* is said to have been *slain*, that is, in the purpose of God, *from the foundation of the world*. The calling, sanctification, conversion, and salvation, of the Christian Church, are said to be according to the eternal purpose of God. A vast multitude of declarations, importing the same things generally, might be added to these, were it necessary. But I shall only observe further, under this head, that the works of Creation and Providence are exhibited in the Scriptures as parts of one great plan, universally devised and conducted, according to the good pleasure of God; extending to the clothing of grass and the falling of sparrows, the government of this world and the regulation of the heavens.

[To be concluded next month.]

Our Camp-Meeting.

The Beaver Creek Camp-Meeting, which is generally attended by the three Junior Editors of this Magazine, was held the last of this month, and has just closed. This meeting is under the care of **Brs. ROGAN and KING**. **Brs. GLENN, POTTER, MOREY, and WELLS**, were present and preached. All, we believe, who were there, have come away having received much wholesome nourishment for the soul, and a good degree of healthful stimulus in the divine life.

Ministers who have had no slight objections to Camp-Meetings, have attended here again and again, and felt that this, at least, was well-conducted, and "that it was good to be there." In many respects there is something peculiarly interesting and profitably exciting in these meetings. Above you is the broad canopy of heaven. Around you are the everlasting hills. Before you are cultivated farms. By you passes the Creek, singing sweetly as it flows over its rocky bed, and winding gracefully among the wild and beautiful scenery of its banks. Upon a gentle declivity are arrayed the camps, in the form of a square, with a shed at one end capable of seating several hundred, and the whole shaded by trees interspersed. This is the place.

Now let us notice the meeting. The families have moved in on *Thursday evening*, and are ready for preaching Thursday night. They retire to their camps; family prayers are attended; and at the usual hour of bed-time, all is quiet and repose. The next morning with the sun, we rise from the slumbers of the night. Soon the inmates of each tent are gathered around the family altar, and the voice of prayer and the song of praise are heard, in subdued tones, ascending on high, amidst the stillness of the early morn. Then the congregation assembles under the shed, where, in exhortation, prayer and praise, a little season is spent. We again separate for the morning meal, of plain substantial fare, which, like most of the meals, was principally prepared at home, and brought to the ground ready for use before the meeting began. At 10 there

are singing and prayer. At 11 the preaching begins, and there are two sermons in succession. We then separate for dinner. In the evening there is no appointment except for an inquiry meeting. There is preaching again at night, and as the bright fires which give light flash up in the darkness amidst the trees, the scene is indeed novel and striking. After family prayers, at the usual bed-time, all is again quiet and repose. This is the daily routine while the meeting lasts—except on the Sabbath, when the Lord's Supper is administered. To describe the scene in a sentence, we would say, it is one continuous Sabbath. Perhaps we can best give a correct idea of the meeting, by mentioning some things which were *not there*, and some things which *were there*.

There was not before the stand an enclosure, or *pen*, covered with straw, for the mourners to lie down upon and wallow in. There was not any going to the impenitent, taking them round the neck, and, as it were, by main force pulling them "*nolens volens*" to the altar. There was no effort on the part of those who preached, by boisterousness, by affected feeling, and clapping the hands, to get the people to shout, clap, and make a hurrah. There was no shouting and crying "glory and amen," so as to be heard at least a mile. There was no taking into the Church on probation scores of mourners, to backslide before the next meeting, and be ready by that time to join again, and swell once more the number of probationers. There was no turning the occasion into one of universal feasting, keeping a good share of the family away from the services, to cook a fine dinner. There was no keeping up such noise and disorder till midnight or day-break, that those who wished could get but little sleep. Neither was there any drinking, drunkenness, and licentiousness on the outskirts of the ground. We say not *where these things are*. We simply state where *they are not*. *They are not*, and *they were not*, at the *Beaver Creek Camp-Meeting*.

But what are some of the things which *were there*? There was the preaching of the Gospel in its simplicity and purity, in its fullness and freeness, in a connected and logical manner, with clearness, discrimination and earnestness, the best calculated to enlighten the mind, convince the judgment, wake up the conscience, and melt down the heart. There was a large

and solemn, most attentive and well-behaved congregation.— There were sinners convicted of sin. There were some hopefully converted to Christ. There was a healthful stimulus imparted to Christians, to quicken them in duty. There was a Missionary collection of about \$200. We say not *where* these things *are not*. We only state *where they were*. They were at the Beaver Creek Camp-Meeting.

From the New York Observer.

Annual Meeting of the American Board.

The THIRTY-SEVENTH Annual Meeting of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, was opened in the city of New Haven, September 8th, 1846, at four o'clock, P. M. In the absence of the Hon. T. Frelinghuysen, the President, the Chair was taken by CHIEF JUSTICE WILLIAMS, Vice President of the Board.

Prayer was offered by Rev. Dr. Yale, of Kingsboro.

Rev. E. Seymour, of Bloomfield, New Jersey, was appointed Assistant Recording Secretary.

Rev. S. B. Treat, Recording Secretary, read the minutes of the last meeting.

A Committee of Arrangements, consisting of Rev. Drs. Goodrich, and Bacon, and Armstrong, Rev. Messrs. Dutton, Cleveland, Griggs, and Strong, was appointed.

At the suggestion of Rev. Dr. Anderson, the Board at the outset of its deliberations spent an hour in devotional exercises. Father Sewall led the assembly in prayer. It was good to go with him to the throne of grace, and see the old Patriarch struggling with the Angel of the Covenant. He seemed to take hold of the horns of the altar and to plead for a blessing, as if he would take no denial.

Dr. Anderson gave expression to the belief that the Holy Spirit would be present in this meeting. He referred to the glorious displays of the power of God among the Missions of

the Board during the year, and he trusted that we had come together to rejoice with gratitude and praise.

Rev. Dr. Allen said that 25 years ago he was present at a meeting of the Board, when only twelve corporate members were assembled. Eight of those are now dead. Dr. Proudfit was one of them, and fifteen years ago I met him here again, and one day I found him at the place of meeting a few minutes before the time, when he proposed that we should go by ourselves and spend the time in prayer! My desire now is that the spirit of prayer, which was in his heart, may fill the hearts of this Board at its present meeting.

Rev. Dr. Edwards mentioned a meeting of prayer on board the boat that carried the dead body of Dr. Proudfit up the North River, toward its last resting-place. The boat struck a rock, and the crew and passengers, after their deliverance from death, gathered for thanksgiving to God. That was a solemn meeting, and its influence was felt upon many hearts, long afterwards.

Father Sewall spoke of the great need of feeling our dependence on God. He said that human efforts were important, but the main thing is to have the blessing of God. He spoke of Samuel J. Mills—when a student in College *here*, his mother said to him, "My son, how stands it between God and your soul?" He burst into tears and said, "O I wish I had never been born." She told him he was born, and he must yield to the will of Him who had made him. She went away to her closet, and wrestled with God in his behalf, and on that very day he was born again. Let us have the spirit of that mother, of the Syrophenician mother, and many such sons as S. J. Mills shall be given to this cause.

Dr. Edwards led the Board in prayer.

The effect of these exercises was very happy. The great number of clergymen and others who had assembled, entered with delight into the services, and the spirit of devotion was delightful.

After this prayer meeting, the organization of the meeting was completed, and the following CORPORATE MEMBERS were enrolled.

* * * * *

Besides these Corporate members there were about *four hundred* Honorary members present.

The Treasurer's Report was read by H. Hill Esq. and committed to Messrs. P. Perit, Dr. L. A. Smith, Page, Fairbanks and Holden, Esqrs. The summary of this report will be found in the Abstract below.

After announcements of the orders of business, the meetings for prayer, &c., the Board took a recess till evening.

DR. HAWES' SERMON,

At half past seven a vast congregation crowded the Centre Church (Dr. Bacon's) to hear the annual Missionary sermon before the Board, which was preached by Rev. Dr. Hawes of Hartford.

Rev. Dr. Beman introduced the services by reading the 46th Psalm, and prayer.

Dr. Hawes announced his text in 1 Samuel, 7: 12. Hitherto the Lord hath helped us.

He commenced by giving a succinct history of the rise and progress of the Board, from the time when *thirty-six* years ago it consisted of *five* men who met in a private parlor of a Connecticut pastor to transact its annual business, and by exhibiting the present as compared with the past he drew a strong reason for saying in the words of the text, hitherto hath the Lord helped us, and in the name of the Lord we will go forward. He passed rapidly over the field of the Board's labors, to show that those fields have been vastly enlarged, and that the barriers in the way of progress have been broken down, so that God has opened every door, until five hundred millions of heathen are now accessible. The world is like the Roman Empire at the propagation of primitive christianity when roads had been cut into all parts of the empire so that the gospel was readily carried by its ministers in every direction. The communications by Commerce are great aids to the missionary work, and here a deserved tribute was paid to Sir Stratford Canning, British minister at Constantinople for his generous and noble protection of the truth.

In the next place the preacher spoke of the vast increase of the missionary spirit. In the early history of the Board it was doubted whether the churches would sustain four or five missionaries, but now a calm deliberate decided spirit pervades the

church, and the conviction is growing that the gospel must be given to the whole world without delay. This spirit pervades the literature of the day, moves all classes of men, is leavening the whole community, swells the contributions of the Board, rouses men to devote themselves to the work, and gives evidence of the coming of the time when the gospel will fill the earth.

Following up this train of thought, with great felicity and power, the speaker passed on to other christian lands, and the labors of other societies, showing what the Lord has done by other instrumentalities, and thus constructed a most powerful occasion for praise to Him by whom these results have been wrought.

In the third place he spoke of the wisdom and success of the plans adopted by the board.

In the fourth place he presented a view of the wonderful success which has attended the labours of the Board, and the brightening prospects which are constantly opening.

In view of these great truths the lessons to be learned are

1. Gratitude to God.
2. Our duty to go forward in the great work.
3. To cherish a Godly fear lest the Lord turn away his hand from helping us.
4. Encouragement and hope in regard to the future.

The discourse of Dr. Hawes was listened to with fixed attention by the great assembly, and the Board requested him to repeat it to-morrow evening in the North church, as multitudes who desired to hear it were not able to gain admittance into the church.

The concluding prayer was offered by Dr. B. C. Taylor of Bergen, N. J.

Wednesday, Sept. 9. Prayer by Rev. Dr. Humphrey. Minutes of yesterday read.

The following letter was read from the President of the Board, addressed to the Domestic Secretary.

* * * * *

Letters were also read from Dr. Pond, S. Ray, Esq., and

others, expressing their regret at being unable to attend the meeting.

The Secretaries then submitted a copious abstract of the Annual Report, of which the following sketch is only a summary of results.

The Hon. John Cotton Smith, a member of the Board since 1819, and its President from 1828 to 1842, deceased soon after the last meeting of the Board. Seven missionaries and assistant missionaries have also been removed by death, viz: Rev. Samuel Whitney, Mrs. Munger, Mrs. Bradley, Mrs. Doty, Mrs. Pohlman, Mrs. Bissell, and Rev. David Abeel.

The arrangements for conducting the business of the Board, at the Missionary House, are the same as were reported last year.

Thirteen missionaries and assistant missionaries, have been, at their own request, released from their connection with the Board.

Thirty have been appointed. Twenty-six have gone out to different missions.

Twenty-seven are now under appointment. Most of these are expecting to embark for the missions in India, China and South Africa, at an early day.

An unusual number of young men preparing for the ministry, have their attention turned to the missionary work. In some of our theological seminaries, this increase of missionary feeling during the last year, has been remarkable.

The South Western Foreign Missionary Society auxiliary to the Board, has been formed during the last year.

Conventions of the friends of missions for conference and prayer in regard to the evangelization of the world, have been held at various places in New England, and the Middle and Western States. At many of these meetings the attendance has been large, and the impression made by them happy.

Thirty-two thousand copies of various missionary tracts, including the last annual report, the sermon preached before the Board at its last meeting have been published during the year. The circulation of the Missionary Herald, and of the Dayspring, is a little less than it was twelve months ago.

The receipts of the Board, for the year closing July 31, 1846, were	\$263,073 55
Expenditures for the same,	257,605 23
	<hr/>
Showing an excess of receipts of	5,468 32
On the 1st of August, 1845, there was a balance in the Treasury of	17,295 89
	<hr/>

Showing a balance on hand August 1, 1846, of \$22,764 21

Of the receipts thus reported, \$93,436 were from legacies, and \$40,000 the bequest of one deceased friend, the late Mr. Waldo, of Massachusetts.

In addition to this amount, the Board has received from the American Bible Society,

\$4,000

From the American Tract Society,

\$7,500

More than a common measure of health has been enjoyed by the missionary laborers abroad, and only six out of about 350 have been removed by death. No obstacles, except such as are to be expected, have impeded the missionary work. On the other hand, the fields have been opening, and increased facilities have been enjoyed for widely and efficiently propagating the truth, and during no previous year have the influences of the Holy Spirit been granted to a greater number of the missions, or clearer evidence been given of progress in this work of salvation.

The number of the missions is twenty-six, the same as last year, embracing ninety-three stations, at which are 134 missionaries, ten of whom are physicians, five physicians not ordained, seven schoolmasters, seven printers and bookbinders, and 14 other male and 175 female assistant missionaries,—in all, 342 laborers sent forth from this country; associated with whom, or at out-stations under their care, are twenty native preachers, and 132 other native helpers, (exclusive of the native teachers of the free schools sustained by the several missions,) raising the whole number of laborers at the missions, and dependent principally on the Board for support, to 494.—The number of preachers is three more, and the whole number of laborers five less than last year.

Gathered by these missionaries and under their pastoral care are seventy-three churches, to which have been added during

the year now reported, more than 1,500 members, and in which are now embraced, not including some hundreds of hopeful converts in Western Asia, 24,824 members.

In the department of education there are under the care of these missions seven seminaries for educating native preachers and teachers, furnished with libraries and various kind of apparatus adapted to their object, and embracing 487 pupils; also 34 boarding schools, in which are 854 male and 533 female pupils; making 1,874 boarding pupils, brought under constant Christian instruction and influence in the mission families, with reference to their being qualified to exert a greater and more decidedly Christian influence among their own people; also 602 free day schools, in which are 28,171 pupils, including those at the Sandwich Islands, which owe their existence and efficiency to the mission, and are still sustained and guided in part by it; making the whole number of pupils more or less under the care of the missions 31,045.

Connected with the missions are fifteen printing establishments, having thirty-two presses and forty fonts of type, and furnished for printing in twenty-seven languages. Five of the missions are also provided with type and stereotype foundries. For eleven of the other missions printing is executed from year to year, as their wants require, at presses not owned by the Board; making the whole number of languages, exclusive of the English, in which printing is done for the missions, 37. The number of copies of works printed during the year, including tracts, exceeds 460,000, and the whole number of pages printed during the year is not less than 40,000,000. The whole number of pages printed since the commencement of the missions exceeds 535,000,000.

Ordination.

ORDAINED, at Jonesborough, Saturday, A. M., Sept. 26, Mr. RUFUS P. WELLS, as an Evangelist, by the Holston Presbytery. Rev. F. A. McCorkle presided, proposed the constitutional questions, and made the ordaining prayer. Rev. Dan'l. Rogan preached the sermon, from I Tim. 4: 16, and Rev. John King gave the charge.

THE
Calvinistic Magazine.

[NEW SERIES.]

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

Vol I.

October, 1846.

No. 10.

A Sermon.

*“Thou thoughtest that I was altogether such a one as thyself;
but I will reprove thee, and set them in order before thine eyes.”*
—Psalm 50: 21.

“The pious and devoted John Newton had an extreme aversion, to controversial discussion. He used to say, and was admired for saying, ‘It is enough to preach the truth, for that being established, error would fall of itself,’ but his course so completely destroyed his influence and usefulness, that he was compelled to leave Olney. And it also opened so wide a door for error, and false teachers, that one of the finest Churches was scattered and dissipated. While false teachers labored to carry off his people, they met with no opposition. When Dr. Scott succeeded Newton, he was not able to collect a congregation of 100 persons in a population of 2,500, for the very professors had gone after Antinomians, Arminians, and other sectarians. Had Paul been as averse to controversy as Newton, the false teachers of Galatia and Corinth would have supplanted him, and ruined those flourishing Churches.”—*Ch. Ref., 4th vol. page 189.*

Evangelical Christians of all denominations, agree in all essential points, such as, one God—one Mediator between God and man—that all men are fallen creatures—Christ died for sinners—repentance and faith are required in order to salvation—a holy life is the only scriptural evidence of religion—the endless duration of the happiness of saints, and of the misery of the finally impenitent—the doctrine of three co-equal persons in the Godhead, &c.

But the points on which sects disagree, are the things which distinguish each sect. This difference may be traced to a few

first principles; the truth of which may be easily established, or their falsehood made manifest.

Few men would be willing to say, *God is altogether such a one as myself*; or few sects would be willing to acknowledge, that they held a system built on principles which lead to such a conclusion.

We will now examine whether many do not hold the following principles, or rather the sentiments that grow out of them, and whether these principles do not lead to the conclusion, that *God is altogether such a one as ourselves* :

PRINCIPLE 1. God created a moral system and endued it with the capacity of acting without being acted upon, or of independent action.

PRIN. 2. God cannot efficiently produce holiness or prevent sin in such a system.

PRIN. 3. God presides over, or governs this system, by light and motive only.

PRIN. 4. The human family never begin to sin, until the first perception of moral objects.

If the first principle be true, then God has not decreed the actions of men, or the events that are brought about by such actions. Nothing would be more absurd, or vain, than that you should decree the actions of one who was entirely independent of you, while you could exert no agency on him to produce his actions. Accordingly, our Cumberland, Methodist and Quaker brethren, deny the decrees of God. This denial grows out of the first principle; and if Taylorites were consistent with themselves, they would reject the doctrine of decrees.

Now, suppose the very opposite of this principle be true, namely, that the agency of God is the efficient cause of all our actions; then God must determine to exert his agency, and thus decrees the actions of free voluntary agents, and the events brought about by their actions.

Now let the Bible decide. God decreed the actions of Pharaoh. "See that thou do all these wonders before Pharaoh, which I have put in thy hand; but I will harden his heart that he shall not let the people go."—*Exo. 4: 21.*

God decreed the actions of the king of Assyria, or more properly, he decreed his own agency, which would produce the voluntary actions of the king. "I will send him against

an hypocritical nation; and against the people of my wrath will I give him a charge to take the spoil, and to take the prey, and to tread them down. Howbeit he meaneth not so, neither doth his heart think so; but it is in his heart to destroy and cut off nations, not a few. Wherefore, when the Lord hath performed his whole work upon Mount Zion and on Jerusalem, I will punish the fruit of the stout heart of the king of Assyria, and the glory of his high looks."—*Isaiah* 10: 6, 7—12.

Every reader of the Bible must know, that the conduct of Pharaoh and of the king of Assyria, was of the basest and most criminal character, and many suppose, that the doctrine, that the agency of God was connected with their guilty conduct, as cause and effect are connected, is dishonorable to God, and inconsistent with their freedom as moral agents; therefore they soften down the language of inspiration, by saying God only permitted Pharaoh and the king of Assyria to take their own guilty course.

The doctrine of permission is totally inconsistent with the language—"Aaron thy brother shall speak unto Pharaoh, that he send the children of Israel out of his land, and I will harden (permit) Pharaoh's heart, and multiply my signs and wonders in the land of Egypt. But Pharaoh shall not hearken unto you, (but Pharaoh shall be permitted not to hearken,) that I may lay my hand upon Egypt, and bring forth my armies, and my people, the children of Israel, out of the land of Egypt by great judgments, and the Egyptians shall know that I am the Lord."—*Ex.* 7: 2—5.

God assigns a reason why he hardened Pharaoh's heart, that justified the Divine conduct in the eyes of Infinite Wisdom. Had it been a bare permission, for aught that can be shewn, Pharaoh might have let the Israelites go, and God's design frustrated. God's agency in the case was perfectly consistent with Pharaoh's free moral agency, which was neither suspended nor crippled in the least. Pharaoh felt and acknowledged this truth. "And Pharaoh sent and called for Moses and Aaron, and said unto them, I have sinned this time, the Lord is righteous, and I and my people are wicked."—*Ex.* 9: 27, and 10: 16.

But will this plaster of man's make, cover the case of the king of Assyria any better than the case of Pharaoh? In the

10th chapter of Isaiah, 13th and 14th verses, we have the arrogant boasting of this haughty King, elated and flushed with his success. The Prophet asks, vs. 15, "Shall the axe boast against him who heweth therewith?" The King was the Lord's axe, with which he hewed down the guilty nations.—Now, does the hewer of wood simply permit his axe to hew, and wait until the work is done, or does he use his own agency with the axe, that it may hew? Does the Lord permit, that is, not hinder his axe to hew, although He sent him, and gave him a charge?

God decreed the voluntary actions of Cyrus. "That saith of Cyrus, he is my shepherd, and shall perform (be permitted, how frigid!) all my pleasure." "Whose right hand I have holden (permitted) to subdue nations before him. I will go before thee, and make (permit) the crooked places straight. I will break in pieces the gates of brass, and cut in sunder the bars of iron, and I will give thee the treasures of darkness and hidden riches of secret places, (yet I have no agency in the matter, nothing but permission,) that thou mayest know, that I, the Lord which called thee by name, am the God in Israel. For Jacob my servant's sake, and Israel mine elect. I have even called thee by name. I have surnamed thee. I gird thee though thou hast not known me."—*Isaiah 44 & 45 chaps.*

God decreed and brought about by his own agency the conduct of Judas and of the Jews, in their treatment of Jesus Christ. "Him being delivered by the determinate counsel (permission, O how jejune!) and foreknowledge of God, ye have taken, and by wicked hands (in the full exercise of free moral agents) have crucified and slain."—*Acts 2: 23.*

God decreed, and by his agency on the hearts of the ten horns (Kings,) secured the event, that these Kings should give their kingdoms to the interest of the man of sin. "For God hath put in their hearts (how will it read *permitted* in their hearts? It reads like the divinity of earth and not of heaven,) to fulfill his will, and to agree (a voluntary act, although God put it into their hearts,) and give their kingdom unto the beast (popery) until the words of God shall be fulfilled."—*Revelations 17: 17.*

2d. If the first principle be true, then God cannot foreknow the future actions of men, or the events which depend on these

actions, as there is no ground or reason why God should foreknow them. He has not determined to bring them to pass by his own agency; and independent agents may or may not so act as to bring to pass the events. Dr. Clark calls God's foreknowledge an awful subject, and says that there are many things that God may not choose to foreknow. See him on Acts 2: 23. But the Bible teaches God's foreknowledge in all things. "Neither is there any creature that is not manifest in his sight; but all things are naked and open unto the eyes of Him with whom we have to do."—*Hebrews* 4: 13.

3d. If the first and second principles be true, then the doctrine of election is not true. By election we mean God's eternal purpose to save by the working of regeneration, and the renewing of the Holy Ghost, all that were given to Jesus Christ in the *covenant of redemption*. But saving men by making them new creatures, by the power of the Holy Spirit, would be acting on men, which is inconsistent with the first and second principle. The Cumberland Presbyterians and Methodists, and many others deny the doctrine of election.

Now suppose the reverse of these propositions to be true, then election necessarily follows. What does the word of God teach on this subject? "He hath chosen us in Him before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy and without blame before Him in love."—*Eph.* 1: 4. We are chosen, not because we are holy, but that we should be holy.

"Who shall lay any thing to the charge of God's elect."—*Rom.* 8: 33. "Elect according to the foreknowledge."—*Pet.* 1: 2. "That the purpose of God according to election might stand."—*Rom.* 9: 11. "There is a remnant according to the election of grace."—*Rom.* 11: 5. "The elect hath obtained it, the rest were blinded."—*Rom.* 11: 7.

4th. If the first and second principles be true, God has no agency in the production of holy affections, or of unholy affections. But what says the sure word of prophecy? "Who worketh all things after the counsel of his own will."—*Eph.* 1: 11. "Not that we are sufficient to think any thing as of ourselves, but our sufficiency is of God."—*2 Cor.* 3: 5. "The King's heart is in the hand of the Lord—he turneth it whithersoever he will."—*Pro.* 21: 1. "He turneth their heart to hate his people."—*Psa.* 105: 25. That is, according to *permission*—

ers, he permitted their heart to hate his people. "The anger of the Lord was moved against Israel, and he moved David against them"—that is, he permitted David against them. Shame! fie!!

"But Sihon, King of Heshbon, would not let us pass by him, for the Lord thy God hardened (permitted) his spirit, and made (permitted) his heart obstinate."—*Deut.* 2: 30.

"Work out your salvation with fear and trembling, for it is God which *worketh in you*, both to will and to do of his good pleasure."—*Phil.* 2: 3. That is, God permitted in you both to will and to do of his good pleasure; for if God worketh in him to will, he interferes with his moral agency, and there would be no virtue or praise-worthiness in his willing, no more than there would be guilt or blame-worthiness if he worked in Judas to betray his Master. Such is the erroneous unscriptural conclusion of the doctrine of permission.

5th. If the first two principles be true, then the perseverance of the saints is very uncertain—and Methodists hold, saints may fall finally from grace, and be lost. If these two principles are true, Methodists are right. The Cumberlands, very inconsistently with their other doctrines, hold the final perseverance of the saints.

The Bible goes on the supposition, that the very opposite to these first two principles is true. Hence it teaches the final perseverance in the most unequivocal language. "I will put my fear in their hearts, that they *shall not* depart from me."—*Jer.* 31: 50. Although the fear of the Lord is a voluntary exercise, yet God claims the power to put that fear in the hearts of his people, without interfering with their moral agency, or the praise-worthiness of the affection; and to put it in their hearts that they *shall not* depart from Him. "My sheep hear my voice." And I give unto them eternal life, and they shall never perish."—*John* 10: 27—29. "Who are kept by the power of God through faith unto salvation."—1 *Peter*, 4: 5.

6th. If the third principle be true, namely, that God exerts no influence on moral agents, except by *light* and *motive*, then regeneration by the Holy Spirit is not true; and, indeed, it is not true if the first two principles are true, for light and motive effects the change.

Cumberlands, Methodists, and many in other denominations

avow the doctrine, that the only change produced in the moral character of man, is effected by light and motive. No sentiment can be more unscriptural. He who is the light of the world came and dwelt among men, and by this holy life, his miracles and heavenly discourses, poured the light of divine truth on the mind of the Jews, and presented the most soul-stirring motives; yet he says:—"If I had not come and spoken unto them, they had not had sin; but now they have no cloak for their sin." "If I had not done among them the works which none other man did, they had not had sin; but now have they both seen and hated both me and my Father."—*John 15: 22—24*. Here is light, "they have seen;" and here is the effect of light on the depraved heart, "and hated both me and my Father." The character of Christ was without spot or blemish. Of this the Jews were convinced; yet none was ever so hated. They knew he rose from the dead, and if so he was the Son of God; yet they were willing to bribe the soldiers to lie, and promised to secure them. Before these people the Apostles wrought the most stupendous miracles. They knew miracles were the testimony of God. How do they act? "That indeed a notable miracle hath been done by them is manifest to all them that dwell in Jerusalem. But that it spread no further among the people, let us straightly threaten them, that they speak henceforth to no man in this name."—*Acts 4: 16—19*. Observation and experience prove, that the more is known of an object which is disliked, because opposed to our taste and inclination, the more that object will be hated. Then it follows, that light and motive will not produce a radical change in a depraved heart; and if it is ever changed, it will be by the naked and omnipotent agency of the Holy Spirit on the heart. And this is in exact accordance with the language of the Bible:—"Created anew in Christ Jesus." Creation is effected by Almighty power, without any instrumentality.

Paul says to the Ephesians, "Even when we were dead in sins hath he quickened," (made alive.)—*Eph. 2: 5*. It requires Almighty power to make the dead alive. "He saved us by the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost."—*Titus 3: 5*.

"Light is whatsoever doth make manifest."—*Eph. 5: 13*. Motive is the considerations, or reasons, in view of which a

rational mind ought to choose the good and refuse the evil; ought "to cease to do evil and learn to do well." All the light and motives that God uses to bring men to repent and turn to God, are contained in the Scriptures of truth; so truth, and truth only, comprehends all light and motive. But truth is a statement of facts, that now exists, or has been, or will be, or of just principles. In this sense, truth is a fact, or principles expressed in words. But is a verbal proposition an agent? Can it act on the human mind, or any thing else? The mind may perceive the truth, and the heart may love or hate it.— And this is the only conceivable action that is possible in the case. But the renewal of the heart is represented in the Bible, as being the effect of power and agency, and that too of the Holy Spirit. "Our Gospel came not unto you in word only; but also in power, and in the Holy Ghost."—1 *Thes.* 1: 5. Now, suppose there is no truth, of course no light and motive before the mind, either from the book of *nature* or *revelation*, and the Holy Spirit should new-create the heart. On this supposition nothing would be perceived as the object of any holy exercise or affection. But as it is truth that presents to the mind of the sinner his guilt, condemnation and ruin, when the Spirit of God excites the heart to look at his condition, his pungent feelings are in view of truth. Hence, by an easy figure, the Word is said to be quick, powerful, and sharper than a two-edged sword. Now, suppose the heart to be renewed, then the truths of the Bible brought to view; these truths would present the objects on which his first holy affection, and every succeeding affection, would be exercised; Then the Word is instrumentally the cause of his conversion and sanctification.

7. If the fourth principle be true, then the human race do not commence their existence sinners. The Methodists and Taylorites, and perhaps many others, hold that infants do not sin until they come to the line of accountability. Some make this line at the age of 10 or 12 years, and others say the child comes to the line of accountability, as soon as it perceives moral subjects. Suppose the child should die before it reaches the line, it could not be pardoned or condemned, because it had not sinned. If it is taken to heaven, it goes without having been regenerated by the Holy Spirit, or having been cleansed by the blood of Christ. What will be its song in heaven?

It cannot be "Unto Him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood." Moreover, if all children come to the line of accountability innocent and sinless, would there not be as much probability that they would continue innocent and sinless, as that they would become sinners? What is there in the innocents, that makes it certain that every one will sin, unless prevented by the power of God? But what says the Bible? "The wicked are estranged from the womb; they go astray as soon as they be born, speaking lies."—*Ps.* 58: 3. "I was shapen in iniquity, and in sin did my mother conceive me."—*Ps.* 51: 5.

In opposition to the obvious meaning of these texts, Methodists hold that infants, idiots and heathen, never come to the line of accountability, and go to heaven on the score of innocence, and not in consequence of having their depraved hearts renewed by the Holy Spirit. If Cumberlandians do not hold the same views, it is because they are less consistent than Methodists; as the light and motive system leads unavoidably to these sentiments. If the light and motive system be true, then it follows that no man is to blame for not being a christian. No man is to be blamed for not taking a road, when there is no light to see it. And if all that is wanting to bring people to love the Saviour, is light, then sin is a mere error of the head, as the heart is ready to love the truth as soon as the truth is seen. But he who knew what is in man, testifies—"This is the condemnation, that light is come into the world; and men loved darkness rather than light, because their deeds were evil. For every one that doeth evil, hateth the light."—*John* 3: 19.

Sentiments that necessarily flow from the four Principles.

1st. Prayer to God to convince of sin, to convert and sanctify, is useless, if not mockery, as God cannot do any of these things without acting on the hearts and consciences of men, which he never does if these principles be true. Especially would it be worse than useless to pray that God would save a sinner who was dying of disease that had deprived him of reason, or to save by regeneration the unfortunate deaf and dumb.

2d. God is doing his best to make and keep the universe holy and happy, by light and motive; but they fail to effect God's designs; therefore God is disappointed and unhappy. "What

could have been done more to my vineyard, that I have not done in it? Wherefore, when I looked that it should bring forth grapes, brought it forth wild grapes.”—*Is. 5: 4.*

3d. It was rash and unadvised to provide a Saviour for all men, for it could not be told that all men would need a Saviour.

4th. It was rash in God to publish in this world, that the happiness of heaven would be eternal, as he has no other way to perpetuate it forever, except by light and motive. These failed to keep angels and Adam holy and happy, and may fail to keep saints in heaven holy and happy.

5th. It was rash to declare that the character of the damned will remain the same forever. “He that is unjust, let him be unjust still; and he that is filthy, let him be filthy still; and he that is righteous, let him be righteous still.”—*Rev. 22: 11.* For the independent agents, who will be condemned at the day of judgment, may in some period of eternity become holy.

6th. It was rash to predict events which depend on the voluntary actions of independent agents, as they may choose not to do such actions.

7th. If the four Principles be true, it was not safe for God to promise that saints will persevere, for they may not choose to persevere.

8th. If the four Principles be true, it is wrong to give God the glory for our conversion; yet we may praise him for the atonement, and for pardon.

9th. It is vain to pray to God to deliver us from the temptations of Satan, as God can only present motives to Satan to induce him to cease to tempt, which Satan may disregard; or

10th. To pray to deliver us from inbred sin, as he can only present motives to induce us to deliver ourselves.

As Cumberlands and Methodists do not avow these consequences, nor perhaps any others who believe the four Principles, it would be unjust to impute these sentiments to them. Yet the doctrines which distinguish them from other denominations, flow from these Principles as fairly as the above 9 or 10 inferences; and these Principles will ferment, until the legitimate consequences that flow from them, will be adopted by thousands who advocate the Principles.

OBJECTION.—You reject these principles because they lead

to the most dangerous and ruinous errors. Methodists, Cumberlandians, and others, reject the opposite principles, because they suppose they lead to dangerous errors—e. g. If God acts on men and angels, to produce their free voluntary acts, then God is the author of sin, and men are not to praise or blame. Let the plain words of the Bible decide. “The son of man goeth as it was determined; but wo unto that man by whom he is betrayed.”—*Luke 22: 22*.

The Lord moved David to say go number the people. And David’s heart smote him, after that he had numbered the people; and David said unto the Lord, I have sinned greatly, in that I have done. I beseech thee take away the iniquity of thy servant, for I have done very foolishly.—*2 Sam. 24: 1—10*. “God hardened Pharaoh’s heart, and turned the heart of the Egyptians to hate his people.”—*Ps. 105: 24*. Yet Pharaoh confessed, “I have sinned this time; the Lord is righteous, and I and my people are wicked.”—*Exo. 9: 27*. Not only David and Pharaoh decide against the objection, but God himself, by punishing them both.

11th. If the four Principles be true, then all the events produced by the voluntary actions of men in families, societies and kingdoms, are contingencies, which, says Dr. Clarke, are such things as God has poised, on the possibility of being or not being; leaving it to the will of intelligent beings to turn the scale.

12th. These Principles generally originate with Unitarians, Deists and Infidels. From them they receive their polish, and are thrown into the Christian community, to be propagated by religious teachers, as they would be regarded as suspicious by the public.

C. N.

THE EMPEROR, SIGISMUND, was reproached for rewarding instead of destroying his enemies, and by that means giving them the power again to injure him. “What,” said the noble minded monarch, “do not I destroy mine enemies when I make them my friends?”

Decrees of God.

BY DR. DWIGHT.

(Concluded from page 224.)

“In my last discourse I asserted, from these words, the following Doctrine:

“*That all things, both beings and events, exist in exact accordance with the purpose, pleasure, or, what is commonly called the Decrees of God.*

“In discussing this doctrine, I mentioned, that I should attempt,

“I. To Explain it;

“II. To Prove it; and

“III. To answer the Objections commonly made against it.

“Under the first head, after having mentioned several erroneous opinions, and forms of phraseology, frequently adopted concerning this subject, I expressed my own views of it in this manner: *What is commonly intended by the Decrees of God, is that choice, or pleasure of the Divine Mind, eternally and unchangeably inherent in it, by which all things are brought into being.*

“Under the second head, *I alleged several direct arguments in support of the doctrine; and then suggested several difficulties which result from denying it.* These, by proving the converse of the doctrine to be false, indirectly proved the doctrine to be true: according to the general axiom, that every proposition, or its converse, is true.

“I shall now, as I proposed, attempt,

“III. *To answer the objections commonly made against this doctrine.*

“These, I think, may be reduced to the following:

“1st. *That it is equivalent to the Stoical doctrine of Fate, or Destiny:*

“2dly. *That it exhibits God as the Author of sin:*

“3dly. *That it destroys the Free Agency of rational creatures:* and,

“4thly. *That it discourages all the Efforts of mankind towards Reformation.*

“I will not say, that no other objections are brought against

this doctrine; but I think of no others, which appear to be regarded as material by those who allege them; or which, if these be fairly obviated, would be supposed sensibly to affect the question in debate. These, therefore, I shall now proceed to consider in the order proposed.

“1st. *It is objected, that the general doctrine of this discourse is equivalent to the Stoical doctrine of Fate or Destiny.*

* * * * *

“2dly. *It is objected that this doctrine exhibits God as the Author of sin.*

“To the phrase, *Author of sin*, very different meanings are annexed by different persons. In order to meet this objection, therefore, with any hope of success, it will be necessary, in the first place, to determine the true meaning of the phraseology. Some persons understand by it *the immediate and efficient Cause of sinful volitions*: others, not only mean *the efficient, but the guilty Cause of such volitions*: others still, *such a Cause, as in any manner, however remote, lays a foundation for the existence of sin*: and others, *a Cause, supposed to be intelligent, which, when possessed of sufficient power to prevent the existence of sin, did not interfere to prevent it*. When it is said, that this doctrine exhibits God as the Author of sin; I shall, for the present, consider the phrase *as used in one, or both, of the two first of these senses*; and regard the objector as intending, that, according to this doctrine, *God is either the guilty, or guiltless, immediate, and efficient, cause of sinful volitions in his creatures*: In other words, that *he constrains, or compels, them to sin*. That the doctrine which I have defended, involves this consequence I cannot perceive nor admit.

“To support the objection, it must be shown that God cannot will, and accomplish, the existence of voluntary agents, who, acting freely, shall nevertheless act in exact accordance with what is, upon the whole, his pleasure; and who, in the circumstances in which they are severally placed, and with the attributes which they severally possess, will, with perfect freedom, contribute each his proper part and efficiency, towards the promotion of the infinite good, originally proposed as the end of the divine system. But this, I apprehend, has never been, and never will be shown. It must be proved, that in the infinite multitude of possible free agents, present to the view

of the Divine Mind, there were none possessed of such attributes, and capable of being placed in such circumstances, as, while they acted with perfect freedom, would also perfectly accomplish the purposes of the divine pleasure. No man will, I presume, attempt to prove this position. If it be granted, that such agents were possible, and that the Infinite Mind discerned their nature and character; it must, in order to support the objection, be proved, that God, having these agents in full view, chose not to select them, and bring them into existence. But this, I presume, will not be admitted by the objector himself. Till this can be done, however, the objection cannot be maintained.

“That Sin is in the world, and that the world, with all which it contains, is under the government of God, in some sense or other, must be acknowledged by the objector himself; unless, on the one hand, he denies the divine government absolutely, or, on the other, the distinction between moral good and evil. Sin has, therefore, entered the world in some manner or other, while it was under the divine government. There are *three ways in which men have attempted to explain the difficulty, involved in this fact*. Some persons assert that by his direct efficiency, God caused; others, that he permitted; and others still, that he could not prevent its existence.

“That God could not prevent the existence of sin cannot be maintained. He has prevented it in *the angels, who kept their first estate*. He prevented it in the person of Christ; who in his human nature *knew no sin*. He has promised that he will prevent it, and he will therefore certainly prevent it, in *the spirits of just men made perfect* in the heavens. Should it be said, that these beings by their own voluntary agency, and without any interference or influence, on the part of God, continue in a state of holiness; I answer, that this supposition affects not the point at all; for God plainly could have created every moral agent with exactly the same attributes, and placed them in exactly the same circumstances, with those several virtuous beings, who persist in holiness. Whatever we suppose to be the means, by which they are preserved from sin; those very means he certainly could have used, to preserve in the same effectual manner all others.

“Beyond this, he has not only continued holiness in the

minds of many of his creatures; but has restored it to vast multitudes, who had fallen into a state of hopeless guilt and pollution. This fact is a proof, that he could have continued it in the minds of these creatures, if he had judged this conduct to be, upon the whole, wise and good for him to pursue.

“That God by an immediate agency of his own, creates the sinful volitions of mankind, is a doctrine, not warranted, in my view, either by Reason or Revelation. There are, I know; many respectable men in modern times, and particularly in our own country, as there have been at other times, and in other countries, who have thought this the easiest way of arriving at satisfaction concerning this abstruse subject. * * *

* * * * *

“Satisfied with this view of the subject, on which, however, I mean to dwell more particularly hereafter, I adopt without hesitation the second of these methods of explaining the introduction of sin into the world; and unite with those who assert, *that God permitted the existence of sin; or in the Scriptural language, that he has in time past suffered all nations to walk in their own ways.* It has not ever been proved, that these ways are *not* their own, in the most absolute sense; nor in the strictest metaphysical language, that God has not suffered all nations to walk in them; nor that this, connected with such a superintendence and control, as invariably directs their conduct to ultimate good, and prevents it from terminating in ultimate evil, is not the whole of the immediate agency of God, so far as sin is concerned. That this scheme does not in any degree exhibit God as the author of Sin, in either of the two first senses, must, I think, be acknowledged by every man, who believes in the perfections and government of God. That he has permitted Sin, and has not prevented its existence, are facts so evident, that they cannot become the subject of serious debate. At the same time I cannot but observe, that those who, when they speak of God as the Author of Sin, mean to indicate these facts as the import of this phrase, use language in an unwarrantable, and, in my view, dangerous and mischievous manner.

“3dly. *It is objected, that this doctrine destroys the Free Agency of rational creatures.*

“It will be easily perceived, that many of the observations,

made under the last head, materially affect this also. Indeed these two objections are so connected in their nature, that it is impossible to consider one of them, to any extent, without anticipating, in some degree, the consideration of the other. To the observations which I have already made, I shall, however, add several others, peculiarly referring to this objection.

“There are but *two ways*, in which the agency of God can be supposed by the objectors to lessen, or destroy, the free agency of his creatures. *One is by compelling, or constraining, their actions: the other, by rendering the existence of their actions certain, before they take place.* That God compels, or constrains, the actions of his creatures; of men for example; certainly cannot be shown, nor even pretended; unless the compulsion exists in his decrees. Nor can it be shown to exist in his decrees, unless it is involved in the nature of his decrees, as such; or, in other words, unless the doctrine of this discourse is inconsistent with the nature of free agency in creatures. This, I presume, is the real opinion of those who bring the objection now under consideration. They regard the supposition, *that God has planned a certain system of things according to his own pleasure, and that he has made, and placed men in such a manner, as that they will certainly do those things, and those only, which will accord with that pleasure, as inconsistent with the doctrine, that they are free agents.*

“To this objection, to which I have intended to give its true import and full force, it is commonly answered, *that the doctrine which I have attempted to support, is capable of being clearly proved both from Reason and Revelation; and that men are intuitively conscious of their own free agency, being irresistibly sensible, that they act spontaneously, and without any coercion, or constraint. Both doctrines being, therefore, true, and certain, it is justly alleged, that they are of course consistent with each other.*

“It would seem, that this answer might as well satisfy the mind in the present case, as in numerous others, in which we perceive propositions to be true, but are unable to discern the nature of their mutual connection. But, as the objection is still insisted on, and seems to have no small weight in the minds of many persons, it will not be improper for me to offer some further considerations on the subject.

All those who make the objection, agree as well as others, that *it is possible for a finite agent, possessed of certain supposable attributes, and placed in certain supposable circumstances, to be free in the absolute sense.* I shall take this for granted; because, otherwise, the objection itself, and the debate founded on it, can have neither place nor meaning. We will suppose, then, *such an agent to exist; and to act, while he lived, in a manner perfectly free: while, at the same time, no being knew, at all, in what manner he would act in any case whatever, until his actions had existed.* In this case, he would undoubtedly be allowed to possess all possible advantages for acting with perfect freedom. Lest I should not be thought to be sufficiently particular, I will suppose his actions *to be all absolutely contingent;* because some philosophers suppose contingency to be an indispensable and inseparable attribute of a free action. We will now, in the second place, suppose *this agent, without any change in his powers, or his circumstances, in any other respect, to have all his actions, which, according to the former supposition are the freest possible, foreknown by God, or some other being.* I ask, whether they would be at all the less free, in consequence of being thus foreknown? The powers, the circumstances, and the actions, of this agent, remain exactly the same as before: the agent himself (for that is included in the supposition) being perfectly ignorant that his actions are thus foreknown. Can it be perceived, that this foreknowledge affects the *nature of the actions* in any manner, or the *freedom of the agent?* To me it is clear that it cannot; because, in the case supposed, the foreknowledge has not the remotest influence on the agent, nor on his actions: both *he* and *they* continuing to be exactly the same, in every respect whatever. On the contrary, all the possible influence of this foreknowledge is confined to the bosom of him, by whom it is possessed.

But if this agent would thus continue free, and his actions would still be perfectly free, notwithstanding they were foreknown; then it is clear, that *a preceding certainty, that the actions of a voluntary agent will exist, does not at all, of itself, lessen, or affect, their freedom.* Foreknowledge renders the future existence of that, which is foreknown, certain: therefore the actions of the agent supposed are all rendered certain,

and will of course exist: yet it is, I think, unquestionably clear from this statement, that their freedom will not be affected.

* * * * *

Again, we will suppose, *that the actions of the agent already specified, which are thus foreknown by God, are perceived by him, also, to be exactly agreeable to his pleasure.* Will this circumstance affect the freedom of agency? Surely it will not be asserted, nor believed, that actions, in order to be free, must contravene the pleasure of God. As I presume this proposition was never advanced by any man; and as it is an obvious absurdity in itself; I shall take the liberty to consider it as being an absurdity. It is therefore clear, *that the actions of a voluntary agent may be certainly foreknown by God to be exactly agreeable to his pleasure, and yet be attended with the highest possible freedom.*

That God knows all things, the knowledge of which involves not a contradiction; and that the foreknowledge of human actions does not involve a contradiction; I here consider as undisputed.

I have, I flatter myself, made it sufficiently evident, that God's foreknowledge of voluntary actions does in no respect lessen, or affect, their freedom; although it renders their future existence absolutely certain. But it will be said, by some persons at least, that the difficulty does not lie here; but in the fact, *that God has willed the existence of human agents, and their actions; and that it is his formation of them in such a manner, as to accomplish certain purposes of his own, which prevents, or destroys, the freedom in question.*

To remove the difficulty, presented by this observation; I will suppose once more *a voluntary agent either self-existent, or existing casually, possessing powers of understanding, similar in their extent to those of angels, or of men; and at the same time free in the highest sense, annexed to that term.* Let him be also supposed to be known, and comprehended, by God in the same perfect manner, in which any angel, or man, is known by him; so that God can foresee with an omniscient survey, and absolute certainty, all his future actions. At the same time, let it be supposed, that God exercises over him no government, or influence, whatever. This being will undoubtedly be acknowledged to be free, even by those who make

this objection; because he was neither brought into existence by the will of God; nor is controlled, nor influenced, in any manner whatever, by any will, beside his own. Let me further suppose, what, as it must be granted, cannot lessen, nor affect, his freedom; that all his actions, thus foreseen, are agreeable to the divine pleasure. Now let me ask, whether the divine omniscience could not contrive, and the divine power create, a being exactly resembling this, which I have here supposed, in every respect; except that he was not self-existent, nor casually existent; and so perfect a copy, that he would differ from this supposed being numerically only; would possess the same attributes; be in the same circumstances; and perform, both in substance and mode, exactly the same actions. Were this supposed being, for example, to be placed by God in his kingdom, in certain circumstances, and acting a certain part, in the system, which was exactly agreeable to the divine pleasure; would not the created being who was his exact counterpart, if substituted in his place, perform precisely the same actions, with the same faculties, and the same freedom? The only difference between them would be, that he, who was casually existent, would perform these actions in consequence of possessing such and such attributes, without having been created for this purpose; while the other would perform them, in consequence of having been thus created with the very same attributes. In their *origin*, I grant, these beings differ: in their *nature, character, and attributes*, they are precisely the same. But their origin, it is plain, cannot, even in the most distant manner, affect their attributes, or their actions. These, by the supposition, are exactly alike. If, therefore, the former of these beings is free; the latter is equally free. If the actions of the latter are foreknown by God; equally so are those of the former; and they both alike fulfil his pleasure.

With these things in view, it must, I think, be evident, *that God can create a free agent, whose actions shall be all foreknown by him, and shall exactly accomplish what is; upon the whole, his pleasure.*

If these things are just, and true; the doctrine of this discourse does not destroy, lessen, nor affect in any manner, the free agency of rational creatures; unless it can be shown, as I am well assured it never can be, *that God has not created agents,*

whose attributes are agreeable to this representation. There was not, indeed, present to his eye a self-existent, nor a casually existent agent; such as I have supposed; but there were present to the view of his omniscience all the attributes and circumstances, which can enter into the existence and character of such an agent. If, then, he did not create beings of such a character, it was solely because he did not choose to create them.

4thly. *It is objected, that this doctrine discourages all the Efforts of mankind towards reformation.*

That this doctrine has often been used to discourage such efforts, I readily acknowledge. This is not unfrequently the tenor of books, and of conversation; nor is it an uncommon thing for persons to make it the source of discouragement to themselves; and to entertain gloomy and distressing apprehensions concerning their own final condition, when referred in their minds to the decrees of God. Still I cannot see, that this conduct is wise, rational, or defensible; nor that the doctrine includes in itself any discouragement, which will not, with as good reason, flow from that which is opposed to it. It cannot result from the consideration, *that the pleasure of God controls this subject, rather than our own pleasure.* On the one hand, the pleasure of God is more wisely and benevolently formed than our own; more disposed to promote our salvation; and more able to contrive the best means, by which it may be accomplished. This we never could have done ourselves; nor, if we were able, should we be willing: as is clearly proved by the fact, that, after the wonderful and difficult things which have been done to provide salvation for us, and while it is proffered to us freely on the easiest of all terms, we are not willing to accept it. How much less willing should we have been to go through the labor and sufferings, could we have gone through them, which were necessary to procure it for ourselves.

On the other hand, if we please to be saved, we shall *now* be saved. This is one great part of the divine pleasure. There is nothing, which prevents us from being saved, but our own inclination; and this would as effectually prevent us in any supposable circumstances. Nor could we in any circumstances possess a greater freedom of choice, or action, with respect to

this or any other subject, than we now possess. Nor is there, so far as I know, any influence from God, which at all hinders us from choosing salvation with all that freedom of action, which moral beings can possess. It will be observed, I speak not here of persons, for their incorrigible obstinacy, punished with judicial blindness, and hardness of heart; though it is to be questioned, *whether, even in this case, God does any thing more, than leave them to themselves.* The language of God to every sinner, is, *As I live, saith the Lord, I have no pleasure in the death of the sinner; but would rather, that he would return, and live.* His invitations to sinners are, *Ho! every one that thirsteth; come ye to the waters; and he that hath no money: yea, come, and buy wine and milk without money and without price: and, Whosoever will, let him come, and take the water of life freely.* This language is perfectly sincere, and exactly descriptive of the disposition of God.

This discouragement cannot arise from the certainty of the event, as established by this doctrine. The event is equally certain, if the doctrine is given up. It is equally certain in fact, with what Mr. Locke calls Certainty of truth, in distinction from Certainty of knowledge, concerning any man, that he either will, or will not, be saved, whether it be foreknown or not. One of these assertions, either that he will, or that he will not, be saved, is now certainly true. *Which of them is true, I grant, does not appear; and will not, until time shall disclose it.* Still, one of the events will take place, whether decreed, or foreknown, or not. God will then judge, and punish the wicked; and will punish them for exactly the same reasons, on either supposition; viz. for their impenitence, unbelief, and disobedience. A person may, therefore, with exactly the same propriety, whether he admits the decrees of God, or not; or whether God has, or has not, formed any decrees; say, *If I shall be saved, I shall be saved, whether I try to obtain salvation or not: and, however earnestly I may try, if I am to perish, I shall perish.* The certainty, in either case, is the same, and equally absolute. Even the foreknowledge of God will not alter this fact at all; for though it affects him, it affects not the certainty of the event. All that can be truly said is, that an event, which would otherwise take place, is now foreseen by him. To us in both cases, also, it is equally

unknown. The causes, which will bring it to pass, will in both cases be exactly the same. The language in both cases, therefore, may be adopted with exactly the same propriety.— But the truth is, the language cannot be proper in either case. In my apprehension, it is never true, that the attempts of the man concerned towards the attainment of salvation, make no difference as to the event. On the contrary it is clear, that of those, who are saved, very few indeed, can be found, who have not made such attempts; nor is there any satisfactory reason to believe, that those, who make them with persevering earnestness and zeal, ultimately fail. I know no reason, why the same language should not be used, with the same propriety and force, concerning our secular, as concerning our spiritual, business. But the farmer, who should loiter at home, and say, “If I am to have a crop the present year, I shall have one; and, if I am not to have a crop, I shall not have one, whether I plough, and sow, and reap, or lie down in my bed:” the student, who should spend his time in dress, sports, and gaming, and say, “If I am to be a scholar, or to get my lesson, I shall accomplish it; and, if I am not, it will never be accomplished, whether I study diligently, or lose my time in idleness:” would be pronounced, and justly, a fool or a madman. But the decree of God extends to each of these subjects as absolutely, as to our salvation. Men are as really chosen to be farmers, and scholars, as Christians: and learning and harvests are as truly appointed, as holiness: although from the comparative unimportance of the former, and the amazing moment of the latter, we are apt to apply the doctrine to one of the cases, and not to the other.

The kingdom of God, as established by his pleasure, is a kingdom of means, regularly connected with their ends. I do not perceive, that this is less true, when applied to spiritual, than to natural, things. The real discouragement which men generally labour under with respect to their spiritual concerns, is their indisposition to make any efforts for the attainment of salvation. In truth, this indisposition itself suggests the discouragement, which I have obviated, and then admits it. To a dispassionate, unbiassed mind, it would never gain admission. By sober Reason it was never devised, and can never be supported.

Were God really unwilling, that men should strive; had he discountenanced efforts; had he established no means of grace; or had those means, when anxiously and perseveringly used, failed of success; there would, indeed, be ample room for well founded discouragement. But, when we find, as in my view we do in fact find, all these things reversed in the good pleasure, and providence, of God; we have every inducement to hope, and to labor: much more, it would seem, than from any supposable situation, in which all things were left to fluctuation and casualty. Stupid sinners have indeed, according to this and every other scheme, the most fearful reason for discouragement and terror. But such as are awakened, anxious, and engaged, to seek eternal life, have solid and abundant reason for hope.

Mankind seem, in many instances to suppose, that the decrees of God produce the event without means; according to the *Mohammedan* doctrine of predestination. Whereas, if they believed, that the pleasure of God formed the system, and selected the means and agents, by which all events are accomplished; if they believed those agents to be endued with all the powers of the freest possible agency, and to be selected, and formed, so that they might act with perfect freedom; if they believed, that God always furnishes them with the necessary means of obedience, and with motives to obedience, more and greater than any, which they can find, to disobey; if they believed that God, by a direct agency of his own, does not constrain them to any act whatever, but leaves them in all instances to act, with perfect freedom, just as they please; I think they would also believe, that there is no more difficulty attending the fact, that he has chosen and formed, such agents, as he knew would unitedly do all his pleasure, than would attend his choice and formation of such agents, as would act in any other manner whatever. But all this, for ought that appears, is true. The contrary doctrine has never been evinced to be true; at least in my apprehension; and I fully believe never will be.

On the other hand, it will be proper, for a moment, to turn our thoughts to the influence of the supposition, that God has not fixed the system of things according to his Pleasure. It cannot but be acknowledged, that he knew what system was

upon the whole, most desirable, wisest, and best. If he did not resolve on it, it was plainly because he did not desire, or choose, to bring it to pass. In plain English, then, he did not desire the chief good of his creation, or the supreme glory of himself, with sufficient good-will to resolve on it. Can this be infinite good-will? Can it be moral perfection? It was certainly as easy for him to accomplish it, as to accomplish an inferior system of good. If, then, he did not resolve on the superior system; it was plainly because he loved the inferior system better, and chose to do less good, rather than greater. His disposition, therefore, is on this scheme, imperfectly good in itself; how imperfectly, it is impossible, according to this supposition, to determine.

According to this supposition, it is further to be observed, all things are left by God in a state of absolute uncertainty. The whole happiness of his intelligent creatures is committed to the casual influence and efficacy of their own views, feelings, and conduct. God cannot, in the nature of the case, interfere, either by determination, or influence, without destroying the free agency, or discouraging the efforts, of his Intelligent creatures, for the attainment of happiness. The whole system of the universe, so far as these creatures are concerned, must of course be regulated wholly by them. Does not this scheme evidently set all their interests afloat, and leave them eternally to the uncertain and hazardous direction of finite wisdom and goodness? From the experience which we have had of the character and conduct of such creatures, is there a person in this assembly, who would willingly commit his eternal interests to this perilous direction, and trust his all to the disposal of beings so weak, and so often wicked? Can this be safe for creatures? Can it consist with the perfect character of God? To the wisdom and forecast of his own mind, a man might, through over-weening self-confidence, be willing perhaps to commit the guidance of any interest, and feel that his soul itself would be safe in his own hands. But would the same person trust himself to the final direction of others?—Would he venture his eternal welfare upon the wisdom and benevolence of any, or all of those, by whom he is encircled? Their fitness for this mighty trust is, however, not inferior to his own; and they would as justly refuse to confide their souls

to his care, as he would refuse to entrust his soul to them. Were he not blinded, therefore, by an unwarrantable partiality for himself, he would no sooner, no more willingly, trust himself in this mighty concern, than he would trust those around him. To do either, he would clearly discern, would be foolish and dangerous in the extreme. Wisdom, on the contrary, would teach both him and them to commit themselves, and their whole well-being, implicitly to God.

On the connection of prayer with this subject, I design to dwell particularly, when I shall come to the consideration of that duty. I have purposely omitted the examination of it at the present time, because several things relating to it, belong to Prayer only, and demand a separate discussion.

Whether the observations which I have made on the general doctrine of this discourse, will be viewed by others as possessing the importance which I have attached to them, I cannot determine. To me, they have appeared to possess real weight. If they should contribute in any measure to remove difficulties, to settle doubtful opinions, to establish truth, and to communicate satisfactory views concerning a subject so often attended with perplexity and alarm, I shall esteem my labors amply rewarded.

Short Practical Sermons—No. 2.

THE PRAYER MEETING—PART 2ND.

Let us look now, in the second place, to the advantages derived from the social prayer meeting.

II. It may admit of a question, whether it would be right to resort to a successful expedient for doing good, and then to claim it to be duty to adopt that expedient. It is very easy to be deceived relative to a reputed seal of heaven's approbation, set to a human device. Thus, there has been a time, when the anxious seat, a thing originated by men, has been thought to bear the marks of God's approval, and every dislike expressed relative to it, has been looked upon by some as a sin. The

same may be said of the protracted meeting. Some men have felt constrained to oppose the introduction of both these means from principle;—but all such opposition has been pronounced, in some quarters, as resistance to the Holy Ghost. This is taking too high ground—it cannot be occupied. You can only say, that anxious seats and protracted meetings originated with good men, and until their abuse, were the means by which the Holy Ghost made the truth to bear upon the hearts of men. But you cannot say, nor ever could, that all dislike to them is a sin against God, *because the seal of God's approbation has not invariably been put upon them.* Had their use always resulted in good, and in good only, you might conclude that God has set his seal of approbation upon them; and you might say, that opposition to these measures is a sin against God.

We will suppose, only for a moment, that the social prayer meeting is a contrivance of man, that it did not originate with Jesus Christ—that it has no sanction from the example of the apostles. Now, it can be easily maintained, that it has invariably been the source of so much good, wherever it has been located, that to be indifferent relative to it, is to be guilty of great sin. In other words, God has so certainly blessed the prayer meeting, that neglect of it can be looked upon only as a great crime in the sight of God. To make this out, let us look at some of the advantages of the prayer meeting.

1. The prayer meeting promotes personal piety. Constant attendance at the house of God on the Sabbath, keeps up a spirit of devotion as nothing else will do. Still, something is needed during the week, to remind the christian of heaven. This is found in the prayer meeting. You will see an illustration of the remark, in those christians who reside so far from their brethren, as to be unable to attend on any of the means of grace, except the public worship of God. Such persons know the value of the prayer meeting. They regret their privations, and, indeed, use such means as they have, to keep up the flame of devotion in their hearts. It is not rare that you will find persons thus situated, who once lived in the midst of religious privileges. They feel their loss. A spiritual deadness has settled down upon their affections. Their piety languishes; and they long for the time when they can again meet their friends for social prayer.

2. Another result of the social prayer meeting is a spirit of Christian activity and enterprise. Point to me a neighborhood where the prayer meeting is not, and I will show you where no faithful christians burn with love for souls. There the only monitor that warms the profane man, is the one within his own bosom. There the infidel talks boldly, and has no fear of failure in his work of propagating death. Send into such a place a Harlan Page, and you will soon hear of the prayer meeting opened. He could as well live among the snows, and feed upon the scanty herbage of Greenland, as maintain a life of christian faithfulness in that place, without the social prayer meeting. If there be no christians to meet and pray with him there, he will give God no rest till he shall have converted some. Such faithful activity is only a development of a social piety; and a social piety does not usually thrive without the social prayer meeting. It is a very great advantage then, in this respect, to be able to attend the social prayer meeting constantly.

3. Revivals of religion, and a high degree of prosperity to the church, are fruits of the prayer meeting also. It is absurd to suppose that men will be converted, and the church made prosperous, where there is no prayer; and where there is a great deal of prayer, some of it will certainly be social prayer.

I have now before my mind a neighborhood, where for quite twenty years, every Wednesday evening, with a very few exceptions, has brought together a little group of praying disciples. That evening has become sacred there, and dark and dreary must the night be to prevent the prayer meeting.

Scarcely a league distant is another neighborhood, where are no prayer meetings at all, and the difference is as great as it can be. The former has often been visited by revivals of religion, and many families have become families of prayer. The latter has never experienced a general revival, and there will be no praying households, when two or three old men shall have died. Many of the young in the one neighborhood are virtuous, sober, pious. Those of the other are, for the most part, wild, reckless, ungodly. The former may be styled the garden of the Lord. The latter is covered with weeds and brambles. There is all the difference possible, and the prayer meeting has done not a little to create that difference.

It will do the same good work in any community, if it be faithfully used.

4. The prayer meeting contributes very highly to the promotion of a spirit of sacrifice and self-denial for others. One thing is very certain; no church will ever make large gifts, or bestow many of her sons and daughters to go and carry the gospel to those who have it not, if she have not much prayer. The spirit of prayer and the spirit of self-denial go together. They throb in the same bosom, and, like fond sisters, the one will not stay where the other is unwelcome.

I well recollect the Church that had two representatives among the Indians of our country, another in India, and another in Turkey. The monthly concert of prayer rarely lacked interest among that people, and much prayer seemed to be offered in faith. It was the prayer meeting, together with the other means of grace, which raised the standard of piety so high, as that so many were found ready to go and labor for Christ far away. And so it is every where. The surest way to feel an interest in the rescue of lost men, is to begin to pray for them. Then, where there is true feeling, there will be action; and action in turn will produce feeling, and feeling again will show itself in action and prayer.

Time will not allow me to speak of the advantages of the prayer meeting at a greater length. Suffice it to say, that they are evident marks of God's favor. Wherever the results of the prayer meeting have been observed carefully, no christian can fail to see that a blessing is in it, and hence we have a very high sanction for it. This is all true, on the supposition that it is a contrivance of man.

But God ordained the prayer meeting. Jesus Christ enjoined attendance upon it—gave a promise that implies it to be a sin to neglect it—gave it the sanction of his own example, and his disciples followed in his footsteps. You will see then, that refusing to attend it is a sin, and that of no ordinary kind.

With these impressions on your minds, you are prepared now to hear the excuses so often given for absence from this divinely appointed means of grace.

1. Here comes first the church member, with a countenance on which you can read thoughts of farms, and stock, and merchandize. Listen to his excuse:—"I am unable to attend the

weekly prayer meeting, because I have so much business to take up my time.” And is that a good excuse, sir? When did Jesus Christ say, that you might bury yourself so deep in the world, as that you are unable to be at the prayer meeting? Did he do it in the same hour when he proclaimed your sins forgiven? Did he do it when you took upon you the most solemn vow, when you publicly professed his name before the world, angels, and God? Did he do it in some hour of joyful communion with him? Brother you are *wrong*. That time you have taken away from the prayer meeting belongs to Jesus Christ, and until you shall give it back to him, he will rob your bosom of a calm and settled peace. Until you shall return to the prayer meeting, you cannot have true enjoyment. A duty so important cannot be neglected without a loss in your own soul.

2. But I see present other church members, who are constantly absent from the prayer meeting, for other reasons yet; and I hear the excuse from some—“We do not attend the prayer meeting because we do not think that meeting of much importance.”

Every one of you knows something about the human body. There are small tubes, situated far below the skin. In the extremities of the limbs these are exceedingly small, and yet it will take only a trivial wound to produce a strong stream of blood. A child of yours has cut one of the arteries, but it bleeds so little, that it cannot do much harm, the artery is so very small. Not so, says your physician. He is in haste—you can read his feelings of alarm in his face, in his eye, in his actions. The prayer meeting is just like a wounded artery. It is a little thing. Only a few persons attend it, and the prayers that are offered are cold and languid. Yet that little thing is of very great importance. It is in answer to the prayers of those few, that God’s church is to be revived. If ever the streams of salvation are to flow, they will probably come in that channel. By staying away from the prayer meeting without reason, you are disregarding the will of Christ, expressed as plainly as it can be, and that certainly is not of little importance. You are refusing to walk in the footsteps of Christ and of his apostles, and that surely is not of little importance. You are counting yourself as rich, and not in need

of Christ's choicest gifts; and that, you dare not say, is a small sin. No, no, the prayer meeting is of great importance, and it can be only a great sin to neglect it.

3. A good number, however, are occasionally absent from the prayer meeting, who cannot join in either of the excuses that have been rendered as yet. I have read their excuse in their countenances. They have expressed it in their actions. Here it is—"I am not exactly certain that it is not my duty to pray, and for fear that I shall be asked to do so, and that I shall come away with a burdened heart, I will not go to the prayer meeting at all." Will you tell us now, dear brother, why you have any doubt as to your duty in this matter? Is it because you are naturally of a timid disposition? Is that timidity, however, so great as to be insuperable? Does it beset you in the social circle? Can you not speak with confidence there, even in the presence of a greater number than are ever seen at the prayer meeting? Or do you say that you have not a gift for praying—you cannot pray eloquently, or with propriety? Did that hinder you from speaking yesterday relative to the Mexican war? That theme unloosed your tongue, and gave readiness to your stammering lips. But you have no eloquence with which to address God! If your family were sick, you would have no difficulty in asking your physician to come and cure them. Or, if the flame of midnight was raging over their heads, ready to burst upon them, you would cry aloud, that they might be awakened. But you cannot call upon Christ to heal their souls, nor to save them from hell, lest you should not do it with propriety!

To any man that is disposed to excuse himself from a part in the prayer meeting, let me say, you *may* have a good excuse in the sight of God. If so, I have nothing more to say. But if this is not the case, I will tell you in faithfulness, you are guilty of a cruel, wicked distrust of Christ. Those compunctions of conscience you feel—that burden which weighs down your spirits on going from the place of prayer—those frequent suspicions, which, with all your efforts to lull them to sleep, will wake up in your soul—these are all witnesses of the truth of what I say. You are unwilling to do your duty, and that unwillingness will shut the light of God's countenance out of your soul. It is in the way of the blessings of salvation which

are ready to come into your family. Do be persuaded to take up your cross and follow Jesus Christ where he directs.

O! it is amazing to see what little excuses will keep christians from the path of faithfulness! Obstacles which would be treated with contempt, did they stand in the way of getting earthly good, are sure and effectual barriers to keep them from getting years of enjoyment, and unfading happiness throughout eternity. Tempests and night storms cannot detain from the political caucus, but a very slight dampness on the breeze, or a little darkness in the heavens, will keep them away from a meeting with Jesus Christ and his brethren. The interests of the souls of their friends, of the souls of the whole world, move them not so much as the question, "shall our party triumph in the next election?" Brethren, these things ought not to be so. Till they are made right, the curse of God will be upon you. Not, indeed, upon your fields of grain, nor upon your flocks, will it rest, perhaps, but upon your families—upon your own souls.

R. P. W.

KINGSTON, Tenn., Oct. 27, 1846.

MESSRS. EDITORS:—You will please give the following an insertion in the Magazine.

THOS. BROWN.

The following persons are authorized and requested to act as Agents in their respective bounds, to receive and forward to the subscriber, at Kingston, Tenn., all moneys which may be paid to them on the subscriptions to the Professorship of Sacred Literature, under the care of the Synod of Tennessee, viz:

FOR VIRGINIA.

Rev. GEO. PAINTER, Wythe county; E. S. WATSON, Smyth county; JOHN ROBINSON, Glade Spring Church; Rev. JAMES McCHAIN, Abingdon; Rev. JAMES KING, Paperville and Cold Spring Churches; Rev. W. A. TAYLOR, Jonesville.

FOR TENNESSEE.

SAMUEL RHEA, Esq., Sullivan county; JOHN LYNN, Esq., Kingsport; Rev. R. P. WELLS, Washington county; Rev. F. A. McCORKLE, Greene county; S. D. MITCHELL, Rogersville; A. A. McCAMIS, Tazewell; O. BOAZ, Cheeks & Roads; Rev. N. HOOD, Dandridge; WM. DICK, Esq., New Market; DANIEL MEEK, Esq., Strawberry Plains; Rev. G. S. WHITE, Knox county; Rev. F. POPE & Rev. JOHN S. CRAIG, Blount county;

REV. JOHN DYKE, Unitia; JAMES A. COFFIN, Esq., Madisonville; Col. W. P. McDERMOTT, Tellico Plains; A. MCKELDIN, Athens; JAMES A. BROWN, Polk county; Rev. R. E. TEDFORD, Bradley county; DAVID N. BELL, Esq., Harrison; Rev. B. WALLACE, Soddy; R. M. HOOK, Esq., Chattanooga.

The subscriptions to the Professorship of Sacred Literature, were taken in conformity with the appended resolutions of Synod, and are payable in five annual installments, but with interest on the subscriptions in advance, until they are collected. Interest commencing on the 10th October, 1846. Persons wishing, however, to pay their subscriptions in advance, as many do, so as to avoid interest, can now make payment either directly to myself, or the agent above named, in whose appointed bounds they live. Payments made at any time until the 1st of January, 1847, will be received as in advance, and without interest.

THOS. BROWN,
Gen. Agent.

Kingston, Tenn., Oct. 26, 1846.

Extracts from the Minutes of the Synod of Tennessee, at their Sessions in October, 1843.

The Committee appointed to bring in a minute on the subject of a Professorship under the care of the Synod of Tennessee, report—

1. That there be a Professorship of Sacred Literature, under the care of the Synod of Tennessee.
2. That the sum of fifteen thousand dollars be raised, as a foundation for that Professorship.
3. That the Synod of Tennessee hold that amount so long as they deem it expedient, under the charter granted to the Maryville College.
4. That for the present, the location of the Chair of Sacred Literature be at Maryville. But with the understanding that Synod be at liberty to remove said Professorship elsewhere, after eight years.
5. That Rev. THOMAS BROWN be the Agent to solicit subscriptions for said Professorship.
6. That subscriptions to be taken in installments of five years, and when the full sum is subscribed, the interest to be paid on the installment in advance, until they are collected. None to be collected until all is subscribed.
7. The donations to revert to the donors, or their heirs, in the event the object contemplated be at any time abandoned.
8. The Professor to fill the Chair of Sacred Literature, shall be a man who has received the highest advantage of education afforded in the United States.

THE
Calvinistic Magazine.

[NEW SERIES.]

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

Vol. I.

November, 1846.

No. 11.

“The Great Iron Wheel.”

No. I.

We invite every man who loves religious and civil liberty, to examine the *Great Iron Wheel*.

In the 18th No. of the Methodist Episcopalian, there is an article on “the declension of religion” in some of the circuits, in which the writer says:—

“One of our Ministers, [now no more,] whose bright genius has happily demonstrated the applicability of our system to the objects of good intended by it, has told us, in his illustration, ‘that the entire movement depends upon keeping the *great iron wheel of itinerancy* constantly and rapidly rolling round,’ and in making the application of the figure to American Methodism, he says: ‘Let us carefully note the admirable and astounding movements of this wonderful machine. You will perceive there are ‘wheels within wheels.’ First. There is the great outer wheel of episcopacy, which accomplishes its entire revolution *once in four years*. To this are attached, *twenty-eight* smaller wheels, styled *annual conferences*, moving round *once a year*; to those are attached *one hundred wheels*, designated *presiding elders*, moving *twelve hundred other wheels*, termed *quarterly conferences*, every *three months*; to these are attached *four thousand wheels*, styled *travelling preachers*, moving round *once a month*, and communicating motion to *thirty thousand wheels*, called *class-leaders*, moving round *once a week*, and who, in turn, being attached to between *seven and eight hundred thousand wheels*, called *members*, give a suffi-

cient impulse to whirl them around *every day*. What a machine is this?"

Truly, "what a machine is this!" We say to every one, "Let us carefully note the admirable and astounding movements of this wonderful machine!" How potent for good—*if controlled by angels!* How omnipotent for evil—*if turned by men!* Why, in essential character, it is the very system of the Jesuits of Rome! It is, *in principle*, a crushing military despotism. It is *astounding!* It is *astounding* that any set of men, after the American revolution, should have dared to fabricate, and set in motion, this *great Iron Wheel of the Itinerant!* Just look at it, and you see it is a perfect system of *passive obedience and non-resistance*. Every *smaller wheel* being "ATTACHED" to the wheel next in power above it, and the whole moving in absolute control of the GREAT OUTER OF EPISCOPACY. The reflecting man must see, at a glance, that *all real liberty of thought and action is destroyed, as truly, by this system, as by the ecclesiastical system of Rome—as by the drill of an army—as by any despotism upon the face of the earth.*

But, it may be said, we must not press too far a mere "*illustration*"—for, that the *figure of the Great Iron Wheel*, properly explained, will not look so bad. Well. Let us see.

In May, 1844, the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, met in the City of New York. Bishop Andrew was suspended from the exercise of his functions, by the Conference. On the resolution of suspension, Mr. Hamline of Ohio, made a speech which had, perhaps, much weight in deciding the mind of the Conference as to its authority in the case. Mr. Hamline was made a Bishop, in part, probably, for this speech. It certainly deserved the mitre, as our readers will acknowledge.

Mr. Hamline argued, that the General Conference had the power to suspend the Bishop, in a summary manner, without trial,—because, according to the genius of the Methodist system, every officer, *under the Bishop*, could be thus suspended, or removed from office. He affirmed, that the *Class-Leader* could be removed by the *Itinerant Pastor*—the *Itinerant Pastor* by the *Presiding Elder* or *Bishop*—the *Presiding Elder* by the *Bishop*—*at any time* during the interval of Conference.

Mr. Hamline summed up his evidence by saying, that the Methodist system of removal or suspension was “*peculiar*,”

FIRST. That suspension, removal, or deposition from office, in the Methodist Episcopal Church, is “*summary*.” “*Without accusation, trial, or formal sentence*”—“*Ministerial, not judicial*.”

SECONDLY. “*It is for no crime, generally for no misdemeanor, but for being unacceptable*.”

THIRDLY. That “*most of the removals are by a sole agent, namely, by a Bishop, a Preacher whose will is omnipotent in the premises*.”

FOURTHLY. That “*the removing officer is not legally obliged to assign any cause for deposition. If he do so, it is through courtesy, and not of right*.”

FIFTH. That “*the deposed officer has no appeal*”—that “*if indiscreetly or unnecessarily removed, he must submit; for there is no tribunal authorised to cure the error, or rectify the wrong*.”

This system, Mr. Hamline acknowledges, is one of surpassing energy, and centralizing of power—and he pronounces it “*WORTHY OF ALL EULOGY*.”

There is the system—from the lips of a Methodist preacher—now a Methodist Bishop! Look at it, ye sober and reflecting lovers of religious liberty, and civil too. Look at it, ye members of the Methodist Church. Look at it. What! A system “*worthy of all eulogy!*” What say *you*, Genius of America? She answers, “*The Methodist system is death to all the institutions for which Washington fought and freemen died!*” What says the Gospel? The Gospel tells us, “*The Methodist system is Anti-Christ. For it is the very identical priestly power which has crushed and trodden under foot the liberty where-with Christ doth make free, in every age of the world!*” Worthy of all eulogy! Look at it—eight hundred thousand members, attached to thirty thousand class-leaders, and every one of these thirty thousand class-leaders holding his office at the mere discretion of some one of four thousand travelling Pastors, and every one of four thousand itinerant Pastors, moving in his circuit, at the *omnipotent* will of some one of a hundred Presiding Elders,—and every one of these hundred Presiding Elders holding his station at the mere pleasure of some one of a half dozen Bishops;—and when *summarily removed from office*,

none may ask the reason why, nor the despot the reason give! And this is the system, lauded by those who wield it, as "worthy of all eulogy!" This is said in the United States—and American freemen—not foreign Roman Catholics, tolerate, aye, submit to the usurpation.

Will it be said, in reply to these remarks, that the General Conference was divided on the resolution advocated by Mr. Hamline? And that the *Methodist Episcopal Church South*, do not sanction the views of Mr. Hamline? But we will not have dust cast in our eyes. Those who now constitute the Methodist Church *South*, denied the applicability of Mr. Hamline's summary process to the *Bishops*, on the part of the General Conference, but admitted, [so far as we understand,] the correctness of Mr. Hamline's interpretation of their Discipline, as to all the officers below the *Bishops*. But let us press this point a little farther. We will ask some questions.

1. Mr. Hamline and the General Conference say, that removal from office in the Methodist Church is "PECULIAR." Will the Editor of the Methodist Episcopalian deny it?

2. Mr. Hamline and the General Conference say, it is "SUMMARY"—"without accusation, trial, or formal sentence—ministerial, not judicial." Will the Episcopalian deny it?

3. Mr. Hamline and the General Conference say, "removals are for no crime, generally for no misdemeanor, but for being unacceptable." Will the Episcopalian deny it?

4. Mr. Hamline and the General Conference say, that "most removals are by a sole agent, namely, a Bishop or Preacher, whose will is omnipotent in the premises." Will the Episcopalian deny it?

5. Mr. Hamline and the General Conference say, that "the removing officer is not legally obliged to assign any cause for deposing. If he do so, it is through courtesy, and not of right." Will the Episcopalian deny it?

6. Mr. Hamline and the General Conference say, that "the deposed officer has no appeal—that if indiscreetly or unnecessarily removed, he must submit; for there is no tribunal authorized to cure the error, or rectify the wrong." Will the Episcopalian deny it?

Now we do not care how the Editor of the Episcopalian decides. If he denies the construction put upon the Methodist Discipline, by Mr. Hamline and the General Conference, we

may still be allowed to believe, that Mr. Hamline and the Conference understood the Methodist Discipline better than Rev. S. Patton. But if the Episcopalian admits the Discipline of the Methodist Church to be just what Mr. Hamline and the Conference say it is, then will Mr. Patton tell the people of East Tennessee whether he holds that that system of despotism is “*worthy of all eulogy?*” And, will he then favor us with a definition and illustration of Russian, Turkish and Chinese despotism, or will he tell us where, in any army on earth, there is any thing akin to this irresponsible power wielded in the Methodist Episcopal Church? Lastly. Will Mr. Patton tell us if the people in the Methodist Church, according to the system, [we thank God the system does not work perfectly, because it is in free America,]—will he tell us, if the people, as recognized by the system—the people—the members, whirled by the Great Iron Wheel, are not the merest *puppets*—moving round “*every day*” under the “*whirl*” of the class-leaders—who are *whirled* around by the travelling Preachers—who are *whirled* around by the Presiding Elders—who are *whirled* around by the Bishops—who are *whirled* around by the General Conference? Will Mr. P. tell us, if the wheel turned at proper speed, and all the parts were working right, whether these eight hundred thousand members might not be made to *whirl* around exactly alike—even dressed to order in stiff collars on one side, and dove-colored bonnets without ribbons on the other—doing identically the same thing, and at the same time, in every place where the wheel moved, from the St. Johns to the Rio Grande?

There is a Cotton Factory here, under the hill, in which a thousand spindles whirl round under the impulse of so many bands, which bands are whirled by so many drums, which drums are whirled by a long shaft-line of communication, which shaft is whirled by a great water-wheel, and every spindle spins just so much cotton, a day, an hour, a minute. So with this Great Iron Wheel. Could it be made to work as perfectly as is desired by those who turn it, every Church member would whirl around—a machine, living, it is true, but as really a machine, as each spindle in the Rotherwood Factory. The perfection of a soldier, said Buonaparte, is that he be an intelligent machine, having neither thought nor will of his

own. This is the result aimed at, and in a lamentable degree accomplished by the Roman Catholic system—and this must be the result of the perfect motion of the *Great Iron Wheel*.—Here a very important question comes up: *From whence does the Great Iron Wheel derive its power?* Listen!

"This General Conference," says Mr. Hamline, "is the sun in our orderly and beautiful system. Look into the Discipline. First, you have our Articles of Religion, in which God appears. What is next in order? *The General Conference*, which, like the orb of day, rises to shed light on the surrounding scene. It is first shaped, or fashioned, and then like Adam by his Maker, *is endowed with dominion, and made imperial in its relations*; and, saving the slight reservation of the constitution, it is *all-controlling* in its influences!" There it is! There you have the answer to the question, from whence does the Great Iron Wheel derive its power? You see that the *power* thus professed by the General Conference, is claimed to be derived DIRECTLY FROM GOD! Yes. There you have it. "It," the General Conference, "is first shaped and fashioned, and then, like Adam by his Maker, *is endowed with dominion and made IMPERIAL!*" Yes, God has endowed the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church with *dominion*, and made it IMPERIAL. Not Regal. No. Regal dominion was not despotic enough. But God has endowed the Conference with *dominion*, and made it IMPERIAL. The *Cæsar*, the *Czar*, the *Emperor* is the highest style of power, unlimited, and unchecked. God has made the General Conference IMPERIAL. So said Mr. Hamline, and so said the General Conference itself.

Now, we ask, where is the *power* of the PEOPLE in this system? Answer. No where. No where. They are the spindles, whirling, yonder, under the augmented, transmitted *power* through drums, and bands, and wheels.—Where are the PEOPLE? There they are, whirling around every day, *attached* to the class-leaders, who are *attached* to the itinerants, who are *attached* to the Presiding Elders, who are *attached* to the Bishops, under the *imperial control* of the outer, GREAT IRON WHEEL OF THE GENERAL CONFERENCE.

The thing is a naked despotism—imperial power, in an ecclesiastical aristocracy, unblushingly avowed and gloried in.

We have said, that in essence, this system is the same as that of the Jesuits of Rome. The Edinburgh Encyclopedia says, “Loyola, [the founder of the Jesuits,] resolved that the government of the Jesuits should be absolutely monarchical. A General, chosen for life by deputies from the several provinces, possessed supreme and independent power, extending to every person, and applying to every case. Every member of the order, the instant that he entered its pale, surrendered all freedom of thought and action; and every personal feeling was superseded by the interests of that body to which he had attached himself. He went wherever he was ordered; he performed whatever he was commanded; he suffered whatever he was enjoined; he became a mere passive instrument, incapable of resistance. The gradation of rank was only a gradation in slavery; and as perfect a despotism over a large body of men, dispersed over the face of the earth, was never before realized.”

We request that this system of the Jesuits may be compared with the Great Iron Wheel, and with the imperial power, claimed for the General Conference, and derived, by Mr. Hamline and the Conference, right from God. O! but say some ignorant, and timid, and time-serving people, that is too bad! To compare Methodist preachers to aristocrats and Jesuits. But softly, Mr. Timid, Time-server. Mr. Wesley himself avowed his system not to be republican. In a letter to Mr. John Mason, dated London, Jan. 13, 1790, he says:—

My dear Brother:—“As long as I live, the people shall have no share in choosing either stewards or leaders among the Methodists. We had not, and never had, such a custom. *We are no republicans, and never intend to be.*”—(London Wesleyan Magazine, April, 1830.)

You see, then, that we are sustained by Mr. Wesley himself. He says, *We are no republicans, and never intend to be.* Well, is the system better in the United States than Mr. Wesley *intended* it to be? No. It is worse. Mr. Wesley was grieved when he heard that the Methodists in America had established the Episcopacy. He wrote to Bishop Asbury,—“How can you, how dare you, suffer yourself to be called a BISHOP? I shudder, I start at the very thought! Men may call *me* a knave or a fool; a rascal, a scoundrel, and I am content: but they shall never, by my consent, call me a *Bishop!*”

And yet this *Bishop*, this *Episcopacy*, this *Great Iron Wheel*—*wheel within wheel*, with its "imperial" power, *derived from God*, acting with omnipotent authority, through subservient Presiding Elders, Itinerants and Class-Leaders, upon the people, has been set in motion in our midst.

But, perhaps some man tells us, "You said the system of Methodism is in essence that of the Jesuits of Rome: that is a hard saying. Jesuitism is the worst form of Roman Catholicism." Yes, examine for yourself, and you will see that Methodism and Jesuitism *are essentially the same*. Methodism is not yet *so bad* as Jesuitism. Let us not be, however, thereby deceived. Methodism is hardly fifty years old in this country. But things require time to show themselves. Look! That little worm, apparently innocent, will become the viper—that tender shoot, green and beautiful, will be the Upas-Tree, spreading abroad its arms and leaves of death. But we may be asked, do other writers call Methodism a system like unto that of the Jesuits? Let us see. Here is an extract from the Princeton Review, which may fairly be considered as exhibiting the mind of our Old School Presbyterian brethren. In the No. for July, 1843, we find this language—page 480: "The polity of the Methodist Society has been little understood by those out of its communion. They who have derived their notions of Methodism from the passing exhibitions of it which may have fallen under their notice, and who look upon it only as a fervent and enthusiastic form of religion, will be surprised beyond measure, to find what a compact and powerful system of discipline lies beneath its external manifestations. *The society of Ignatius Loyola, [i. e. the Jesuits] is the only one with which we are acquainted that surpasses it in its centralization of power.*"

And so, our good Princeton brethren have told the world that those who will examine Methodism will be "surprised beyond measure" to find that *its centralization of power is only surpassed by that of the Jesuits!* It is even so—and we, the Editors of the Calvinistic Magazine, want to help our Princeton brethren to startle "beyond measure" every man by the exhibition of this *Jesuitical Great Iron Wheel*. *The system is dangerous to our liberties, civil and religious. It ought to be understood, and done away by public opinion, enlightened by the*

spirit of the Bible; and the movement to do it away cannot be too soon.

It is sometimes asked, with great greenness, what business have we, the Editors of the Calvinistic Magazine, with the Methodist system? We answer—just the same business we would have, if a man living in the same house with us, had a barrel of gunpowder in his room. We think we should have the right to try to get that powder out of the house. So, we have the right to expose Popery, and Prelacy, and Methodism, as dangerous to the civil and religious liberty of our country.

We said in the outset, that this article is No. I. We have materials for at least twelve numbers of the *Great Iron Wheel*, in which, if spared, we will show the beginnings of Romanism in as many particulars, in the Methodist Episcopal Church. And, *as proof of what is to come*, we feel sure no candid man will rise from the reading of this number, without saying, with a long breath—"Well, Methodism is worse than I thought it was."

FRED. A. ROSS.

For the Calvinistic Magazine.

Presbyterianism.

(Continued from page 163.)

Having inquired into the constituent elements of Presbyteries, showing that they are composed primarily and essentially of ministers, and by representation from the several Churches within their respective bounds of ruling elders, I proceed to show more fully that the government of the Church is to be administered by these bodies.

In addition to the evidence already introduced on this point, in proving another evidence deduced from expediency; from the civil polity of the Jews; from the government of the Jewish Synagogue, &c.; I remark that the evidence from the New Testament is complete, that the government of the apostolic Churches was administered by Presbyteries. As this is a point of some importance, and as our object is to place within the reach of the feeblest reader of the magazine, the means of understanding this subject, I propose to inquire into the gov-

ernment of the Church in four of the principle cities where the apostles preached, viz: Antioch, Ephesus, Corinth, and Jerusalem. The object will be to prove that the Churches of these several cities were composed of different congregations, and that these congregations had their respective and appropriate ministers, or presbyters, who, together with the apostles, or any of them when present, constituted Presbyteries; by which, together with such representatives as the Churches may have furnished, the government of the Church was administered. I shall trust, as in other cases, to the desire of the reader to understand the subject, carefully to look out the proof-texts referred to, as it would require considerable space to transcribe them here.

1. We will begin with the Church at Antioch, the capitol of Syria. Here the disciples were first called Christians. I assert that the Church here was composed of different congregations, and I prove it (1,) from the multitude of believers here, Ac. 11: 19—26; (2,) from the number of “prophets and teachers,” Ac. 13: 1—and apostles who resided with them, Ac. 13: 1—3. 14: 26, 28. 15: 35. These would naturally organize and supply different congregations in that large city, which was “about ten miles in circuit.” These congregations formed but one Church, (Ac. 14: 27,) which was governed by a Presbytery composed in part of its own ministers and representatives, Ac. 15: 1—35.

2. The Church at Corinth, the capitol of Achaia; a populous and famed city. There were multitudes of believers here.—This is evident—from Paul’s stay here, perhaps near three years in all, Ac. 18: 1, 11. 19: 1, 10—from the number of places where worship was there maintained, as Cenchrea, Ro. 16: 1; the house of Justus, Ac. 18: 7, 8, and of Cloe, 1 Cor. 1: 11.—from the fact that churches, in the plural, are mentioned, 1 Cor. 14: 34.—from the great number of ministers among them, who had doubtless the charge of the several churches or congregations, 1 Cor. 1: 12. 4: 15.—These several churches were under the control of a Presbytery, composed of their several ministers; as appears from 1 Cor. 5th, and 2 Cor. 2nd, where instructions for the exercise of discipline are given by the apostle, which apply manifestly to the rulers of the church, and not to the church at large, 1 Cor. 12: 28. If we apply

these instructions to the church at large, they will prove that the church, as such, might administer the Lord's Supper, 1 Cor. 11: 8—34; and so Independents teach, but so the apostle never taught. If the church, without minister or ruler, may administer the Lord's Supper, on the same principle it may administer the ordinance of baptism, and all the high functions of discipline; which would wholly annihilate the distinction between rulers and ruled, and thus set all government aside.

3. The Church at Ephesus, one of the most famous cities of Lesser Asia. Here, too, believers were numerous, as appears from the considerations following:—Paul preached here “three years,” Ac. 20: 17, 31.—His labors were blessed to the conversion of multitudes, Ac. 19: 18—20. Jews and Greeks are mentioned v. 10, 17, see also 1 Cor. 16: 8, 9.—A church is mentioned in the house of Aquila and Priscilla, 1 Cor. 16: 19. But these disciples resided at that time at Ephesus, Ac. 18: 18, 19, 24, 26. There were, therefore, believers enough at Ephesus to constitute several different congregations. These congregations made *but one* church, Ac. 20: 17, Rev. 2: 1—6. They had their respective ministers or presbyters, Ac. 20: 17. These presbyters constituted a Presbytery, which had the control and government of the Church, Ac. 20: 28. They ministered to the several congregations separately, but governed “*ALL the flock* over the which the Holy Ghost had made them overseers,” in common.

4. The Church at Jerusalem. The Church of this distinguished city is called *one* Church, Ac. 8: 1. 15: 4. This “one Church” was composed of several different congregations.—This appears from the multitude of believers there (1) *Before* the great dispersion mentioned, Ac. 8th. Immediately after the Saviour's ascension, we read of an assemblage of the disciples there, numbering “about a hundred and twenty,” Ac. 1: 15. About ten days after, there were added to their number, in one day, “about three thousand souls,” followed by “daily” additions for a length of time, Ac. 2: 41, 47. A short time afterwards their number had increased to “about five thousand,” Ac. 4: 4. Proceeding with the history, we find in a short time again the addition of “multitudes both of men and women,” Ac. 5: 14. In the next chapter, v. 7, we read that

“the word of God increased, and the number of the disciples multiplied in Jerusalem *greatly*, and a *great company* of the priests were obedient unto the faith.” The number had now become so great that the deacons were chosen to bear part of the burden of the Church, Ac. 6: 1—6. (2.) *After* the dispersion like multitudes were still found there, and still were multiplied, Ac. 9: 31. “Then had the Churches rest throughout all Judea and Galilee and Samaria, and were edified; and walking in the fear of the Lord, and in the comfort of the Holy Ghost, were multiplied,” see also 12: 24. 21: 18.

These immense multitudes must have worshiped in different congregations, each of which would be served by an apostle or some other minister, Ac. 6: 2. 11: 30. 21: 18. Jas. 5: 14. These apostles and presbyters composed a Presbytery, by which, together with such representatives as may have been furnished from the individual Churches, the government of the Church at Jerusalem was administered, Ac. 15: 1—29.

The Presbytery of Jerusalem seemsto have formed the nucleus of the famous assemblage here reported, respecting which assembly, (as it was essentially presbyterial in its character, and affords conclusive evidence for the Church order for which we contend,) I remark, (1.) That it was not a church-meeting.—The immense multitude of believers in Jerusalem at that time *could* not have met in any one place. Nor would such a meeting of (heretical) christians have been allowed by the city authorities. It was not a meeting of ministers possessing exclusive official authority to govern the Church. No such power was claimed in the assembly. It was composed of “apostles,” who, by virtue of their apostolic office were the representatives of the Church at large—of “presbyters,” as well perhaps those of the Gentile Churches who were governed by its decrees, as those of Jerusalem: (the reference from Antioch was made “to the apostles and presbyters *at*,” not *of* Jerusalem)—and of the delegates from Antioch. (2.) Its proceedings were not controlled by apostolic authority; nor by arbitrary episcopal dictation; nor yet by direct inspiration. It proceeded in the regular order of a deliberative assembly, basing its deliberations upon the word of God, and mainly thus ascertaining the mind of the Spirit. (3.) Its “decrees” were not mere council. They were of binding authority on the Churches,

and so regarded by them. Indeed every thing connected with the assembly from first to last, shows that it had, and felt that it had power to govern the Churches at large: to this all seem to have agreed. In every particular, therefore, it was strictly and essentially Presbyterian.

5. My next argument is drawn from the Oneness of the Church. All agree that the true invisible Church is one; that all who compose it are so united to each other, and to Christ the Head, as to constitute but one spiritual body. Perhaps all, too, will agree that the external and visible unity of the Church should, if possible, correspond with its internal and spiritual unity. That this should be the case, is more than intimated in all those scriptures which speak of the "union of the body of Christ." The great object aimed at here is the spiritual union of christians with each other, and their common Head. For this the Saviour prayed, Jno. 17: 20—26. For this Paul besought with the deepest anxiety, 1 Cor. 1: 10. In order to this, their visible unity is everywhere insisted on.—This indeed is expressly declared to be the *very object* for which a visible organization was given, and officers furnished to the Church—"For the perfecting of the saints, for the edifying of the body of Christ; till all come in the unity of the faith, and grow up into Him in all things, which is the head, even Christ," 1 Cor. 12: especially v. 28, Eph. 4: especially v. 11—15.

We are bound then, to adopt such a mode of church government, as will maintain the visible, and secure the invisible unity of the Church. Hierarchal, as Papal, Episcopalian, and Methodist forms, it is agreed, maintain the visible unity of the Church. But they do it at the expense of official ministerial equality, which we take to be most clearly recognized, if not absolutely enjoined in the Scriptures, Mar. 9: 33—35. Lu. 9: 46—48; of the most sacred rights of the Church at large; and, by necessary consequence, to a very great extent, of spiritual unity itself. No one, who is acquainted with the condition of Churches thus organized, needs to be told of the almost incessant internal commotions which reach them. Even holy Mother, with all her boasted unity, covers with her hierarchal ægis, scores of discordant and disorganizing sects.

Independents, as Congregationalists and Baptists, on the

other land, by claiming entire independence for each individual church or congregation, seem to us to cut up the Church into just that many independent bodies, destroying almost entirely its visible, and greatly interfering with its invisible and spiritual unity. Even the boasted "Church Covenants" of these denominations aim at nothing more than to secure the "fellowship" of *one* congregation; and every pious beholder has reason to lament how far short they fail of obtaining even this desirable object; and how liable the Church usage and doctrinal views of each individual Church are, to become wholly irreconcilable with those of every other.

But Presbyterians, by adopting a Representative Republican form of Church government, claim to have secured each of these desirable objects. They secure perfect official ministerial equality; the fullest rights of every member of the Church at large; and by their courts of review and control—courts based upon the same divine authority upon which the Presbytery stands, sustained by the same and similar arguments, and being indeed but an amplification of this denominational court, keeping pace with the territorial enlargement of the Church—they bind the *whole Church* together in one compact body, and govern it by the united wisdom, intelligence, experience, piety and impartiality of the whole combined. In this way we see not how they can fail, so far as church government is concerned, to promote, in the highest degree, the spiritual unity of the glorious invisible body of Christ. It is on this principle that, without seeking it, they have won for themselves, from the candid, the mead of anti-sectarianism, and of an ardent desire, if possible, for the visible unity of the Church on apostolic principles; and if not, as far as possible, for its invisible unity and co-operation in every good word and work.

PRESBUTEROS.

Thoughts on Calvin's Commentaries.

To ———, *one of the Editors of the Calvinistic Magazine.*

MY DEAR BROTHER:—You have been setting forth Calvinism in its doctrines and history;—will you permit me to say some-

thing in your Magazine respecting the Commentaries of Calvin? Your clerical readers, especially, should be invited to study those writings, and I venture to make the attempt, upon my brethren, with that familiarity of address, which a letter to one of them may justify.

It is well known that we are far enough from consulting Calvin as an oracle—we do not speak of him as the “founder” of our denomination of christians, nor as the father of the faith and discipline which we have embraced. No. We look beyond all men, to the God-man, as the foundation rock on which we are built, and to the same Jesus as the author and finisher of the faith which we hold. Yet it is only the enemies of the Bible, and of free and full inquiry into all matters of religion, who can discountenance the use of those great aids to the proper investigation of scriptural truth, the learned and pious commentaries on holy Scripture, that have been furnished to the Church, as the choicest fruit of their best hours, by some of the best and wisest servants of God;—and we would not be partakers of their sins.

Every period of reformation and revival in the Church has been a period, also, when the Scriptures were searched with special diligence, when they were expounded with peculiar pains-taking, when expository writings were printed and scattered widely among the people. The late revival of Evangelical doctrine in Germany, the cradle of the great reformation, has been marked as well by the appearance of extended investigations of Scripture in the form of Commentaries, as by the multiplication of fervent appeals in the form of sermons; and another characteristic of the age in its religious awakening is a returning regard for the expository works of the earlier church. Men who have been animated by a merely literary interest rather than by the practical spirit of Evangelical piety, have united with the orthodox in offering a tribute of praise to the learned and the godly, who, before Luther and in his day, were mighty in the Scriptures. Rosenmuller does homage to Jerome and Augustine as able expositors of the Bible. Gesenius, after all his learned and prolonged researches in the Hebrew archaeology, was seen to renounce not a few of his neological interpretations, and in the last edition of his great lexi-

con, he has returned to the ancient orthodox view in many instances.

And to come now to the writings before us. These Commentaries of Calvin, the greatest of the Reformers, as a systematic Divine, have been recently issued anew, under the auspices of Tholuck, himself an eminent leader among the Lutherans, the most eloquent preacher of Germany, and a powerful champion of orthodoxy—by the confession of all parties. I speak of Calvin as a Commentator, from some knowledge of this edition, of that part of it especially, which contained his Commentaries on the New Testament. For the sake of brevity, and because I have not the books at hand, I shall make but few references to particular passages in the work, noticing merely some of its peculiarities, and certain advantages that may result to the student of Calvin.

But first, are there any, I might ask, who would perfect themselves in the noble language which Calvin wrote, with such graceful vigor? Let them give their days and nights to the Latin of the great Genevan Reformer, and in finding not a little of the rounded fulness of Cicero, they will meet with a burning intensity of thought on the mightiest themes, such as never animated the Roman.

The stern preacher of the Cross does not rival the great classic scholar of that age, in the pureness of his Latinity, nor has he, perhaps, the pleasing flow of the polished Melancthon; but there is a vigorous pulse that beats in every line of Calvin, and an earnestness, forceful yet repressed, which makes you overlook the beauties of his simple and severe epitome, while you *feel* his power, and grow familiar with the language he had mastered so well.

But aside from any aid which he may afford one, in acquiring the language of the learned, there are advantages to the scholar in studying the Commentaries of Calvin, resulting from the *perspicuity*, the *distinctness* and the *directness* of expression, that characterize his style. By the first quality, I mean the clear shining out of his thoughts, without a cloud or a veil.—His words are mirrors, true, bright, uncovered,—they give back just the thought he designs them to convey. By his distinctness, I refer to Calvin's power of discriminating between things that differ; so that, as there is no mist over his expres-

sions, so there is no blending, no running together of things that should stand apart, in the mind and in the statement of them. His thoughts have boundaries that are fixed, that are sharply defined, like coins fresh from the mint. They rise up before you like the lofty peaks of a mountain-range, behind which the sun is setting in his pomp;—their outlines are not confused, they are strongly marked; they are drawn firmly upon a luminous sky. His *directness* is such, that you are conscious, in reading his annotations, of a steady stress and impulse of thought, bearing you onward to a predetermined end—an end predetermined, not in the arbitrary purpose of the writer, but involved in the very nature of the subject discussed, and by him evolved as the ultimate truth to be attained. Towards this end, all his remarks converge, to this every thing contributes.

But I would speak of Calvin, not simply as a writer, but more expressly as a *Commentator*.

1. His *critical* talent is acknowledged by all that have perused his writings. With respect to mere learning, the giants of erudition that have walked the earth since his day, may look down upon Calvin, but that he was accurately learned in the original tongues, his energetic labors indicate beyond question. The skill of the critic, however, is seen chiefly in his ability to analyze and develop the peculiarities, to penetrate, and to be penetrated with, the very spirit of an author. Now, Calvin possessed great logical power; he saw the precise point to be investigated and made clear, in order to determine a debated question; he grasped the essential truth or principle in the work which he was examining, and drew it to light and pictured it to the eye with a masterly hand. It cannot be pretended, perhaps, that he had the skill to develop fundamentally, to unfold from the centre to the circumference, a deep scriptural principle in all its parts, and aspects, and bearings, which renders the Biblical writings of Olshause so valuable to the student; but no man excels Calvin in piercing keenness of vision, in the power to discern essential points, and show them as they are to others. And I am here reminded of an expression by Prof. Tholuck, in regard to Calvin's *psychological* insight in the power of mind, by which he could see into the mind of a writer,—in which power of thinking in sympathy

with another whom he would interpret, Tholuck assigns him the pre-eminence above all Commentators on the Bible in his time.

Mental science, it must be confessed, has made advances since that day, so that the constituent powers of the human spirit are now somewhat better understood, yet seldom is it that Calvin does not still appear as one speaking the very mind of Paul, in his Commentary on Romans.

2. The systematic spirit, evident in his Commentaries—the cumulative force with which he unfolds and binds together his views into the unity of a system—the comprehensiveness of mind to which all parts of that system appear to be present—no matter upon what fragment of it, or what point he may be for the moment employed. These also are characteristics of this great divine.

The power of system, and of systematic views, even educated men undervalue. When that power exists in the preacher, it communicates energy and life to every discourse—the energy and life which appertain to the entire system. It strengthens the views exhibited in discussing his immediate subject, by means of its real, though perhaps unnamed and undiscovered connexion with a whole body of truth. In a well-organized army, every division and member of the force is stronger in battle from its position in such an army.

3. Calvin's vast *knowledge of christian doctrine*—of the scope and contents of the Christian scheme—appears in all his writings. The Commentaries were written later in life than his Institutes, and present his matured opinions. It characterized his way of thinking on religious subjects, to run up every thing straight to God, and the will of God. The will of Holy Love, Calvin sought with all diligence to know;—that knowledge once gained, in reference to any matter of belief or practice, his own mind rested on it as altogether true and good, and nothing daunted him from announcing and maintaining his convictions. From this simplicity of faith, there resulted a profundity and harmony in his mind, such that they not only show themselves as systematized and self-consistent, but as possessing an interior harmony and a spiritual depth, that manifest their alliance with the Divine Spirit.

His thoughts on the Lord's Supper, receive a character of

spirituality and depth, from the view he had taken of the mystic union subsisting between Christ and all believers. A profundity which Puseyism groped after for a time, and then stumbled into obscurity and profaneness.

4. The *controversial skill* of Calvin, is to be remarked on almost every page of his Commentaries. That was an age when the men of God stood forth ever harnessed for the fight. Calvin was sent to contend for the faith once delivered to the saints, and with shield and sword he did valiant service in that warfare. His pages are bright with the flashes of the sword of the Spirit. It is no strained use of Scripture, evidently, when he turns it upon an enemy. Every truth of God is in his hand a weapon against the enemies of the God of truth. Thus, in remarking on those teachings of our Lord, which flowed so sweetly from his lips in that sermon on the Mount, Calvin ever and anon deals a fearful blow at Rome. For he could "discern the signs of the times," and the results of the times. And again, while commenting upon the conclusion of St. Paul's first Ep. to the Thessalonians, in explaining the words, "Quench not the spirit; despise not prophesying," the Anabaptist fanatics of his time receive merited castigation for seeking after light apart from the ordinances of God, appointed to give light.

Great value must attach to his Commentaries, for their apt discussion of questions now agitated among us.

5. *Solidity of reflection* distinguishes his practical remarks. His thoughts are weighty with golden truths, yea, with "much fine gold." Something of a higher strain than the skill of the disputant, or the logic of the reasoner, or the knowledge of the learned, or the fervid rhetoric of the orator, we see in this gifted man of God, as he wields with dexterous strength the words of Holy Scripture, to confirm some grace, to root out some sin, to enforce some duty. It is not his way, however, to abound in formal "improvements" or "reflections," but an earnest practicalness breathes in all that he says. He is not given to sermonizing like Scott in his Commentaries, but almost equals even Scott, in the skill with which a Biblical argument, more powerful than Scott's, is summed up so as to promote the edification of the reader.

Calvin's vivid feeling of guilt before God, his profound faith, his whole inner life as a christian, made him know thoroughly

the real wants of the soul, and made him able to dispense the pure milk and the strong meat of the word, giving to every one his portion.

With such cursory words as these, I have presumed to characterize the Commentaries of Calvin. To make known simply and fully the mind of God, as the Bible reveals that Eternal Mind, is his one object. The views enforced in them have ever proved their power to foster and strengthen believers.—Those views have made them men—intelligent and stable christians.

The one doctrine of the Divine Sovereignty—how powerful is that to fill the believer's soul with ceaseless energy, as the soul consciously thinks and acts in unison with Sovereign Wisdom and Sovereign Love. Or, take any other of the strong doctrines which he advocates, as he advocates them—as, for example, the assurance of grace and salvation, the hope of perseverance to the end—and how have these sacred virtues, far from relaxing the mind of the *true Christian*, only moved him to new efforts, and braced him with new strength, the strength of gratitude and love, to walk in every way of righteousness and true obedience. If you have read that most interesting book, “*Isabella Campbell, or, peace in believing,*” you will remember the “rest” into which that young Scotch-woman entered, when once she had truly believed. And you will remember, too, that while having no doubt, afterwards, of her estate God-ward, she was unceasingly diligent, and with peculiar fervency of spirit, exact in all the duties of a christian.—Salvation hoped for, salvation assured to the mind, on good grounds, is but grace in its strength, and in vigorous exercise. The same grace has now the form of joyful hope, and now the form of joyful diligence in well-doing.

But I must break off, and I leave you with another reference to the excellent Tholuck, and with one word more upon Calvin himself.

His Lutheran predilections did not prevent Tholuck from bearing the most pointed testimony to the need which our age has of Calvinism, in its enthronement of the Divine Will.—Men, he has remarked, are prone to set themselves up with numberless claims on God;—their minds ought to be turned to view God's rightful claims on them. So will the prevalent

feebleness of thinking on religious subjects be done away, and men be taught their true place, as subjects, and not lords, in the universe of the Creator.

The preacher, then, who would "provide man his diet" for a people, should study Calvin and the Bible, in the spirit of Calvin.

His mighty intellect moulded and ruled the Theology of England in the times of the Reformation and of the Commonwealth—the purest days of her Church. Then Calvin was studied in her Universities, and his writings aided to form the great Divines of the ages succeeding. But the Reformation never had its perfect work in England—a simple faith, rigidly scriptural, and a simple worship, have not prevailed throughout that land. The present condition of her national Church, decaying by the lingering death of Puseyism, warns us against false doctrine. The religious state of our own country—the cravings of our own souls—the wants of our own people, all appeal to us to give earnest heed to the first principles of the oracles of God—to the truths that make wise unto salvation. The writings of Calvin are powerful aids to those searching after such truths. Affectionately yours, J. K. M.

Synod of Tennessee.

Our Synod met at Athens, Ten., Oct. 9th. Rev. Robert Glen preached the opening sermon, Rev. F. A. Ross was chosen Moderator, Rev. Gideon S. White, Clerk pro tem, and Rev. J. S. Craig assistant. The Synod meets next year at New Market. We publish the following extracts from the Minutes.

Extract from the Minutes of Union Presbytery.

The Report of the Committee on Presbyterian Ordination which was laid over at Pby. at its last stated sessions was taken up, read and referred to Synod, with the request that Synod will not decide on its merits at present, but will encourage its publication in the Calvinistic Magazine, for the examination of the Church at large.

Orderæd, that the Temporary Clerk forward a copy of the above Minute to Synod.

H. F. TAYLOR, *Temp. Cl'k.*
of Union Presby.

Oct. 7th, 1846.

The Committee to whom was referred a list of questions on the subject of Ordination to ecclesiastical offices according to the New Testament, beg leave to report:

That we find at least twelve words in the Greek Testament that the English Version has translated by the word *Ordain*. We deem it necessary, for a full and clear understanding of the subject, to present a brief explication of a few of those original words. The first that presents itself is *poieo*—*poieo*, “and he ordained twelve, that they should be with him, and that he might send them forth to preach,” Mark 3: 14, see also John 6: 15, Acts 2: 36, Heb. 3: 2. The most common meaning of the word is, *to make, to create, to cause to be*; then the import of the term in the texts referred to, is, to cause a person to be, what he was not, to appoint to an office, duty, &c.

The second word is *kathistemi*—*kathistemi*. The Saviour says, “who then is a faithful and wise servant, whom his Lord *hath made ruler* over his house,” Matth. 24: 45, 47, see also Matth. 25: 21, 23, Luke 12: 14, in these passages it is translated *make*, also in Heb. 2: 7. In Acts 6: 3, it is translated *appoint*. It is the word used in Tit. 1: 5, “I left thee in Crete, that thou shouldst ordain Elders in every city.” From a perusal of these passages, it appears that the word means to constitute, or appoint to any station or duty.

3d. In Acts 14: 23, we are told, that Paul and Barnabas ordained them Elders in every Church, the word in the original is *cheirotonesantes*, a participle, from *cheirotones*, to vote by holding up the hand, to appoint by vote, to choose, to select; see also 2 Cor. 8: 19.

4th. In Acts 1: 22, the word translated *ordained*, comes from the verb *tinomai*, and has no particular reference to our subject.

5th. In 1 Tim. 2: 7, we read that Paul was ordained a preacher, and an apostle, the word in the original is *tithemi*—*tithemi*, a word of very frequent occurrence in the New Testament, and is applied to designating persons to any office or duty; see Acts 13: 47 and 20, 28; 1 Cor. 12: 28, 2 Tim. 1: 11, Heb. 1: 2.

In these texts the word is translated set, made, committed, appointed, ordained.

By reference to the Scriptures cited and referred to above, it is evident, that no rites or ceremonies are mentioned as making any part of the ordination, nor does the connection of the texts shew, that they are implied. But from other passages in the New Testament, we will obtain some light on this interesting subject.

Before we proceed to examine the texts that have the most direct bearing on the subject, it may be of importance to examine the phrase "imposition of hands," *epitheseos cheiron*, which occurs several times in the New Testament. It was used among the Jews and Christians when they offered prayers and invoked blessings on any one. The hand figuratively meant power, "we should be saved from our enemies, and from the hand of all that hate us," Luke 1: 71; see also John 3; 35. Acts 12: 11, 12 and 4: 30, and 7: 5.

2d. It denotes ministerial action, "speaking boldly in the name of the Lord, which gave testimony unto the word of his grace and granted signs and wonders to be done by their hands," Acts 14: 3; see also Acts 7: 35, Gal. 3: 19.

3d. The phrase is used when the sick and infirm were miraculously cured by Christ and the apostles—2d. When the miraculous powers of the Holy Spirit were conferred by the apostles, Acts 8: 18.—3d. In authoritatively blessing, "He took them up in his arms, put his hands upon them and blessed them," Mark 10: 16; see Matth. 19: 15, Gen. 48: 14, 15.

4th. In ordaining and setting apart to a sacred office, God directed Moses to lay his hands on Joshua, to set him apart as his successor, Num. 27: 18, 23. The deacons were set apart to their office by the laying on of the hands of the apostles, Acts 6: 6. Paul and Barnabas were set apart by divine command, to a special work, by the laying on of the hands of the prophets and teachers at Antioch. This imposition of hands was not to ordain them as apostles, for Paul was an apostle long before, Acts 13: 1—3.

We will now examine 1 Tim. 4: 14, "Neglect not the gift that is in thee, which was given thee, according (*dia*) to prophecy, together with (*meta*) the imposition of the hands of the presbytery."

The gift (*charisma*) that was in Timothy, means the supernatural endowments necessary to qualify him for the work of an evangelist, and not the influence of the spirit, that creates us anew, as Timothy had been a christian for some time before. But how were these gifts imparted? The apostle tells us, that it was by the imposition of his own hands, "stir up the *gift* of God which is in thee by the putting on of my hands." But how, was the apostle directed to the selection of Timothy as the proper person, to fill the office of evangelist, and to receive these supernatural gifts? We answer by inspiration "by prophecy," as is asserted both in 1 Tim. 4: 14. and 2 Tim. 1: 6. By the same kind of revelation *prophecy*, Paul committed to Timothy a solemn charge: "This charge I commit to thee, son Timothy according to the prophecies that went before concerning thee," 1 Tim. 1: 18. This revelation was made to the apostle himself, and was his infallible guide in the whole matter.

Timothy, as we have said, was an *evangelist*, next in office, and importance to the apostles; and if we may judge from the facts of his case, evangelists were appointed to their office by an apostle directed by inspiration, and had their supernatural gifts by the imposition of the hands of an apostle; so that like the apostles, they received the office "not of men, nor by man," as ordinary presbyters, or elders; yet they were not commissioned immediately by Christ, as were the apostles; but an apostle chose the proper person, and conferred on him miraculous powers by divine direction. It may now be asked,

If Timothy was appointed to the office of *evangelist* by inspiration and the miraculous powers of the Holy Ghost were imparted by the imposition of the hands of the apostle, why were the hands of the presbytery laid on him at all?

We answer, it was not to impart the supernatural gifts; this was the prerogative of the apostles. Yet they did it by the approbation of the apostle, which was equal to a divine command. If the object was to ordain him as an evangelist, then the presbytery composed of presbyters, ministers, and ruling elders, ordered Timothy to an office, which was not held by themselves; and of course would be an example to guide presbyteries in all future time. The laying on of the hands of this presbytery was a solemn and public recognition of Timothy as an evangelist, and of their concurrence with the apostle in set-

ting him apart to the office. And the fact that they laid their hands on Timothy, goes far to shew that the right to ordain, at least, presbyters was vested in a presbytery, when we connect it with the instruction the apostle gave this same evangelist, "lay hands suddenly on no man," 1 Tim. 5: 22. A presbytery had laid hands on Timothy, and how natural would it be for him to associate a presbytery with him in the ordination of every presbyter? But if the imposition of hands was to be confined to Timothy alone, yet after the apostles and evangelists were dead, their example would be regarded as of divine authority, and the practice would very properly be continued by the presbyters, who themselves had been ordained by the imposition of hands under apostolic authority; for aside from ordination by apostles and evangelists, there is not the most distant allusion to any other ordaining except by a *presbytery*. But what is a *presbytery* in the sense of the New Testament? We answer, an assembly of presbyters, or elders, and nothing else, "as soon as it was day the elders of the people (*presbuterion tou laou*, the presbytery of the people) came together," Luke 22: 66. They held the office of presbyters, and are called a presbytery before they met, and as a presbytery came together. Paul says, "the high priest doth bear me witness, and all the estate of the elders," in the original *pan to presbuterion* the whole presbytery. In both these texts, the presbytery consisted of the members of the Jewish *sanhedrim*, or council, called presbyters; in modern language, senators or assessors, see Matth. 11: 23, and 26: 3, 47, 59. According to this use of the word, it must mean in 1 Tim. 4: 14, an assembly of those who were presbyters in the Church. But who were presbyters in the Church? We answer, the title was given to ministers who were bishops or overseers of a Church, as is evident from Acts 20: 17, 20, "He called the elders of the Church—and said take heed to the flock, over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you bishops," see Tit. 1: 5, 7. "Ordain elders in every city—for a bishop must be blameless also," 1 Pet. 5: 1—5. "The elders which are among you, I exhort, who am also a fellow elder, *sum presbuteros*—feed the flock of God taking the oversight;" (*episkopountes* exercising the office of bishop.) Paul, in his first letter to Timothy shows, that there were presbyters whose business was to preside and rule;

and that there were other presbyters who, beside presiding and ruling, labored in preaching and teaching, 1 Tim. 5: 17.— These presbyters had equal rights in presbytery.

The title was given to the apostles, and no doubt to all ecclesiastical officers, above the grade of deacon. John, in his letter to the elect lady says, "The elder to the elect lady," 2 John 1. And in his third letter he says, "The elder to the well beloved Gaius," 1 v.; and Peter styles himself a fellow presbyter or elder. Then the word *presbytery* in 1 Tim. 4: 14, includes Paul himself; this is rendered more than probable, by 2 Tim. 1: 6. Taking these texts in connection, the import of 1 Tim. 4: 14, is obvious. Neglect not the gift which is in thee by the laying on of my hands, according to a prophetic inspiration, together with (*meta*) the laying on of the hands of the presbytery. If the imposition of the hands of Paul had been at one time, and of the presbytery at another time, there could be no propriety in saying *together with*, and that such is the import of *meta*, see Matth. 12: 3, 11, and 12: 3, and 16: 27, Luke 22: 59.

Your committee now feel prepared to answer the questions of presbytery in the light of God's word.

Quest. 1st. Is a setting apart of a person to an ecclesiastic office, to be done, according to the New Testament, by the imposition of hands?

Ans. Yes, deacons and elders, the only officers known to the christian church since the death of the apostles and evangelists, are to be ordained by the imposition of hands.

Quest. 2d. Does not a minister, who has charge of a Church, together with the elders, constitute a presbytery in the scripture sense of that word?

Ans. Most certainly, as we have shown, a presbytery is an assembly of elders; the same number of ordained ministers, would not constitute a presbytery, according to the New Testament, more than the pastor and his session would.

Quest. 3d. If a ruling elder, according to the New Testament, is to be ordained by the imposition of the hands of a presbytery, would not the pastor, and the elders of the Church, be a competent presbytery?

Ans. An affirmative answer necessarily followed from the

answers to the two preceding questions; and the three constitute a perfect syllogism.

Quest. 4th. When a Church is to be organized, and persons chosen to fill the office of elder, when there are no elders, would not a bishop appointed by presbytery be competent to ordain the persons chosen by the imposition of hands with two elders from other Churches?

Ans. We are compelled by the light of Scripture, to answer this question in the affirmative.

Quest. 5th. Ought ruling elders to unite with the ministers in the imposition of hands, when a person is to be ordained to the ministry?

Ans. No reason can be shewn from the New Testament, why they should not. Why the contrary practice has prevailed so long, and so extensively, it is not necessary here to state. But it ought to be abandoned by all Bible Presbyterians.

An Extract from the Records of the Synod of Tennessee.

“Resolved, That Synod consider that the Churches within our bounds urgently demand the circulation of doctrinal tracts and periodicals. Therefore Synod recommend the Calvinistic Magazine, published under the editorial care of Rev. Isaac Anderson, D. D., F. A. Ross, James King, and James McChain, as a most excellent periodical.

Also, Resolved, That, in the estimation of Synod, a tract lately published by Rev. F. A. Ross, entitled “The Doctrine of the Direct Witness of the Spirit, as taught by the Rev. John Wesley, shewn to be unscriptural, false, fanatical, and of mischievous tendency,” is an able production, setting forth that important subject in its true scriptural light, and is earnestly recommended to the perusal of all the members of our churches.

Ordered, that the assistant clerk furnish the editors of the Calvinistic Magazine with an authenticated copy of the preceding resolutions.

Attest,

J. S. CRAIG, *Ast. Clk.*

Athens, Oct. 12, 1846.

“Resolved, That the members of Synod are requested to inform their respective congregations that the sum of \$15,000 has been subscribed and that a professorship of Sacred Literature has been founded with said fund in the Maryville College, that the Rev. Thos. Brown is appointed as a general agent to collect said fund, and that any of the subscribers that may choose, may pay their subscriptions to him or any person appointed by him, without interest, on or before the 1st day of January next, and that a copy of this minute be published in the Calvinistic Magazine.”

Ordered, that the assistant clerk furnish the editors of the Calvinistic Magazine with an authenticated copy of the foregoing resolutions for publication.

A true copy.

J. S. CRAIG, *Ast. Clk.*

Athens, Oct, 11, 1846.

An Extract from the Records of Synod of Tenn., Oct. 12, 1846.

Resolved, That it be recommended to the friends of Education in the bounds of this Synod, that they continue their endeavors to increase the subscriptions to the Professorship of Sacred Literature now founded in Maryville College, in order that all losses may be covered, and that the sum of \$15,000 may be fully realized, and that the general agent to collect said fund be requested to obtain all additional subscriptions he can.

A true extract.

GIDEON S. WHITE,

Clerk pro tem of Synod.

Missionary.

We hear of but few revivals in our Churches at home; but the hearts of christians have been greatly cheered in reading the accounts contained in the Missionary Herald for some months past, of a deep and powerful revival among the Nestorians of Oroomiah, Persia. This mission has been established, if we recollect aright, about ten years, and the Missionaries are already reaping a rich harvest. Most of our readers doubtless know, that the Nestorians are believers in the Bible, and have the Scriptures in the ancient Syriac. They were once a

zealous Missionary Church, and carried the gospel to China and Japan. Now their religion is very corrupt, principally made up of superstitions and forms. The people are now deeply degraded, and pressed down to the dust by the Turkish yoke. Our readers will recollect, that thousands of them, living in the Koordish Mountains, were, a few years ago, hunted out and slaughtered like wild beasts. But God has now visited this interesting people in great mercy, and we give a few extracts from the accounts of the Missionaries, in the Herald for November:

NESTORIANS.

JOURNAL OF MR. STODDARD.

The young Priest of Ooshnooh.

The journal of Mr. Perkins, published in the last number of the Herald, brought down the history of the revival among the Nestorians to May 14. The present communication, it will be seen, covers a period extending from May 16 to June 20.

We cannot be sufficiently grateful to God for his continued favor to this mission. Amid a most painful dearth of revivals in our own land, it is truly refreshing to contemplate a powerful work of the Spirit, in regions which have been for ages unblest with such showers of divine grace. But there is some danger that Christians in this country, and the missionaries also, may be elated by past success, and so become less fervent in their desires and their supplications. In the letter accompanying the following journal, Mr. Stoddard alludes to the possibility that this blessed work of grace may cease in the way which has now been indicated. "But why," he says, "should it be so? If scores have been brought into the kingdom of Christ, do not hundreds and thousands still remain in their sins? If light has suddenly broke in upon us, and filled us with thanksgiving and the voice of melody, are we to forget the deep gloom in which the mass of the people are still shrouded? Are the Prudential Committee willing to have the work cease? Are the churches willing to have it cease? Instead of our friends feeling that we no longer need their prayers, will not all of them pray for us with more earnestness than ever?" The request of this brother is commended to the churches as deserving their special regard.

May 16, 1846. Several months ago, one of our pupils,—who has this winter given very satisfactory evidence of piety, and been remarkable for his humble and prayerful walk,—was withdrawn suddenly from the seminary by his father. This

was done while the young man was visiting his relatives for a few days; and we were long unable to account for his protracted absence. Some time afterwards we heard that his father, an ignorant deacon, residing in Ooshnooh, about forty miles from Oroomiah, had compelled him to become a priest, contrary to his earnest protestations and tears. As the city of Ooshnooh is inhabited mostly by Mussulmans and Koords, and has only a small community of Nestorians, this deacon was the only ecclesiastic in the place. Having the ambition to make his son a priest, and perhaps fearing lest the boy should offer decided resistance, if the subject was proposed to him while in the school, he took him to Mar Gabriel during this absence from us; and, by a present of five dollars, induced that worldly Bishop to consecrate him to the sacred office. We learn that the son protested against the act, on the ground that his acquisitions were quite insufficient, and that he was too youthful, as well as too much of a child in grace, to become a spiritual shepherd.

We have now waited several weeks, hoping that this pupil would return to us, or that we should at least have a letter from him. But as no more definite information has reached us, I am to-day sending John to look after the youth, and, as far as possible, to preach the gospel to the people. And as he is going among strangers, the patriarchal family have given him a letter of introduction; which, so far as words are concerned, is very apostolic in its character. Would that it came from hearts glowing with love to Christ. In this, however, as in many other things, they now manifest great readiness to aid us in our work.

19. John has just returned from Ooshnooh, and brings a very interesting report. On reaching the place, the people received him with respect, kissing the letter he brought from the patriarchal family. Nothing could exceed the joy of the young priest. For many weeks he had been in a wicked and ignorant community, who could not sympathize with him nor understand any thing of that hidden life which was begun in his soul. And now, on meeting his former friend and spiritual guide, he was quite overcome. When he saw Mrs. Stoddard's horse, which I had lent to John for the journey, he forgot his dignity as a priest; and, in his oriental simplicity, throwing his

arms around the horse's neck, kissed him out of affection for the owner.

John found that this priest, young as he was, by his discreet deportment, had gained the love and esteem of the Nestorians around him. He seemed to be very prayerful; and though in a place of so much temptation, he did not appear to have gone backward at all in his Christian course. His father, being quarrelsome, has a number of enemies. The young man has been unwearied in his exertions to promote peace, and has performed every kind office in his power for these individuals, in order to win their love. He has thus far failed to reconcile them to his father, but he has secured their respect and affection for himself; and they, as well as the other Nestorians of that place, all give testimony to the excellence of his character.

The Boys' Seminary at Seir.—Love of Prayer.

It has been customary to suspend the boys' seminary during the hot season; but this year it was deemed very desirable to preserve the pupils from the dangers of a long vacation. Arrangements were accordingly made for giving them instruction at Mount Seir, the health retreat of the mission. After a vacation of one month, the school was reopened, as mentioned in the following extract:

22. To-day our pupils have assembled for the summer.—Finding it difficult to give them suitable accommodations on our own premises or in the village, we have pitched several tents for them on a fine knoll above our house. Here they can look out on a widely extended and uncommonly beautiful landscape, and enjoy the works of God. Here too they may, to an unlimited extent, have opportunity for devotion in the numerous valleys and dells of the mountain. And here, we trust, we shall have much of God's presence, and see our beloved pupils gradually attaining the stature of perfect men in Christ Jesus.

It is delightful to observe with what cordiality they greet each other, after their separation. They seem to have but one heart and one mind. Those who came earliest, took their stations where they could watch their companions, as one group after another was seen approaching. The pupils from Geog Tapa, when they reached the base of the mountain, stopped and offered several prayers, imploring God's blessing on their new home. And all for whom we entertain the hope that they

are Christians, have come back, apparently breathing a spirit of earnest piety.

Mr. Stoddard announces the intention of giving unusual prominence to a careful study of the Scriptures during the ensuing session. A few of the most promising teachers in the village schools were expected to join the institution for the summer, and participate in the benefit of this course of instruction.

26. In the city, our pupils were frequently embarrassed for want of places of retirement; and although we had seven rooms which might be used for the purpose, it was very common to see them all occupied for hours together. But here there is no external hinderance to very frequent communion with God.—It is delightful, as I walk about the mountain, to find here and there, in some secluded spot, individuals wrestling with the angel of the covenant. The other day a Mussulman fell in with one of our pupils who was thus engaged; and, never having seen before a Nestorian praying in secret, he stopped in silent wonder. The young man, on being asked what he was doing, commenced teaching the Mussulman how to pray, and he so deeply interested him, that they kneeled down together, side by side, while the prayer was renewed in the Turkish language, that it might be intelligible to the stranger.

Several times I have allowed our pupils to ascend to the top of the mountain. There the view is very grand. The spectator, elevated two thousand feet above the surrounding country, looks down the declivity to this noble plain, rejoicing in all the beauty of spring. In the distance, the lake of Oroomiah, stretching nearly a hundred miles from north to south, dotted with islands, and girt around by high and precipitous mountains, is spread out before the eye. In the opposite direction, one finds himself on the verge of a lofty precipice, from which he surveys with trembling the gulf below. Beyond, the mountains of Koordistan tower in simple grandeur, their snows glittering in the sun. In this place, so removed from human observation, so fitted to draw out the thoughts to God, our pupils have had a number of interesting prayer meetings; while the mountain eagles were hovering around them, wondering at the unusual sight.

THE
Calvinistic Magazine.

[NEW SERIES.]

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

Vol. I.

December, 1846.

No. 12.

For the Calvinistic Magazine.

A Dialogue

BETWEEN AN ARMINIAN AND HIS FRIEND.*

"OUT OF THINE OWN MOUTH."

FR. — Sir, I have heard that you represent God as a weak, short-sighted, changeable being, dependent on the wills of his creatures for the accomplishment of his purposes.

ARM. — I deny it. We only say, "We grant that God has desires which are never fulfilled."—*Corvinus ad Molin, cap. 5: sec. 9. Concedimus in Deo desideria quæ nunquam implentur.*

FR. — Do you mean that his counsel will not stand, or that he will not do all his pleasure?

ARM. — We mean that "many things are done which God does not wish to be done, and that those things do not always come to pass which he wishes."—*Vorstius de Deo, p. 64. Multa fiunt quæ Deus fieri non vult, &c.*

FR. — Do you not believe that God could have hindered man from becoming a sinner if he had judged it best?

ARM. — By no means. "To say the power of God was ade-

*This dialogue is intended as a counterpart to the famous "Dialogue between a Predestinarian and his friend," circulated so extensively by the Methodist preachers, and published by the "General Conference" in their volume of "Doctrinal Tracts." There is this material difference, however, that the quotations are correctly and fairly taken from the writers, which cannot be truly affirmed of the Methodist Tract. To enable any one easily to verify the citations, not only chapter, section, and page are generally given, but where the authors wrote in Latin, the original words, either in whole or in part, are transcribed.

quate to have prevented man as a free-agent from sinning, is a contradiction in terms.”—*Bangs' Reply to Haskel*, p. 24.

FR.—Why, then, God may be defeated in his favorite purposes!

ARM.—Very true. “We acknowledge that the execution of his will is often hindered or suspended by man.”—*Episcopus, Disp. prim. de Vol. Dei Corol 5. Ab homine agnoscimus quod voluntatis executio sæpe suspendatur.*

FR.—What! Do you hold that man can effectually resist God?

ARM.—Yes, certainly. “We can resist God when he wishes to convert us by his grace.”—*Remonstrant. Colloq. Hag. p. 193. Possumus Deo resistere cum nos vult per gratiam suam convertere.*

FR.—Do you think no objection will be made to this?

ARM.—“Some will object that if so, God hath not accomplished his end. We answer: this we admit.”—*Remonst. Def. Sent. in Synod. fol. 256. Objiciet quis, ergo illum suum finem Deus non est assecutus. Respondemus, nos hoc concedere.*

FR.—It would seem, then, that God doth not work all things after the council of his own will?

ARM.—“To us it is certain that God intends the salvation of many whose salvation he does not accomplish.”—*Grevinchov. ad Ames. fol. 271. Nobis certum est Deum multorum salutem intendere in quibus eam non adsequitur.*

FR.—Does he then always continue to entertain the same desires?

ARM.—No. “Some desires of God cease after a certain time.”—*Episcop. de Vol. Dei Thes. 7. Volitiones aliquæ Dei cessant certo quodam tempore.*

FR.—Then may he not break his promise, and covenant with his servants?

ARM.—Yes, verily. “God did fail David. He did alter the thing that had gone out of his lips.” “He did break the covenant of his servant.”—*Methodist Doctrinal Tracts, p. 213.*

FR.—Well, to me this appears like blasphemy little short of Atheism. But pray tell me, why should not the will of God always be done?

ARM.—“It is not proper that God should use his infinite power to effect that to which he is impelled by his own natu-

ral desire.”—*Arminius Antiperk*, p. 584. *Non decet ut Deus infinita sua potentia utatur, &c.*

FR.—May he not effectually influence sinners to come to Christ?

ARM.—No, for “Whatever things God wills to be done of us freely and contingently, those he cannot will more powerfully or efficaciously than in the way of wish or desire.”—*Vorstius parasc.* p. 4. *Quæ Deus libere prorsus ac contingentur, a nobis fieri vult, &c.*

FR.—But does he not at least in answer to prayer, exert some special influence upon sinners, inclining them to come to the Saviour?

ARM.—None at all. “God confers nothing upon the creature by any influence of his by which he is incited and assisted to act.”—*Corvinus ad Molin.* cap. 3. sec. 15, p. 35. *Deus influxu suo nihil confert creaturæ, quo ad agendum incitetur ac adjuvetur.*

FR.—Why, I had always thought that it was God that worketh in us both to will and to do.

ARM.—No. “The divine influence is upon the act itself, not upon the will.”—*Arminius, Antiperk.* *Influxus divinus et in ipsum actum, non in voluntatem.*

FR.—So, then, the Lord doth not turn the hearts of men as the rivers of waters are turned!

ARM.—No, truly. “Divine Providence never determined the free-will to either of two opposite things.”—*Arminius, Artic. perpen.* *Providentia divina non determinat, &c.*

FR.—But does not God accomplish his purposes by the free actions of men, as in the selling of Joseph to go to Egypt, the taking of Babylon by Cyrus, the crucifixion of Christ, and the destruction of Jerusalem?

ARM.—“That God by his decree should determine future contingent events, one way or another (I mean such as are brought to pass by the free-will of the creature) I abominate and curse as false, absurd, and leading to manifold blasphemy.”—*Arminius, Declarat. Sent.* *Deum futura contingentia decreto suo determinasse, &c.*

FR.—Do you deny that God ever determines the wills of men?

ARM.—We do. “Determination (of the will) can in no

wise consist with true liberty.”—*Remonst. Apol. cap. 7, fol. 82. Determinatio cum libertate vera, nullo modo consistere possit.*

FR.—Is it certain, then, that God will accomplish the salvation of any one?

ARM.—“No such will can be ascribed to God by which he so willeth any man to be saved, as that his salvation shall therefore be certain and infallible.”—*Arminius, Antiperk. fol. 583. Nulla Deo tribui potest voluntas, &c.*

FR.—As you allow so little liberty to God, and so much to the creature, I presume you must be warm advocates of a *free* ecclesiastical government.

ARM.—“We are no republicans, and never intend to be. It would be better for those who are so minded to go quietly away.”—*Rev. J. Wesley’s Letter to J. Mason, in the London Wesleyan Magazine of April, 1830.*

FR.—What think you of the doctrine of election? Were any chosen before the foundation of the world?

ARM.—No. “It is false that election took place from eternity.”—*Remonst. Apolog. cap. 18, p. 190. Falsum est quod electio facta est ab æterno.*

FR.—What then are your views of election?

ARM.—“There is one election which is complete, and which extends to no one till death. There is another which is incomplete, which belongs to all believers—just as the blessings of salvation are incomplete, which are only continued while faith continues, and are recalled when faith is renounced; so election is incomplete in this life, not peremptory, but revocable.—*Grevinchov. ad Ames. fol. 136, Electio alia completa est, &c.*

FR.—Go on, I am listening.

ARM.—“There are three classes of believers and penitents in the Scriptures, viz: new converts, those who for a while believe, and those who persevere. The first two of these classes of believers were indeed truly elected, not altogether absolutely, but only for a time, namely, so long and in so far as they remain believers.”—*Remonst. Confess. cap. 18, sec. 6. Tres sunt ordines credentium, &c.*

FR.—Why, if it be so, I cannot see the least possible use or advantage in election.

ARM.—“I do not acknowledge any fruit or sense of election in this life.”—*Grevinchov. Electionis fructum aut sensum in hac vita nullum agnosco.*

FR.—But what will you do with infants who are incapable of believing?

ARM.—Such as are baptized are “elect children.”—*Methodist Discipline, chap. 3, sec. 2.*

FR.—How will you make it appear that baptism affects their spiritual condition?

ARM.—“If infants are guilty of original sin, then they are proper subjects of baptism, seeing in the ordinary way they cannot be saved, unless this be washed away by baptism. It has been proved that this original stain cleaves to every child of man; and that hereby they are children of wrath, and liable to eternal damnation.”—*Rev. John Wesley in the Methodist Doctrinal Tracts, page 251.*

FR.—Well, this may truly be termed a *horrible* doctrine!! Infants, you say, cannot in the ordinary way be saved without baptism. Of course those who die without baptism must *ordinarily* sink down to eternal flames. The very thought of it is enough to make one shudder. I now understand why your preachers baptize the children of all parents without discrimination. And they are right in doing so, if they can save them from “eternal damnation.” But what think you of the doctrine of the Divine Foreknowledge?

ARM.—Ah, “that troublesome question concerning the knowledge absolute or conditional of future contingencies.”—*Episcop. Disp. 4 sec. 10. Operosam illam questionem, &c.*

FR.—How is it troublesome?

ARM.—Because, “If any one ask how God’s foreknowledge is consistent with our freedom, I plainly answer I cannot tell.”—*Wesley’s Letter to Robertson.*

FR.—You have not yet said whether you believe the doctrine of Foreknowledge.

ARM.—God may choose not to foreknow all things.—*Dr. A. Clarke, Comm. Acts 2 & 4.*

FR.—May he then be deceived in his expectations?

ARM.—Undoubtedly. “The hope and expectation of God is disappointed by man.”—*Remonst. Scrip. Synod. Dei spes et expectatio est ab homine elusa.*

FR.—But if often disappointed, must he not experience anxiety and fear of the future?

ARM.—Truly. “God in his measure sometimes feareth, that is, hath reason to suspect, and prudently conjectureth that this or that evil will arise.”—*Vorstius de Deo*, p. 351. *Deus suo modo aliquando metuit*, &c.

FR.—Enough! Enough! And yet you do not make God “a weak, short-sighted, changeable being, dependent on the wills of his creatures?” What think you of Christ’s death?

ARM.—“Christ did not properly die for the salvation of any one.”—*Grevinchov. ad Ames. fol. 8. Christus non est proprie mortuus*, &c.

FR.—Has he any security that he shall see of the travail of his soul?

ARM.—None whatever. “The death and satisfaction of Christ having taken place, it may come to pass that no one fulfilling the condition of the new covenant, none might be saved.”—*Grevinchov. ad Ames. fol. 9. Præstita et posita Christi morte*, &c.

FR.—Awful prospect! Christ dying in vain!

ARM.—“The end of Christ’s death would be attained, even though none should believe on him.”—*Corvinus ad Molin. cap. 27, sec. 3.*

FR.—Still more shocking! That Christ should come into the world to save sinners, and yet should be satisfied without saving a single sinner! But you seem to intimate that the efficacy of his death depends altogether upon the creature.

ARM.—We are told to maintain that “the efficacy of the merits of Christ depends so wholly upon ourselves, that we can make our own calling effectual or ineffectual.”—*Remonst. Apol. p. 93. Sic efficacia meriti Christi tota penes nos est*, &c.

FR.—Why, then, conversion is the work of man!

ARM.—Truly. “We can convert ourselves or not.”—*Corvinus ad Bog. fol. 263. Possumus nosmet ipsos convertere, vel non convertere.*

FR.—But are not faith and conversion the work of the Spirit wrought in us?

ARM.—No. “Faith and conversion could not be obedience if they were wrought in us by another.”—*Remonst. Collog. IIag. fol. 196. Fides et conversio non possunt esse obedientia*, &c.

FR.—I must now return you my thanks for the freedom with which you have avowed your sentiments, and especially for the quotations from your eminent writers, who, as they were intimately connected with the rise and progress of Arminianism, must have had a thorough understanding of its principles. And, adopting with some variations the language of Dr. W. Fisk, one of your file-leaders, I may say, "These early defenders of your system come out boldly and fearlessly with their doctrine. If modern Arminians would do the same, we should need no other refutation of their system. At the present day, numerous changes of a more popular cast, and such as are suited to cover up the gross absurdity of the system, are introduced. And whenever they have been hard pressed by their antagonists, they have thrown up new redoubts, and assumed new positions, not only to conceal their doctrine, but if possible to defend it."

A. G. F.

Perseverance.

Some months ago we published some extracts from Dr. Spring's chapter on perseverance, in his excellent work, "Attractions of the Cross." Our intention was, to have given the rest of the chapter in the next number of our Magazine. As we could not do so, we deem it best to give his whole chapter on perseverance in this No.

Such is the attraction of the Cross, that what it once secures it holds fast forever. Those who are once interested in it never lose that interest. Once attracted to it by a true and heaven-imparted faith, they never so break the bond as to be ultimately severed from Christ, and finally perish. There is no falling away from the Cross.

This is a truth which is liable to perversion and abuse, and ought therefore to be stated with some clearness and caution. There is no doubt that not a few who *profess* to have received Jesus Christ, and are for a time outwardly conformed to the requisitions of the Gospel, do ultimately apostatize and perish.

To deny this forms no part of the truth we propose to establish. Though, in a well-instructed community, there are comparatively few who, when they make a profession of religion, either intend or expect to renounce their profession, there are, notwithstanding, very many who profess religion without possessing it, and who, on that account, apostatize from their profession and perish. The Word of God, as well as melancholy facts which have taken place under our own observation, show us that the professed disciples of the Cross have become apostates, and have renounced both the principles and the duties of Christianity, beyond recovery. But it is no impeachment of the efficacy of the Cross, that men whom it never held at all it does not continue to hold. Persons of this description were never at heart believers in its truths and power. It is perfectly natural for such persons to fall away, even from all their false appearances of godliness. It has only "happened unto them according to the true proverb, the dog is turned to his own vomit again, and the sow that was washed to her wallowing in the mire." The exalted Redeemer will say to all such deceivers, when he comes in the clouds of heaven to judge the world, "I *never* knew you." The true account of all persons of this description is given by the apostle in a single sentence: "They went out from us, but they were not *of us*; for if they *had been of us*, they would *no doubt* have *continued with us*: but they went out, that it might be made *manifest* that they were not all of us."

Nor is it any part of the truth we propose to substantiate, that true believers in Christ may not and do not fall into great sins. Not only are all of them imperfect in holiness, but frequently lose so much of the spirit and power of godliness, as to bring deep reproach upon the sacred name by which they are called. Inward declension almost always leads to outward negligence; while an uncircumspect and untender walk and conversation, are very apt to degenerate into some of the forms of open wickedness. The Spirit of God is often thus grieved away from the bosoms of his own people; and where that fountain of living water within them is at its ebb, or for a time diverted into other channels, not only do the plants of righteousness wither, but noxious weeds spring up in their stead. Where spiritual activity and diligence are superseded

by indifference and sloth, where vain desires and inordinate affections after this world shut out the love of God, the fellowship of the soul with Him is interrupted, and the believer for a time exhibits little evidence that he has ever passed from death unto life. Such defections form no part of the Christian character; and while from such defections every believer is ultimately recovered, from none of them is he infallibly sure of being uniformly and always preserved. The Scriptures nowhere represent his condition as such, that in consequence of his union to Christ, he is in no danger of sinning. Their admonitions imply directly the reverse of this. "Let him that thinketh he standeth, take heed lest he fall." "Take heed, brethren, lest there be in any of you an evil heart of unbelief in departing from the living God." "Let us therefore fear, lest a promise being left us of entering into his rest, any of you should seem to come short of it." Let us labor to enter into that rest, lest any man fall after the same example of unbelief." "Thou standest by faith: be not high-minded, but fear; for if God spared not the natural branches, take heed lest he spare not thee." Admonitions like these would be out of place, if there were no danger. If there ever was a man who was warranted, from the strength and ardor of his piety, and the assurance of his faith, to live above this cautious and watchful spirit, that man was the Apostle Paul. But, so far from bordering on presumption, his language is, and in perfect consistency with his conscious glorying in the Cross, "I keep under my body, and bring it into subjection, lest by any means, when I have preached to others, I myself should be a cast-away." There is nothing in the *nature* of holiness to keep good men from falling; for if there were, neither the fallen angels, nor our first parents, would ever have lost their primeval integrity. It would be the highest arrogance for those, who have perfectly conclusive evidence that they are accepted of God, to yield to the temptation that they are in no danger of falling into grievous apostacies. Everything is leagued against them, from within and from without: a heart desperately wicked and deceitful above all things—an alluring and a threatening world—and a powerful, malignant and subtle adversary, watching every avenue through which he may enter and lead them captive at his will. If they do not fall, it is not because

there is no danger of falling; for they often stand on slippery places, and where it wants but little to precipitate them into the gulf below. It is with extreme caution that they do not turn aside from the way, and with great difficulty that they are rescued from the pit. "The righteous are scarcely saved."

But while all this is true, and important truth, it is also true that "the righteous shall hold on his way, and he that hath clean hands shall wax stronger and stronger." What the Cross of Christ has done for all true believers, it has done effectually and forever. While many who profess the religion of Christ, and appear outwardly conformed to it, will apostatize and perish; and while true believers may, for a time, be left to themselves and fall into sin, and are always in a condition which calls for unsleeping vigilance; *yet will they persevere in holiness to the end, and be infallibly preserved from final apostacy and perdition.* That is what I mean, when I say there is no falling away from the Cross.

Before I call your attention to the evidence by which this truth is substantiated, it is important to a just view of this truth itself, to show *by what power, or influence, believers are thus preserved, and enabled to persevere.* On this part of the subject, I desire to do honor to the Cross, and ascribe all glory to its atoning blood, its sanctifying power, and its unchanging faithfulness. No creature, were he ever so holy, can persevere in holiness, independently of divine power. It belongs to the nature of creatures, to "live, and move, and have their being in God." Gabriel does not possess a holy thought independently of his Maker. The unremitting and powerful energy of the great Supreme is the immediate cause of all the holiness, perfected and continued as it is without intermission and forever, of cherubim and seraphim in the upper Sanctuary. Divine power is as necessary for the preservation of right principles and right affections in the heart, as for their original existence. Firm in principle and vigorous in action as the faith of Christians may be—nay, though it were a thousand fold more deeply seated than it is, and though it uniformly pervaded and consecrated all their powers and conduct—it is not so incorruptible and unchanging that, if forsaken of God, they will not fall and perish. Their dependence on all powerful grace is one of the sweetest and most cheering truths in all the Bi-

ble, and is most deeply and at the same time most gratefully felt, when they themselves have most of the spirit of that blessed Book. Take from them their dependence on God, and they sink in despair. They are "kept by the power of God, through faith, unto salvation." Who, that is acquainted with his own heart, has not felt how much more in accordance with his own depraved desires to give way than to resist, and to yield the conflict with his spiritual enemies, rather than maintain it! The best of saints would be the worst of sinners, without preventing and sanctifying grace. Of all the disasters a good man deplures, this is the greatest, that God should depart from him! Were their perseverance in holiness dependent on the saints themselves, there is not one among them all that would persevere. Moses would have turned away in disgust from the bright visions of Pisgah, but for this; David would have persevered in adultery and blood, but for this; but for this, Paul would have drawn back to perdition, though within sight of his crown of righteousness. Hence, Moses so earnestly prays, "If thy presence go not with us, carry me not up hence!" and David supplicates, "Hold thou me up, and I shall be safe;" and Paul expresses the assurance, "The Lord will preserve me unto his heavenly kingdom." The Scriptures are full of this truth. "The steps of a good man are ordered by *the Lord*: though he fall, he shall not utterly be cast down, for the Lord upholdeth him with his hand." "Now unto him who *is able* to keep you from falling, and present you faultless before the presence of his glory with exceeding joy." What but the fulfilled promise, "My grace is sufficient for thee, for my strength is made perfect in weakness," spreading itself before them, like the cloud by day, and shining on their path like the pillar of fire by night, could ever guide the people of God to the heavenly land?

The truth we wish to illustrate, may be made still more plain and unobjectionable, if in addition to the power and divine influence by which believers in the Cross are preserved, we also *advert to the means by which they are kept from falling away*. There are appointed and appropriate means of their perseverance, as well as an efficient cause; nor may the former be dispensed with any more than the latter. The Scriptures insist on this truth, as itself a component part of the doctrine

that there is no falling away from the Cross. This is that feature of the doctrine which is overlooked by that class of its opposers, who affirm that it is a doctrine which *tends to licentiousness*, and one which even the best of men would feel strong temptations to abuse. "He that *endureth to the end*, the same shall be saved." "Be thou faithful unto *death*, and I will give thee a crown of life." "To him that *overcometh* will I grant to sit with me on my throne." "He that *overcometh, and keepeth my words*, to him will I give the morning star." There is no hope without continued holiness. The believer may not suppose his work is done, because he has found pardon and peace. It is not more necessary that he should come to the Cross, than that he should keep at the Cross, and live and die by the faith of that finished redemption. There is no divine purpose or grace to keep him from perdition, if he does not persevere in faith and holiness. His own faith and holiness are themselves the very things to be secured in order to his salvation; nor can there be any salvation without them. It is a disingenuous and perverted view of the truth, to say, that because a man is once in Christ, he is sure to be saved, though he goes away from Christ. The true doctrine is, that once in Christ always in Christ, and that the only proof and way of being in him at all is to continue in him. "I am the way," says the Saviour. Men are no longer in the way to heaven than they are in Christ, and pursuing the straight and narrow path marked by his footsteps and his atoning blood. The Christian is engaged in a perpetual conflict; and no sooner does he put off his armor than he is at the mercy of the foe. He must watch and pray, lest he be led into temptation; he must live above the world, and walk with God; he must hunger and thirst after righteousness, and grow in grace and the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ. As he advances in years, he must make advances in piety, till "his hoary head is a crown of glory, because found in the way of righteousness;" nor must he be satisfied until the last vestige of corruption is erased, and he "beholds the face of God in righteousness." Men, therefore, must continue in holiness, or die in their iniquity. God has solemnly declared, "When a righteous man doth turn from his righteousness, and commit iniquity, he shall die." He may not dismiss his solicitude, because he is once righteous, but

must hold on his way. If he is lifted up, and grows presumptuous, because, in some favored hour, he has enjoyed some peculiar tokens of the divine favor—if he stops where he is, and is satisfied with his present attainments—he will draw back to perdition. He will not gain the prize without reaching the goal, nor wear the crown unless he achieves the victory. He may never be satisfied, without pressing forward. “I count not myself to have apprehended,” says Paul; “but *this one thing* I do: forgetting the things that are behind, and reaching forth to those that are before, I press toward the mark of the prize of the high calling of God, which is in Christ Jesus.” There is no other doctrine of not falling away than that all true believers “are kept by the power of God, *through faith*, unto salvation.” A continued faith is the appointed *means* of perseverance; and to look for the end without the means, is stumbling over palpable error, walking in darkness, and ignorantly and rudely separating what God has joined together. The design of the Cross is to make men holy as God is holy. God would make them meet for his presence, and by the continued and progressive influence of the death of his Son. The most confident will lose their confidence, if they work not out “their own salvation with fear and trembling, because it is God that worketh in them to will and to do of his good pleasure.”

I have occupied more of your time in these explanatory remarks than I intended, because the illustration makes the proof of our position more intelligible and easy. Our position is, that there is no such thing as finally falling away from the Cross. Once in Christ, always in Christ: once justified, always justified. The final perseverance of every true believer is certain. The reasons for this position I will state with as much brevity and simplicity as I can.

We find one of the fallen children of Adam at the Cross; penitent, humbled, and believing, at the foot of the Cross. He came there, not because it was naturally in his heart to come, for he was once a totally depraved being, and hated nothing so much as the holy salvation procured by God’s crucified Son. Salvation was freely offered to him through the Cross, but he would not accept it; nor did he accept it until God, by his own almighty power, created within him a new heart and a

new spirit, and transformed his character from death in trespasses and sins to spiritual life. "He is God's workmanship created anew in Christ Jesus, after the image of him that created him." Now, is there any reason to believe that God would thus have made bare his arm to awaken, convince and renew this once depraved creature, and conduct him to the Cross of his Son, and give him joy and peace in believing, only to suffer him, at some future period, to break away from the Cross and perish? Is it thus that the God of heaven honors and magnifies the riches of his grace toward guilty men? Would he do all this; unmoved and uninduced by a single trait of excellence in the sinner, and from mere compassion toward him as self-ruined and condemned, and, now that he has imparted to him a portion of his own comeliness, leave his work unfinished, and suffer him to sink unrecovered, and irrecoverably, into deeper sin, and a deeper damnation? Is such the method of grace revealed in the Gospel? Is this the extent of God's compassions? Does he do no more than introduce men, in all the weakness and ignorance of their spiritual infancy, into his own family, and then leave them to go alone, and stumble, and fall, and perish? Or does he, now that he has led them so far, pledge himself "never to leave nor forsake them?" to keep them as the apple of his eye, to nourish and bring them up as children, and fit them for his heavenly kingdom? Which were the most like God? I read in the scriptures such declarations as these: "Whom he loved, he loved to the end." "The gifts and calling of God are without repentance." "The Lord forsaketh not his saints; they are preserved forever." "In whom also, after that ye *believed*, ye were *sealed* with that Holy Spirit of promise, which is the *earnest* of your inheritance until the redemption of the purchased possession." "Being confident of this *very thing*, that he which hath *begun* a good work in you, *will perform it* until the day of Jesus Christ." And what do they teach us, if not that the God of love never leaves his own work unfinished, and that what he begins with grace he ends with glory? It would be a new view of God, to my own mind, that he ever abandons those whom he has once united to his Son. It is, I am persuaded, a view unauthorized by the Scriptures. There is joy in heaven over one sinner that repenteth; but the joy would be premature, if he entered on a

course that might, after all, terminate in the chambers of death. Strange that the dream should ever have been told, that the grace of God, so wonderful and so unchanging, does not preserve and secure the triumphs it has once achieved.

Take now another view of this same general thought. This regenerated and believing sinner, so lately brought to the Cross, is *pardoned and justified*. By faith in the Cross of Christ, he not only possesses a different character from that he once possessed, but is brought into *new relations*. He is no longer under the law, but under grace. He is in a state of grace—a justified state. From the moment of his believing, the sentence of condemnation which he had incurred by his transgressions is removed; he is judicially absolved from punishment; his debt to divine justice is paid; and a righteousness is imputed to him which answers every demand of the law of God. He is reinstated in the favor of his once offended Sovereign, and entitled to all the immunities of his kingdom. He is united by a living faith to the Saviour, and has become one with him, as the branches are united to the vine, and the members of the body to its head. The precious faith by which he is thus united to the Living Vine he “obtained *through the righteousness of God, even our Saviour Jesus Christ.*” Now, how does the notion of falling away from the Cross accord with this *justified state* of every believer? Paul, in speaking of this condition of all true believers, uses the following language: “Therefore, being justified by faith, we have peace with God, through our Lord Jesus Christ; by whom also we have access by faith unto *this grace wherein we stand*, and rejoice in the hope of the glory of God.” He regards the believer’s justification as a *permanent* reinstatement in the divine favor; and he goes on to reason strongly and conclusively in support of his position. His argument is this: If God gave his Son to *die* for men, while they were yet *enemies* to him, how much rather, now that they are become his *friends*, shall he save them *through his death!* “God commendeth his love toward us, in that while we were yet *sinners*, Christ died for us. Much more then, *being now justified by his blood*, we shall be “*saved from wrath through him.*” In perfect accordance with this are all the representations of justification which are given in the Bible. God never forgives one of the sins of his people,

without forgiving them all. When he once forgives them, there is no more condemnation. "Their sins and iniquities will I remember *no more*." Justification is represented as being *unto life*, to life eternal. "There is *no condemnation* to them which are in Christ Jesus; for the law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me *free* from the law of sin and death." Is the hypothesis to be allowed, that those who bear so near a relation to Jesus Christ as to be the members of his own body, will ever perish? or is it more in accordance with what we know of him to believe the encouraging assurance, "Because I live, ye shall live also!"

The faith which was at first through his righteousness, will, through his righteousness, be perpetuated to the last; and the union which it once forms with him will never be dissolved. Such is the obvious teaching of the Scriptures. "He that *believeth* shall be *saved*." If, as we have already seen, none will be saved without persevering in holiness, and if all who believe shall be saved, then all who believe shall persevere in holiness. God has given this promise the solemn and emphatic form of a *covenant*—a covenant "ordered in all things and sure," and pledging to his people "the sure mercies of David." Read his own interesting description of that covenant: "Behold the days come, saith the Lord, that I will make a *new covenant* with the house of Israel and the house of Judah, *not* according to the covenant I made with their fathers; but this shall be the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel: After those, saith the Lord, I will put my law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts, and I *will be* their God, and they *shall be* my people. And I will make an *everlasting* covenant with them, and I will *not turn away* from them to do them good, but I will put my fear in their hearts, and they **SHALL NOT** turn away from me." In writing to the Hebrews, Paul speaks of this covenant not only as a *new* covenant; but a "*better* covenant," and established upon "*better* promises," than the covenant of Sinai. The covenant at Sinai was a pledge of the divine favor *so long as the Israelites persevered in their obedience*, but did not promise *persevering obedience itself*; but this new covenant contains this "*better* promise," and this promise constitutes its great pre-eminence. A *justified state* is one of the promises of this covenant—a promise made to

faith as the revealed condition of its blessings. The great and primary condition of that covenant was the sufferings of the Cross; and it has been fulfilled, and "by one offering he hath *perfected forever* them that are sanctified." But there is a subordinate condition fulfilled by believers themselves in those transactions into which faith enters with their great Surety, and this also has been fulfilled. Nothing can be more to our purpose than the declarations of the apostle, urging the encouragements of this gracious covenant, when he says, "The just by faith *shall live*; and if any man *draw back*, my soul hath no pleasure in him. But *we are not of them who draw back unto perdition*, but of them that *behave to the saving of the soul*." If there be such a final falling away from this *state of justification*, what is the import of such declarations as the following? "He that believeth on the Son *hath everlasting life*, and shall *not* come into condemnation, but *is passed* from death unto life." "This is the will of him that sent me, that every one that seeth the Son, and *believeth* on him, may have *everlasting life*, and I will *raise him up at the last day*." "Whom he called, them he also justified, and whom he *justified*, them he also *glorified*." "Faithful is he that called you, who also will *do it*." "For the mountains shall depart, and the hills shall be removed, but my kindness shall not depart from thee, nor shall the covenant of my peace be removed, saith the Lord God, that hath mercy on thee."

But there is a view of the believer's permanent hold of the Cross, which relates to the *great sufferer himself*, and which furnishes evidence certainly not less satisfactory of the truth we are considering. The Saviour himself has a chartered right to the final perseverance in holiness, and the ultimate salvation of every sinner who once truly believes in him. It is a right guaranteed to him in the ages of eternity, and purchased and sealed by his atoning blood. "When thou shalt make his soul an offering for sin, he *shall see* his seed; he shall see of the *travail of his soul*, and be satisfied." Paul speaks of those who have "the hope of eternal life, which God, that cannot lie, promised *before the world began*." To *whom* was the promise of eternal life made, *before the world began*? Not certainly to *men*, because they were not in existence; but to Jesus Christ, for all who should thereafter believe on him, and who were

thus early given to him as the reward of his sufferings and death. He did not lay down his life for nothing, nor for a reward that was indefinite. It was "to the intent that now, unto principalities and powers in heavenly places, might be known through the church," which he redeemed, "the manifold wisdom of God," and his triumphant victory over the Prince of darkness. Had the success of his great work been dependent on the ungoverned will of man, none would have accepted his salvation; or had it been dependent on their own fickle and faithless minds, when once accepted, there would have been no security that those who once came to him would not finally be cast out. And did he descend from heaven, and pour out his soul unto death, on any such uncertain and dubious enterprise? or had he the promise, before he left the bosom of his Father, of the conviction, the conversion, the faith, and the final perseverance and salvation of a "great multitude which no man can number," not one of whom should furnish occasion, by ultimate apostacy, for the fiend-like exultation that the great Conqueror is spoiled of his reward? Nor was this great promise ever lost sight of by the Son of Man, but often adverted to while he was on the earth. "All that the Father giveth me," says he, "shall come to me, and him that cometh I will in no wise cast out." "Thou hast given him power over all flesh, that he should give eternal life to as many as thou hast given him." "I give unto them eternal life, and they shall never perish, neither shall any pluck them out of my hand. My Father which gave them me is greater than all, and none is able to pluck them out of my Father's hand." "Father, I will that those whom thou hast given me be with me where I am, that they may behold my glory which thou hast given me!" Here lies the security against their falling away. The suffering Saviour has a claim upon them which is respected in heaven, and which he is able to enforce. We say of the Cross, what a remarkable man once said of one of its kindred doctrines: "I understand, sir," said a friend, to the late Sir Rowland Hill, "that you hold that terrible doctrine of election." "It is a mistake," replied Sir Rowland; "I do not hold election, election holds me." Believers hold the Cross, because the Cross holds them. I do not see that the Saviour has any security for the salvation of those thus given to him, if the doc-

trine of falling away be admitted. If one may fall away, all may fall away. The charter may be violated, and he may lose his reward, unless the grace of his Cross hold them fast and forever. There are obliquities in their course, but his faithfulness is pledged to rectify them; there are sins to which they are exposed and will commit, but that same faithfulness will purge them away. "I have made a *covenant* with my chosen," saith the Holy One of Israel; "I have laid help upon one that is mighty; I have exalted one chosen out of the people. *His seed* also will I *make* to endure forever. If *his children* forsake my law, and walk not in my judgments, if they break my statutes, and keep not my commandments, then will I visit their transgression with the rod, and their iniquity with stripes; nevertheless, my loving kindness will I not take from *him*, nor suffer *my faithfulness* to fail."

The Father's engagement with the Son was a *bona fide* engagement; and so long as God is on the throne, and is able to control their hearts and govern their condition and destiny, their unfaithfulness shall never be allowed to "make the faith of God of none effect." Dangers may stand thick around all the paths they are travelling, and they may often tremble lest they fall by the hand of the enemy: but from that altar of intercession, he who bled on Calvary looks down and says to them, "Fear not, little flock; it is my Father's good pleasure to give you the kingdom!" Nor could there be any such thing as the *full assurance* of hope, in this covenant and promises, if believers ultimately fall. No present evidence of a change of heart, be it ever so convincing; no consciousness of love to God and faith in his Son, be it ever so strong and infallible; no indications of a pardoned and justified state, be they ever so conclusive; could warrant that full assurance of hope possessed by the saints of the Old Testament and the New, expressed by Abraham, sung forth so often and so devoutly by David, and gloried in by Paul, had there been any uncertainty as to their holding out to the end. No living man can *know* that he will not at last lie down in hell, if he once admits the hypothesis that he may fall away. The *assurance* and *certainly* of salvation, so often enjoyed, and so uniformly required in the Scriptures, were a state of mind absolutely impossible,

were not the attraction of the Cross powerful enough to *keep* all whom it once attracts.

Let this great doctrine of the Cross, then, be, as it was designed to be by its Author, for the comfort and edification of all who truly fear God and love his Son. Here, Christian, is the pledge of your security. "Cursed is the man who trusteth in man, and whose heart departeth from the Lord his God!" Go on your way, and rejoice as you go. The Cross of your Redeemer is not so powerless as to be unable to keep you from falling, and present you faultless before the presence of his glory, with exceeding joy. The feeblest lamb is safe, once housed within the fold of the great Shepherd. There is no uncertainty as to the issue of this spiritual conflict, though it be sharp and long. Despondency is not one of the elements of advancement. Christ received is heaven begun. He who is the Author is also the Finisher of your faith. Away with your discouragements, and look to Jesus. Away with your weakness, and look to Jesus. Away with your darkness, and look to Jesus as the light of life. Look back to him on the Cross; look up to him on the throne; look forward to him at his second coming. Your Saviour, your counsellor, your righteousness, your strength, the captain of your salvation, your portion hung on that Cross, is now on that throne, and will soon come to judge the world in righteousness. If you have Christ, you have all. Heaven itself is not so great a gift as God's own Son. "What shall we say to these things? If God be for us, who can be against us? He that spared not his own Son, but gave him up for us all, how shall he not, *with him*, freely give us *all* things?"

Nor is it less in keeping with the whole design and spirit of the truth here presented, that we say to you, that there *is no well-grounded hope in Christ, without perseverance in holiness*. I entreat you to give this thought that place in your hearts which it deserves. Past efforts, past hopes, past experience, will be of little avail, if you now become weary, or ever cease to remember that "he that endureth to the end, the same shall be saved." In retirement and in the world, therefore, in prosperity and in adversity, on the mount and in the vale, "watch and pray, that ye enter not into temptation." You will have " manifold temptations," and trials of your faith; "therefore

fear, lest, a promise being left you of entering into that rest, any of you should seem to come short of it."

Nor may I conclude this chapter, without a word of affectionate admonition to those who are still out of Christ. My beloved friends, if all true believers must and will endure to the end, in order to be saved, what will become of you? If "the righteous," though saved, saved infallibly and forever, are saved with so much effort, "where shall the ungodly and the sinner appear?" You have come in sight of the Cross, and have turned from it. You have to begin and persevere to the last, and you have not yet entered upon the path that leads to life. You have to fight the good fight of faith, and you are not only without your armor, but asleep on the field. And can you hope to reach the goal, to gain the victory, and wear the crown? When so much is to be done, can you be safe in doing *nothing*? Oh, when will you receive Christ Jesus the Lord and enter upon that course in which you have something more than human assurance, that you shall hold on to the end? *Once in Christ, always in Christ*—what a motive is this to seek an interest in him! *No falling away from the Cross*—what a motive is this to flee to the stronghold, as prisoners of hope?

Look Forward!

No object of general benevolence and public utility ever secures due attention, until efforts are made to attract the minds of those who are to be the recipients of the promised good.—The usefulness, if not the existence, of the American Bible Society, depends upon the intelligence and well-directed activity of its travelling and distributing agents. They go from house to house, from city to city, and urge the importance of their mission upon individuals and public assemblies. Colporterage illustrates the same fact in a very pleasing manner.

The education of young men for the Ministry, is scarcely secondary to the free circulation of the Sacred Scriptures.—About once in a long time, the public is called to the perusal

of an article, in some religious periodical, on this subject; and we rejoice that *some* sections of the Church exhibit this knowledge of its importance, by uniting in hearty co-operation; but unfortunately, this spirit is not general.

The Western Churches have organization, more or less perfect, on various other subjects; but on this, particularly in East Tennessee, we have almost no concert of thought and action. It is true our Synod has made the requisite arrangements for imparting instruction; but of what profit is mere water-power, or even machinery, if the raw material is not furnished? At Maryville there are but ten or twelve young men preparing for the Ministry. There ought to be *fifty*, and would be, if every Church in East Tennessee would do its duty. With scarcely a dissenting voice East Tennessee Presbyterians agree that we must educate our own Ministers. In vain may we look beyond our own peculiarities and geographical boundaries, for Ministerial supplies. If we do, on the one hand we prove recreant to our native independence of character—on the other, we would inevitably fail. Attempts have been made by a few of our Churches, to obtain Ministers born and bred in other climes, and many of such successful instances have, in the end, proved *miserable failures*. We would not dissolve or neglect our associations with the North, or, indeed, with *any* part of the world; yet we have distinctive traits of character, and, whether they are or are not considered original and peculiar, our modes and habits of thinking are formed, and innovators are engaged in a thankless task, of which they soon grow weary, and mutual recrimination is the issue. *We must depend upon our own Ministerial resources*. What is meant by that?—Explicitly as follows:—We must arouse the public mind—the subject must be brought and kept before our people—and they must be convinced that *interest, privilege and duty* unite in urging them forward in this great work. Every Minister should be Moses, and every elder and layman should be Aaron or Hur. Students who have the means of giving themselves a liberal education, seldom turn their attention to Theology; hence the necessity of the Church contributing for the special purpose of supporting indigent young men at College. Every congregation of ordinary size, should search among the young men of their own number, and choose him who has the best

head and heart for the work, and not only encourage him to make a beginning, but support him promptly and *liberally* during his stay at College. Let his own Church make him an object of their special prayers, and otherwise use all means to encourage him in his arduous labors. Thus, each individual Church can qualify one Minister every eight years, and the expense will hardly equal its consumption of that filthy drug, tobacco. If it should even be necessary to curtail the ordinary amount of contribution for other benevolent purposes, no one should hesitate to make the sacrifice. Let us supply ourselves *first*, if need be, and then we will be more able, and ten-fold more willing to supply others. But there is no need of this—our Churches could conveniently increase all their subscriptions, and educate one Minister beside.

We should hasten on with this work, and make an indefinite postponement of the day when modern Senacheribs might laugh at the building of our walls. TERRAE FILIUS.

The Thief on the Cross.

The common belief in regard to the conversion of the Thief on the Cross is, that, up to the moment of his crucifixion, indeed, for a time after it began, he was not only in an impenitent, but in a hardened and obdurate state;—that unmoved by a consciousness of guilt, and the prospect of a speedy death, (for he probably knew, as it was the preparation for the Sabbath, that he was to die before the setting of the sun,) he could revile his Saviour even to his face;—that suddenly, without remonstrance, or any apparent cause, a change came over him, and he was led to utter a cry for mercy, which was instantly granted.

Now these circumstances are so remarkable, and so contrary to the history of like incidents in the Bible, and to our own experience, that I have been led to inquire, is this the true understanding of these events? and does the account leave us no alternative but to adopt it?

The decision of the whole matter turns upon the question, did the thief revile upon the Cross? If this be determined in the negative, then the evidence that his repentance was previous, is highly presumptive, if not conclusive.

There is an apparent discrepancy in the accounts of Matthew and Luke in relating this incident, but it is easily reconciled. Matthew says, "The thieves also which were crucified with him, cast the same in his teeth." Mr. Barnes, in commenting on this passage, says, "The evangelists, when for the sake of brevity they avoid particularizing, often attribute to many what is said or done by single persons, meaning no more than that it was done or said by some one or more of them without specifying the one." Compare Mark vii. 17, with Mat. xv. 15; Mark v. 31, with Luke viii. 45; Luke ix. 13, with John vi. 8, 9.

Luke in his account is explicit—"And one of the malefactors which were hanged railed on him, saying, if thou be the Christ, save thyself and us." "But the other answering, rebuked him saying, dost thou not fear God, seeing thou art in the same condemnation? And we indeed justly, for we receive the due reward of our deeds, but this man hath done nothing amiss."

If, then, the thief did not revile upon the Cross, we are under no necessity of supposing that his conversion took place there, but rather that it had occurred previously. Some time may have elapsed between the commission of his crime and his detection—and between his detection and his trial—and between his condemnation and execution. How much time intervened we have no means of knowing; but enough, doubtless, to admit of his repenting of his sins and embracing his Saviour, especially as he seems to have had a familiar acquaintance with his character—so familiar that he was able to say of him, "He hath done nothing amiss," a knowledge not acquired on the Cross, for he could not possibly have said this of one whom he had now seen for the first time. And farther; he clearly understood that Christ had a kingdom, and that it was a spiritual kingdom, and not of this world, for he saw him expiring; in this respect going even beyond the disciples. He knew he had a soul, and that it would exist after the death of the body. Here is an amount of information we can hardly

suppose could have been acquired on the Cross, in the absence of a direct miracle, and that it was imparted in this way we are not at liberty to suppose, because, as I have shown, there is no necessity to suppose it.

If, then, he did not revile on the Cross, we see in his conduct the strongest evidence of Christian character. 1st. In the well-timed reproof of his wicked comrade. 2d. In the testimony he bears to the purity and innocence of his Saviour's life. 3d. In the confession of his sins. 4th. In the calm resignation with which he suffers the penalty of his crimes. 5th. In the humble confidence with which he appeals to the Saviour, "Lord remember me when thou comest into thy kingdom."

J. K.

Short Practical Sermons—No. 3.

SECRET PRAYER.

"But thou, when thou prayest, enter into thy closet; and when thou hast shut thy door, pray to thy Father which is in secret."—*Matt. 6, 6.*

Secret prayer is the duty here enjoined, and in discussing it, let us notice the *place, time, manner, and importance* of performing it.

I. I will first speak of *the place* for private communion with God.

Respecting this part of the exercise under consideration, the most important particular is, that we should be *alone* with God, that no human eye sees us, no human ear hears us. The text specifies the closet, conveying not only the idea of secrecy, but intimating, perhaps, the *uniform choice of the same place*. I would dwell a moment on this latter thought, the choice of the same place for secret prayer, since the other is involved in the very nature of the duty. Each of us is conscious of a peculiar attachment to the sanctuary where we first publicly consecrated ourselves to God, and sat down at the Redeemer's table; and to the Church where we regularly worship. In the latter, our *souls* are most *at home*, and more readily than elsewhere brought into a devotional frame.

Because such is our nature, I would earnestly urge every christian to have *his closet*, some *particular* place, whither he retires to “pray to his *Father* who is in secret.” The atmosphere of that spot is purified by the prayers which we have already poured out there. When we enter it, we seem surrounded and pervaded with sacred influences. No strange object meets the eye, to draw off the attention. Every thing reminds us of the duty we are to engage in, and prepares our hearts for its performance. That place is our *private* sanctuary. Therefore let us have *a closet* for secret prayer.

II. I will now notice the *time* for the discharge of this duty. It should be attended to at *regular, stated* seasons. We should have a particular place, we should have particular times for private devotion. System is of great service in all our worldly business. The most systematic men are generally the most successful men. Now, we have more difficulties to contend with in taking care of the soul, than in providing for the body. Therefore, system is more necessary in this duty, which is the life of religion, than in temporal duties. Besides, Daniel, and David, and the most holy, have observed stated seasons for the closet.

You will now ask, what plan should we adopt, at what particular times should we pray? All will admit that we ought to retire to our place of prayer in the morning. Others have slept the sleep of death, but we still live. Others have been tossed on beds of languishing and pain, but we have been refreshed by sleep. Others have waked to wretchedness and want, but we are surrounded with the comforts of life. Should we not thank God for this distinguishing, this discriminating goodness? We are short-sighted creatures. Should we not seek the guidance of Infinite Wisdom? We are weak beings. Ought we not to ask strength from the Almighty? We are sinful. Does it not become us to implore the Spirit to renew and sanctify? Is there not, too, a *particular time* in the morning, peculiarly suited to private devotion? Communion with our *Father* should be our *first* business, after rising. We are then most likely to be in a devotional frame of soul. How can we better prepare ourselves for contact with the world, than by first repairing to the closet? Otherwise, how often the very first breath of the world discomposes and ruffles our spirits!

By secret prayer, how are our faces made to shine with a heavenly sweetness as we come forth into the family? Therefore let us go to God *before* we go to the world.

All will admit that before committing our bodies to sleep at night, it is also a suitable time for private devotion. We have received through the day many blessings. Should we not thank the giver? We have committed many sins. Should we not ask their pardon? We lie down, but we may never rise up. Should we not implore that in such an event God would receive us? Here let me observe, that we should not put off our devotions *till we are drowsy* with sleep, but we ought to select that hour before retiring for the night, which we can most regularly consecrate to this holy object, when also our minds, hearts, and *bodies* will be in the best state for the performance of the duty.

If now, we pray in secret, morning and night, will this be sufficient? Our bodies need to be refreshed with food **THREE** times a day. Surely the soul is exhausted by contact with the world more than the body is. Therefore, it should be supplied with its proper nourishment at least as often. So the eminently pious have always thought and acted. Daniel went to his closet morning, noon, and night. David speaks of praying *seven* times a day. You cannot find the joyful, useful, growing christian, who does not daily commune with God in secret, at least as often as Daniel did. Let us then faithfully attend to our private devotions in selecting a stated place, and stated seasons, *at least* morning, noon, and night, at such hours as we can most regularly observe, when, likewise, we are generally in the best state for this exercise, in mind, heart, and body.

III. The *manner* of discharging this duty is next to be considered.

Prayer should be accompanied with *reading the Bible*. We want subjects for holy meditation. The sacred volume furnishes them. We want to bring our souls into close contact with God's truth. The Scriptures are the great store-house where it is treasured up. We want to hear the Lord speak. In his Word he utters his voice. We should read, not to glance the eye over pages and chapters, not to speculate and theorize, but to understand and apply to the heart, to get definite views and distinct impressions, to have the soul most fully

drawn up to God and heaven. Some of the most eminent saints have kept by the side of their Bibles, for occasional reading in secret, the lives of some devoted christians, or a few of our best works on practical piety. These books would, probably, be valuable helps to most in private devotion, when judiciously used, and made completely subordinate to the Book of Books.

Prayer and the reading of the Scriptures should be accompanied with *self-examination*. We should ask the Lord "to search and know us, and see if there be any evil way in us." We should ask ourselves, what we have come to our closet for? what is the state of our mind and heart, and what has been our conduct, since we were last alone with God? This we should do, that we may know, where to watch most carefully, for what particular mercies to render thanks, what specific sins to confess, and what special blessings to entreat.

IV. The *importance* of the duty enjoined, in the text, is the last point to be noticed.

Secret prayer is important because it is demanded by the *constitution of our natures*. We do not wish always to commune with our most intimate and dearest friend, in the hearing of others. There is something in our hearts which requires that we should, at times, be alone, and, away from the hearing of others, give unrestrained utterance to the thoughts and feelings of our inmost soul. Thus it is, our natures demand that we should often go to our Heavenly Father and friend, and pour out our whole hearts before him, when no human eye looks upon us, no human ear hears us.

Secret prayer is *important as a preparation for public prayer*. It is generally an easy matter to discover whether he who prays in public, is much accustomed to his closet. There is an earnestness, a simplicity, a tenderness, a drawing near to God, a forgetting that others hear, which generally characterize the public supplications of one who prays much in private. We may confidently expect also, that the Lord will help us, when we publicly call upon him, if we go to him often in secret.

Private devotion is important, *all-important*, because *it lies at the foundation of all enjoyment in religion, and all growth in grace*. Our departures from God generally begin *in the closet*. Our return to him usually commences there also. The best index of a christian's piety is *his closet*. All experience shows that prayer is "his vital breath, his native air," *his food, his life*.

O then, child of God, follower of Jesus, weigh carefully, prayerfully, the practical thoughts now presented. Have your closet. Be there often; be there regularly. Oh! love it with all your heart. Let it be your earthly heaven. J. McC.

INDEX.

	PAGE.
An examination of the doctrine of the imputation of Adam's sin to his posterity, in connection with the interpretation of Rom. 5: 12—21, by the Rev. STEPHEN TAYLOR, Petersburg, Va., - - - - -	122
A Sermon, - - - - -	186
Annual Meeting of the American Board, - - - - -	227
A Sermon, by C. N., - - - - -	234
An Extract from the Records of the Synod of Tennessee, - - - - -	292
A Dialogue between an Arminian and his Friend, - - - - -	298
Brief Hints to Parishioners, - - - - -	46
Controversy, by JAMES KING, - - - - -	14
Calvinism—its Doctrines and History, by the Rev. JAMES McCHAIN, - - - - -	17
Conscience, - - - - -	49
Counsels for the Young, - - - - -	93
Christ's Glory in his Humiliation, - - - - -	112
Card, - - - - -	201
Christian Doctrine Proved by Christian Experience, - - - - -	202
Decrees and Natural Religion, by R. P. W., - - - - -	66
Decrees and Free Agency, - - - - -	82
Dedication and Installation, - - - - -	199
Decrees of God, by Dr. DWIGHT, - - - - -	213
Decrees of God, by Dr. DWIGHT, (Concluded,) - - - - -	245
Extract from Calvin's Sermons, - - - - -	38
Look Forward, by Terrae Filii, - - - - -	318
Look out for a Robber, - - - - -	44
Methodist Admissions to the Church, - - - - -	69
Miscellany, - - - - -	92
Miscellany, - - - - -	96
Miscellany, - - - - -	119
Missionary, - - - - -	201
Missionary, - - - - -	293
Maternal Influence, by R. P. W., - - - - -	79
Ministerial Support, by J. K., - - - - -	98
Methodist Episcopalian—Mr. PATTON's Review of Mr. Ross' Book on the Direct Witness of the Spirit, as taught by Mr. WESLEY, with remarks by Mr. Ross, - - - - -	146
Methodist Episcopalian, - - - - -	170
Maryville Professorship, - - - - -	264
Obituary, - - - - -	121
Our Camp-Meeting, - - - - -	225
Ordination, - - - - -	233

	PAGE.
Prospectus,	1
Particular Providence Proved by Fact,	42
Presbyterianism, by Presbuteros,	61
Progress of Civilization,	90
Progress of Liberality,	91
Poetry,	97
Publisher's Notice,	121
Perseverance Explained, by Dr. Spring,	138
Poetry,	145
Presbyterianism,	157
Perseverance Proved, by Dr. Spring,	163
Presbyterianism, by Presbuteros,	274
Perseverance, by Dr. Spring,	304
Reflections on the 8th Chap. of Leviticus,	32
Religious Gems,	48
Saving Time,	49
Solemn Responsibility of Christians,	92
Sheep and Shepherds of Judea,	95
Self-Education, by JAMES M'CHAIN,	103
Sayings of Dr. Emmons,	144
Short Practical Sermons—No. 1, by J. K.,	194
Short Practical Sermons—No. 2, by R. P. W.,	210
Short Practical Sermons—No. 2, by R. P. W., (Concluded,)	258
Short Practical Sermons—No. 3, by J. M'C.,	322
Synod of Tennessee,	286
The Bible my Own,	70
Thoughts,	71
The Bible and Election, by J. M. C.,	74
The Free Church of Scotland,	84
To Christians,	113
To Ministers,	115
The Methodist Episcopalian,	121
The Puritans, by Macaulay,	167
The Emperor Sigismund,	244
The "Great Iron Wheel"—by F. A. Ross,	266
Thoughts on Calvin's Commentaries, by J. K. M.,	279
The Thief on the Cross, by J. K.,	320
Witchcraft, by FRED. A. ROSS,	3
Witchcraft, (Continued,) by F. A. Ross,	26
Witchcraft, (Concluded,) by F. A. Ross,	50
Westminster Standards,	68
What Perseverance can do,	118



059171101339260