

THE  
**EVANGELICAL WITNESS,**

VOL. I.

JANUARY, 1823.

NO. VI.

THE CHRISTIAN CHARACTERIZED, IN A BRIEF EX-  
POSITION OF ROMANS VII. 14—25.

The perfection of heaven is not found on earth; nor does the innocent, and regular deportment of man in Eden, characterize him as banished to the thorny fields of a world, under the pressure of the curse of eternal justice. God, indeed, is immutable, and the principles of the primitive law of our nature, the rule of life, are unchangeable. That law is holy, just, and good. There is nothing which the mere man of the world can more easily discern, especially in their application to others, than the obligations of the divine law, as referable to moral deportment. His enmity to that holiness which gives the real Christian an essential distinction from the voluntary slave of sin, makes him eagle-eyed in marking those incidental failures, from which none in this stage of imperfection, is entirely exempted. The saint, himself, marks the deviations of his life, with the eye of strictest scrutiny, and on them he pronounces the terrible sentence of God's law. Thus these transgressions of the religious man are observed by himself, and by the votary of unrighteousness: but how different are the sentiments for which, and the end for which these observations are made. The one aims at the sinking of the religious character, and hopes to reach, by a fatal shaft, the cause of godliness itself; the other ob-

REVIEW OF DR. KIDD AND PROFESSOR STUART.

1. A Dissertation on the Eternal Sonship of Christ, by James Kidd, D. D. Professor of Oriental Languages in Marischal College and University of Aberdeen, &c. &c. p. p. 357. Oct. Aberdeen, 1822.

2. Letters, on the Eternal Generation of the Son of God, addressed to the Rev. Samuel Miller, D. D. by Moses Stuart, Associate Professor of Sacred Literature in the Theological Seminary, Andover, p. p. 166. Octav. Andover, 1822.

The two respectable gentlemen, whose names appear above, are of high rank and reputation as scholars, and have long been considered as well versed in sacred literature. They have both, before now, appeared to the public with works nearly related to one another, as well as intimately connected with the subject to which they at present call the attention of the churches on each side of the Atlantic—they have written on the doctrine of the Trinity, and the Divinity of Jesus Christ; and now discuss the nature of the *relation* subsisting between the persons of the Trinity, especially *that*, between the Father and the Son.

It appears, from the publications, under review, that, about the same time, and unknown to each other, they have been labouring in the same field of biblical criticism; and, we doubt not, with like industry and sincerity, although they have arrived, without intending to be antagonists, at opposite results. Doctor Kidd comes to the conclusion, that the *three Persons* of the Godhead, subsist in one simple immutable essence, divinely and eternally related the one to the other; that this *related state is ne-*

cessary to the deity; that the relation is *revealed* to us in the holy scriptures; and, that it is indicated by the terms Father, Son and Holy Spirit. Mr Stuart seems to conclude, for he is not yet quite explicit and consistent, that *if there be* three persons in the Godhead, they are *not necessarily* related, but exist, each, *independently of every other*; that the related state, revealed in the Scriptures, is *voluntary* and temporary—*economical* and not divine: and that the terms Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, denote not a *real relation* in the Godhead; but *assumed relations* of the Deity which are merely official, or economical for the salvation of man. He seems to think that divine revelation declares merely what God *is to us*, without signifying what *he is in himself*; but Dr. Kidd affirms, that *what God has become* to us, is designed to shew what *he is in himself*; and, that Revelation does not answer its purpose, otherwise than, by declaring *the true God*, in the attributes and persons of the Godhead, as necessarily and immutably related.

We find it ourselves somewhat difficult to conceive of God's declaring to us *what three persons have become* for our sakes, without also declaring *what the persons are*, who did become so, on our account. Surely God's last end, in creation, is the display of his own perfections, to make known *what he is*; and the peculiar object, of the redemption by Christ, is to make known the persons, in the Godhead in their related states: for, "this is life eternal, that they might know thee, the only true God"—THE ETERNAL TRINITY—"and Jesus Christ"—officially appointed by the covenant of grace,—"whom thou hast sent."

It is a fundamental principle, in all such minute investigations, we would say in all intellectual theological discussions, that God reveals *himself* to man, "that they might know thee, the only true God." Upon this simple axiom depends the decision of the

whole controversy respecting the *object* of religious worship. The dispute, with Polytheists, those that assume the name of Unitarian, and among Trinitarians themselves, about the *filiation* of Christ, and the *procession* of the Spirit, depends upon this question, Has God, indeed, made HIMSELF known to man? This is unquestionably, the dividing line between the Christian and the Heretic, by whatever name he may be called. Let us apply this principle—*God has made himself known.*

Now, the Deity is made manifest by his works and by his word; and the Scriptures are, not only, the best revelation, but also a sufficient declaration of what God is *in himself*. Do you believe there is an invisible superior to whom homage is due from all the earth? So say the Pagans. Do you believe this invisible being is ONE? So say the Persian magicians, the Mahometans, the Socinians, the Deists, and the unbelieving Jews. Do you believe the Bible tells us many good things of God and of his relation to man? So say they all. What then? There is one thing more: God, in the Bible, makes *himself* known to us for our salvation. This is the principle by which we would try that theory, which affirms that the terms FATHER, SON, and SPIRIT respect God only in his dealings with men, and not as he is in himself.

1. If these terms are *merely* economical, they may be classed with the terms Creator, Preserver, Governor, King, Husband, Redeemer, Lawgiver, Judge, Sanctifier, Comforter, &c. &c. and, then, we know *not* if there be any distinct persons, or how many, are in the Godhead. This would immediately lead to a subversion of the doctrine of the Trinity altogether.

2. If these terms denote the relations into which the Persons of the Godhead *voluntarily* entered for our salvation, and *not* the *actual* relations in the Godhead, then we have *no* revelation, at all, of the *real*

persons of the Trinity, and God has not as yet revealed HIMSELF to man; for there are no other terms to denote three actual distinctions.

3. It is not conceivable, that there are three persons in the divine essence, without being in a related state, and distinguished by personal properties; and it is equally incredible, that, if there be such persons, so distinguished and related, God should not have made these persons known by their properties, and relation to each other, in the same indivisible, infinite, and immutable essence.

We conclude, therefore, that, as God has made himself known to man, in his persons, as well as attributes, the terms Father, Son, and Spirit, are not only founded upon a threefold distinction, but do actually declare both the distinction and their peculiar properties. The relation of Father, then, is eternal; the relation of Son is eternal; and the relation of Spirit, both of the Father and the Son, is eternal, necessary, and immutable, because it is divine.

This is the ONLY TRUE GOD, Father, Son and Holy Ghost, into whose name we are baptized, and in whom all our salvation is centered. Math. 28, 19, 2 Cor. 13, 14—*Every one that loveth is born of God, and knoweth God.*

Of the two authors before us, Dr. Kidd appears to be the ablest reasoner; but Mr. Stuart, the most perplexed and perplexing disputant. The former is profound in thought and rich in language, the latter, an acute and persevering controversialist. The Scottish Divine has taken up the subject, without special reference to any book or person, on the broad and sure basis of its own merit, and endeavours to vindicate the common creed of the churches of God among the nations; but, our neighbour, of Massachusetts, has particularly addressed the Reverend Doctor Samuel Miller, and has put forth his strength in support of, what he himself represents, as having been, for nearly forty years, the faith of the most orthodox

parts of the New-England churches. His words are pp. 4, 5.

“During all my Theological life, I never once heard the doctrine of eternal generation seriously avowed and defended. Nearly all the ministers of New-England, since I have been on the stage, have, so far as I know their sentiments, united in rejecting it, or in regarding it as unimportant.”

The gentleman, whom Mr. Stuart has chosen particularly to oppose, *Dr. Miller*, is as well known and as much admired, both at home and abroad, as any one that could well have been selected for a correspondent on the subject; and we indulge the hope, that he will, in due time, speak for himself and furnish us with opportunity to bring the discussion again before our readers. In the mean time, we refrain from making any remarks on his *Letters on Unitarianism*, which Mr. Stuart has attacked.

We take pleasure in mentioning, before we proceed further, some things very commendable, in which the Professor of Aberdeen, and the Professor of Andover, resemble one another, although they discover very different degrees of intellectual endowment; and argue in defence of opposite sides of the same great question. They, both, display a temper entirely under control; and observe due courtesy throughout the discussion. They are, alike, ardent, without irritation, and decisive, without being magisterial. Each of them, too, offers a perfectly satisfactory apology for his undertaking. We readily join them in affirming that every man should speak out. It is vain to attempt to silence inquiry, and it would be criminal were it practicable.

“I am satisfied that the time has come when it is necessary to examine well the doctrines which we believe and inculcate. The watchful opponents of our common faith have their eyes on all the steps of its advocates, and will demand a reason for all that they inculcate. But independently of this, the love of truth should be enough to stimulate us to the highest efforts, in order to know what we ought to believe and teach.—I must say, that the supposition, we cannot and may not discuss theological questions, about which different opinions are entertained among us

is, in fact, reproachful to us, and to the cause of truth, which we profess above all things to love.—It is useless to claim an imaginary perfection, which does not, and never did, and never will exist in the present world; and to the cause of truth it would be deleterious, in a high degree, to suppress in any way, or discourage the spirit of inquiry, when conducted with sobriety and decorum. I am so well persuaded of the truth and propriety of these sentiments, that I cannot hesitate to lay before my Christian brethren, who believe in the doctrine of the *Eternal generation of Son of God*, the following considerations to invite examination of this subject.”—Stuart’s Letters, pp. 10 and 11.

To all this we annex our approbation. Such free inquiry is becoming the age, is worthy of an American, and requisite in a Christian Divine. With equal truth, and perhaps more pathos, speaks our trans-atlantic Professor. We cannot quote him at sufficient length in continuation, to give a fair specimen of his strong yet tender reasoning, on the subject. We give scraps, that answer *our* present purpose, without injury to *his* sentiments.

“The doctrine of the Eternal Sonship of Jesus Christ has been received by the Orthodox Church in all ages—of late years, however, its truth has been questioned; and the subject has, in consequence, become a subject of controversy. Man in every age, has directed his attention to that superior power by which the energies of creation are wielded. From the contemplation of himself, and the beings with whom he mingles, he has been directed, either through the medium of sense or reflection, to survey that which is mightier than himself or his fellows. An impulse, undefined, inherent in his nature, has led him to conclude, that all power does not stop within those limits by which he feels himself circumscribed; and his excursive faculties have carried him in quest of the last link in the chain of the universe. That Being has sought man, and has revealed himself to him; the proclamation of glad tidings has been made; the messenger foretold has come, and in his coming has brought healing in his wings to the disordered soul. God in his essence is one and indivisible; and in that essence, there are Three persons in related states. The object of the following observations is to maintain, that the doctrine, of the eternal Sonship of the second Person of the Trinity, is revealed in the Scriptures of truth. Such an investigation, conducted with the humility and reverence which the subject requires, is calculated by the process and by the conclusion attained to enlarge our views of God, as he has revealed his nature, to expand the capacity in the contemplation of the grandeur of Him who fills heaven and earth with his glory, to illustrate the self-existent aspect of the being;

of God, and his redeeming aspect in the restoration of man, and to explore the everlasting purpose of the glorious Three, who in their eternally related states, said, in consultation, "let us make man," and who in the development of that purpose, have created man anew. It is an investigation calculated to elevate the immortal Spirit to communion with him. It conduces, when properly conducted, to a charitable and beneficent frame of mind. The question ought not to engender one unharmonious emotion."

We admire Kidd's Dissertation, as an able defence of the faith of the church, though we disapprove of his giving up, without a cause, or advantage to his own argument on the term Logos, the disputed text, 1 John 5, 7, and we by no means, admit all his subtle metaphysical ideas, and far fetched etymologies. These are, however, but spots.

Mr. Stuart's theory of God, and we fear he represents the prevailing sentiments of the eastern section of our country, seems to be a revival of the *Tritheism* of former ages—three distinct, supreme, and independent beings, each of them, separately self-existent. We hope it is not *Sabellianism*, with a *supreme* Logos and *figurative* Trinity. His letters abound in such assertions as the following.

"We do believe there is a distinction in the Godhead—which we suppose maybe *something more than mode of existence*. The LOGOS is a name for the second distinction of the Trinity as such. SON, therefore, does primarily indicate the *inferior* nature—inferior to that of the Father. Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, are words which designate the distinctions of the Godhead *as manifested* to us, and *are not intended to mark the eternal relations* of the Godhead *as they are in themselves*, and in relation to each other. I believe the Logos is really divine, self-existent, uncaused, *independent*, and *immutable in himself*—**A BEING SELF-EXISTENT.**"

Here, then, we have three distinctions, each of them **A SELF-EXISTENT BEING**, *independently* of the others—*something more than mode of existence* in the Godhead, and not at all related to one another, as Father, Son, and Spirit—*three self-existent beings*, each of them independent, supreme, immense, immutable and eternal in himself, and irrelated the one



to the other; for, as is the second *distinction*, so also is the *first*, and the *third*: and the Logos is divine, self-existent, independent and *immutable in himself*, according to our author.

This theory, which, we lament to learn from Mr. Stuart, is entertained by the New-England Divines, appears to be more irrational and absurd, than the theory of Socinus and Priestley.

We will now quote from Dr. Kidd.

"There are three persons in the Godhead and these three must exist independently or in related states. If they exist independently of each other, they are then each an independent person; consequently there are three independent and separate Deities. This goes to affirm there are *three Gods*. We may further remark, that if the three persons exist independently of each other, each, as a divine person, must possess all the qualities of the Deity inhering in himself; consequently each, independently of the others, possesses self-existence, eternity, immensity and immutability. There, thus, would be three self-existences, eternities, immensities, and immutabilities. This introduces *Polytheism*. The Persons of the Godhead do not, therefore, exist independently, but in *related states*, and these related states must be natural and *necessary in the divine essence*, which is simple, absolute, and indivisible."

This argument appears to us conclusive against the *New-England theory*; and we recommend it to the careful attention of Mr. Stuart, and the modern theologians who have forsaken the faith of their Fathers. For ourselves, repeated examinations serve to confirm us in the belief, that there is no medium between *Polytheism* and *Unitarianism* after some form, except a belief of *three persons necessarily related to each other, in one divine essence*, as Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, according to the Scriptures, in their most obvious meaning.

We will proceed, however, to give a succinct analysis of the two publications, which lie upon our desk.

(To be continued.)

THE  
**EVANGELICAL WITNESS,**

VOL. I.

FEBRUARY, 1823.

NO. VII.

THE CHRISTIAN CHARACTERIZED, IN A BRIEF EX-  
POSITION OF ROMANS VII. 14—25.

(Concluded from page 248.)

III. DOCTRINE. Though the Christian character is marked with imperfection, yet the principles and practice of holiness greatly predominate. I shall illustrate, briefly, the two facts now stated.

1. The Christian character is, in this life, marked with imperfection. Would we be satisfied of this? 1. Let illustrious examples pass in review. Draw near and with unjaundiced eyes, contemplate those constellations of light that shine in holy splendours in the firmament of the church of God. Where is Abraham, the father of all that believe? Where is Job, the sainted sufferer of Uz? Where is David, the inspired minstrel of Israel, the man after God's own heart? Where is Moses, the meek and intrepid, and favoured Prophet? Where is the seraphic Isaiah? Lift your eye to the heavens where they shine! Have you reached their height? Do you rival their splendour? Do you not see them advanced far before you on the celestial arch? In the brightness of their example, do not you direct your way? Yet who of them was without his spot? Not one. Those spots are distinctly marked, to humble man, and deep-

turned unto fables?" Has there not flowed in upon this city, from the eastern section of our country, a flood of error, which, under the semblance of great benevolence in endeavouring to unite the various classes of Christians, has been gradually undermining the bulwarks of the truth—a new divinity that would supplant the old gospel—a new system of making Christians, that would supercede the plan of God's regenerating grace—a system of *feeling* which places very little, if any, value upon the *peculiar doctrines* of Christ, and has very little, if any, connexion with *sound, substantial, and well-informed piety?*"

---

Review of Dr. Kidd's Dissertation on the Eternal Sonship of Christ, and Mr. Stuart's Letters to Dr. Miller on the Eternal Generation of the Son of God.

(Continued from page 271.)

The Dissertation consists of *fourteen* Chapters, besides a Preface, and Conclusions. Chapter I. is introductory. II. and III. afford a succinct statement of the general principles connected with the subject of discussion. IV. gives the meaning and the use of the term *Λογος* as applied to the Messiah. The argument in support of the doctrine of the *divine filiation* of Christ is contained in the *five* succeeding Chapters, V. to IX. both included. Chap. X. explains the use of the phrase, "Son of Man." XI. refutes the opposite arguments. XII. shows that *eternity* is an attribute both of the WORD and the SON of God. XIII. respects the term FATHER: and the XIV. consists chiefly of quotations exhibiting the sentiments of both the Ancient Fathers and the Reformers on the same side of the question.

The work is respectfully inscribed to the Rev Dr. Green, late President of the college of New-Jersey,

and the Rev. George C. Potts, one of the ministers of Philadelphia; both true men, and sound in the faith of the Presbyterian Church.

The Author shews in a masterly and satisfactory manner, that the Deity has revealed to man the essential existence of *persons* in the Godhead; and that these persons exist, not in a state of independence of each other, but in a *related state*; and that the *mode* of the related state, is indicated by the terms *Father, Son, and Holy Spirit*, and by no other terms. His conclusion is, of course, that the *filiation* of the Son, and the *procession* of the Spirit are divine, necessary, and eternal, in the simple, pure, and spiritual essence of the Godhead. By this Dissertation, Dr. Kidd has made a valuable addition to our Theological literature; and we hope that our enterprising Booksellers will soon give an American edition of it to the public.

Professor Stuart's pamphlet comprises *ten* letters. The *first* letter consists of introductory remarks, and the *last* of-concluding observations. II. and III. are designed to review the opinions of the early Fathers. IV. and V. propose to examine and refute the doctrine of our creeds and confessions of faith, and set aside the definitions of the principal works on systematic theology, with particular reference to Professor Turretine. VI. and VII. are employed in criticism on the terms *Son, Son of God, and Sons of God*. Letter VIII. is an attempt to prove that the appellation, *Son of God*, is applied to Jesus Christ as man *primarily*, on account of the miraculous conception, and *secondarily*, because of his exaltation by the resurrection from the dead, &c. The IX. aims at the entire refutation of the arguments of the Orthodox in support of Christ's eternal Sonship.

On every one of these topics, Professor Stuart has failed in a remarkable degree. There is, indeed, in his letters, ample evidence of patient and extensive research. There is a display, too, if not of vigorous

and comprehensive intellect, of learning and subtlety. The Author has cultivated an acquaintance with the Fathers, at least, so far as they are quoted by *Bishop Bull* and *Murtini*. His style of composition is neat, his language is perspicuous, and his reasonings are many and minute, rather than luminous and accurate. The evil lies, we are confident, more in the incapacity of mental comprehension than in the lack of speech; or of industry. He is indefatigable; and, we doubt not his sincerity. The time, however, which he has occupied, with the *Fathers* we esteem as wasted. It can be no profit, to this generation, to learn that some of them were *heretics*; or that a few men, of distinction among them, used very inaccurate phraseology. Their testimony is of very little service to the cause which Mr. Stuart supports. It is of *none* to his own argument; and it goes but a very short way to contradict the assertions of Dr. Miller, the only end to have been answered by the whole historical discussion. Professor Stuart, himself, being Judge, there is not a *single one* among the Fathers, whom he has quoted, that maintains his view of the question respecting the Sonship of Jesus Christ. None of them refer the filiation either to the incarnation or the resurrection. A few of them, we admit, spake somewhat incoherently about the *Λογος ενδιαιθετος*, and the *Λογος προφητικος*; but even they are misunderstood, when they are considered as teaching, that the *endiathetick* Logos is *Reason*, and the *prophorick* Logos is formed, out of that attribute, into the *person* of the Son of God, some short time before the creation of the world. We must, moreover, add that the *Antenicene* Fathers are greatly misrepresented, when they are said to have been so far misled by their idolatrous education in Polytheism, and by their attachment to the Platonic Philosophy, as either to admit of a *derived* divinity, or to imagine a mere *attribute*, of the divine mind, to have been contrived into a distinct person, and constituted

the Saviour of the world. Their Conversion from idols to the true God, and their martyrdom, for protesting against Polytheism prove sufficiently the injustice of such allegations. At all events, an *Ante-mundane generation* is not that which Mr. Stuart endeavours to inculcate. The *Nicene creed*, itself, composed by the united wisdom of the Fathers, stands, as a great public document, to testify for the Orthodox faith in opposition to the Criticism of both parties in New-England—those, who are called Unitarians; and such as think and act with the opponents of Christ's eternal Sonship.

The two historical letters are the ablest part of the work. They include the greater part of the literature and the reasoning displayed in the performance: and yet, taking them together, they constitute but one false argument, even were the allegations against the Fathers correct in every *Iota*. The argument is this; some of the *Antenicene* Divines were Heretics, therefore the church of God did not believe that Jesus Christ is eternally the Son of God. There is no connexion between these premises, and the conclusion: the Logic, therefore, is not good.

Before, however, we leave this subject, we must give notice to our readers, that those, among the earlier Fathers of the Church, who wrote most loosely on this subject, unequivocally affirmed, that the Generation of Christ is *before the foundation of the world*. In what year of Eternity, they have not attempted to explain, nor has Mr. Stuart as yet, supplied the omission. He takes for granted that it was *low down* in Eternity; some short while before the Creation.

In his subsequent letters, he treats with more freedom, than propriety indicated, the definitions of our Standard writings, even when supported by the terms of the sacred Volume. The letters to Dr. Miller are to be considered as a continuation of his previous writings; for in addressing Mr. Channing, the Au-

thor classes the terms, *persons of the Godhead*, *person of Christ*, *the eternal generation of the Son of God*, together, under one common censure.

"I have no hesitation in saying, that my mind is *unable* to elicit any distinct and certain ideas, from any definitions of *person* in the Godhead which I have ever seen. We profess to use the word *person*, merely from the necessity of language. I could heartily wish that the word *person* never had come into the symbols of the churches. You may indeed find fault with us, that we speak of *three persons* in the Godhead, where there is but one Nature; and yet of but one *person* in Christ, where there are two natures. I admit that it is an *apparent inconsistency* in the use of language, and can only wish that it had not, originally been adopted. After all, I am *unable to conceive* of any definite meaning in the phrase *eternal generation*—the *generation of the Son of God* seen to be *out of the question*. If the phrase eternal generation, then, is to be vindicated, it is only on the ground that it is *figuratively used*—it is not well chosen, however, for this purpose."

It must be confessed that we approve of the *discussion* of every topic in Theology, as well as in the other sciences, however we may disapprove of the *sentiments* uttered; and, certainly this language is plain enough. We have, of course no reason to be surprised, that a man, who could speak and write in this style, when professing to vindicate against the Socinians, the doctrine of the Trinity, should talk about with strong prejudices in behalf of his own novel scheme, and attack an old-fashioned Presbyterian for his adherence to his Confession of faith. *There are three persons in the Godhead*—distinguished by their *personal properties*, these three are *of God the same in substance*. It is proper to the Father to beget the Son, and to the Son to be begotten of the Father from all eternity. Christ being the Son of God became man, and so was and continues to be both God and man in two entire and distinct natures, and so on forever. This is the Creed of the Church.

has objected to three facts, which were unequivocally affirmed, by Jehovah in his writings. 1. That there are three

persons in the Godhead. 2. That Jesus Christ is both God and man, in one person.. 3. That Jesus Christ is the only begotten of the Father from eternity. He comes to the investigation with an assertion that he has no definite idea of the meaning of the terms; and with a *prepossession* of their impropriety. In this state of mind, it is no wonder that he misinterpreted the definitions of Orthodox Divines, and the several texts of Scripture which they quote. In his correspondence with Professor Miller, he treats only of the generation of the Son of God—a fact, which he had previously declared to be *out of the question*.

Standing committed, therefore, before his friends, his Class of Theological Students, and the public, on a question of such importance, as *what is the object of religious worship*, a question which, it is presumed, every man must have settled, upon due deliberation, to his own satisfaction, before he entered on the ministry, it was to be expected that Mr. Stuart would persist in opposition.

The same ground he appears determined to occupy, until we find a set of definitions, in language originally borrowed from objects of sense, that shall comprehend and precisely declare the mysteries of a spiritual essence. This can never be. The subject is immense, and our faculties are limited. God is a Spirit, and our language is derived from material objects. All that we *advise*, is to credit facts known to God and by him declared unto us. All that we can *do*, is to select the best terms; and all that we *propose*, is to defend the terms and the doctrine from the opposition of their adversaries. We disclaim any attempt to *explain* the fact. When we define, describe, or illustrate, it is to expose the objections of disputants; and never to explain or prove the facts asserted in the Bible, which are beyond our capacity. Of the *Deity* we say, "who can by searching find out God;" and of the *Son of God* we say, "who can declare his generation."



Mr. Stuart understands this distinction: and he has acted upon it, in his letters to Channing. Every man, who can reason on subjects of this nature, knows how to act upon it, at his own convenience. The Theist has done so, in arguing with the Atheist; the Christian, with the Infidel; the Orthodox, with those who deny the Trinity, or the distinct personal properties of the *Sacred THREE*.

We shall advert to this distinction, in our subsequent and concluding remarks on the Hypothesis of the Associate Professor of Sacred Literature, Andover.

That Jesus Christ, is a *proper Person* we believe, because the Scriptures speak of "the Person of Christ," and ascribe to him personal names, and properties, and actions. That the Father is a *proper person* we believe, because the Scriptures speak of "the Father's person," and ascribe to *him*, also, personal names, properties, and actions. That the Spirit is a *proper person*, we believe on similar grounds. We believe that Jesus Christ is the *Son of God*, the *only begotten Son*, the express image of the Father's Person; and that the Holy Ghost is the Spirit of the Father, and the Spirit of the Son. Therefore we teach that there be three persons necessarily related in the Godhead—the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, one true God, in opposition to every other Theory. Here we rest. We explain not. We use the word *Procession*, as applied to the Spirit, because the Scriptures tell us He cometh forth from the Father and the Son. We use the word *generation* as applied to Christ, because the Father said unto him, "Thou art my Son, this day I have *begotten* thee." When these *Facts* are denied, and our terms are attacked, in order to destroy our faith in the facts, we have recourse to illustration, by reference to other facts that are not called in question. We do so, however, not with design to prove or explain our doctrine: but in order to explain, and by explana-

tion to shew the irrevelancy of objections. This is the ground which the Orthodox should always occupy: and if they were to confine themselves to this ground, and their opponents were careful to give them credit for it, there would be less difficulty in prosecuting that candid discussion which would eventually lead to happy results.

The objection to the use of the term *Persons in Godhead*, if carried out, would not only condemn the whole Scripture phraseology; but also the system of grace revealed in the Bible. If it is proper to apply the word *Person* to the Father and Son, then it is improper to apply to either personal pronouns; for surely, if the noun be applied, the *pro-noun* ought not. Take them, from the Bible, all the *personal names* and what have you left? Then, in the Church become a Widow, without a Father. She has lost her Father, and Redeemer. She has lost her husband, and she has lost *Him*, whom her soul lov-

ever, the Professor will permit his word, *person*, in a *figurative* sense, to be the poverty of language, wishing that it be into the symbols of the Church." *Personify*, *figuratively*, to both the Father and Son? *Personify*, by speech, those *Persons* in reality? Alas! a *figura* *me no salvation*, says the penitence *figure of personification*, we advise. It is applicable to every thing. Mr. Stuart may *personify* his *Rafters* of his House, and the *Angels* may *personify* all the divine *Persons*. We have several *figurative persons*, *represented* as *three*; but, after all, a *figurative person* is more valuable than an *image*. *Personify* the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, in the Godhead we do not

have persons *in reality*, and not merely in name, if we have them at all.

We know of no other *noun* so well calculated to answer the purpose, in our ecclesiastical phraseology, for which all the personal *pro-nouns* are used, as the noun *person*. The Three personal pronouns, I, THOU, HE, in all their inflections, and adjective forms, are applied to three distinct objects, The Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. There is, therefore, required some common type, or *noun*, to which all the pronominal expressions refer. Assuredly, there is no term, so well adapted to this purpose, as the one in use, in the symbols of the Churches. There is, metaphysically, a necessity for the idea: and if the common language of our Bibles is to be retained, there is a grammatical necessity for the use of the word *person*, when speaking of the Trinity.

The Substitute, which Mr. Stuart employs, is exceedingly inadequate—*Distinction*. There are, he says, three distinctions in the Godhead; the *first* distinction, the *second* distinction, or Logos, and the *third* distinction. These are the Trinity. Three *distinctions* are all distinguished, the one from the other, but not by *personal* properties. They are more than *modes* of existence in the Godhead; but not persons. The Father, Son, and Spirit, are only economical terms, and do not denote these distinctions, as they are in themselves.

This new Theory has nothing to recommend it, on the score of accuracy or simplicity. It appears, to us, as confused and indistinct as any that has seen the light. *Three* distinctions; and, wherefore, *three*? There are ten distinctions if you please to make economical names, and relations, and attributes, the distinguishing properties. Yes, there are *twenty*. Three distinctions; to which belong the application of personal *pronouns*; but not the *noun*, person. Put this theory to the test of Scripture.

Suppose the Professor seated in his chair, and his Class of Students before him with their Bibles,

opened, no matter where—say, Isaiah, Chapter LII.

He reads the sixth verse of that elegant Chapter.

My people shall know my name—I am he that doth speak; behold, it is I.”

Student.—I wish Sir to know the name of this speaker.

Professor.—The name is Jehovah.

Stud.—Who of the Trinity?

Prof.—Speak correctly Sir; say *What*; there are no persons in the Trinity; ask *what distinction speaks*.

Stud.—Distinction speaks, Sir, I do not understand you.

Prof.—No person speaks, I tell you.

Stud.—Here is the Bible, Sir, a Speaker is declared, and the personal pronouns, *I, He*, behold, it is *I*, are used by the speaker in regard to himself.—may say himself? And yet, no person! I confess this to me incomprehensible.

Enough. Our readers will say this is childish. It But reviewers must condescend to childishness they deal with the Doctors of the new Divini-

there not, however, objections to the term as applied to the Father, the Son, and the Spirit? There are not valid objections. There is no abstract term which may not be put to

To the words, Church, State, Town, Commerce, Husbandry, History, Poetry, and Ingenuity may offer objections: Yet, they are English, and easily understood, in their own language. The learned come with childish objections, and the vulgar.

We go further, and apply philosophically, and metaphysically, there is no possible use of the term, correct, than the application of it to the Father, Son, and Spirit. Professor Stuart will favour us with an explanation of his own personal identity.

do not mistake, be able to sh-

its application to the Son of God. He, too, is *himself*, and not another.

We would also retain, the phrases *eternal Son of God*—and *only begotten of the Father*, because strictly true, and divinely prescribed. “Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee.” The words *eternal generation*, are not employed with *design* to denote inferiority, derivation, emanation or production. Mr. Stuart knows, and will himself confess the truth of this assertion. It is not so much our *intent* as our *phraseology* and sentiments, that he arraigns at the bar of Criticism. He well knows that, the Orthodox, in connecting with the term Son, the adjectives, *necessary*, *divine* or *eternal*, effectually preclude the ideas of inferiority or derivation, in the order of either nature or time. *Divinity* includes all perfection, and, of course, excludes *inferiority*; and, if the Sonship of Christ be divine, it is both necessary and eternal. Nor does the term, *Son*, itself, or the terms, *generation*, *filiation* or *begotten*, infer, either *posteriority* or *production*. It is not to be denied, that in the ranks of creation, the Son is younger than the Father; but even, here, the relations of Father and Son, are correlates, and commence at the very same moment, although by the constitution of human nature a man must be of some years before the relation of Father exist. When, treating of the Trinity we are not, however, speaking of a *human Son*; but of the *Deity*: and the *related state* of distinct persons, in the immutable and undivided essence of the Godhead, precludes the idea of time.

Nay the very idea of Sonship, excludes priority or posteriority, in point of time, even among men. Abraham was a very old man, to be sure, before he had a Son; yet Isaac became the Son of Abraham at the same moment of time in which Abraham became his Father. The relations, of each to the other, are simultaneous. It must be so from the constitution of human nature. The related states of Fa-

ther and Son, are necessary in the Godhead; and of course, eternal.

The objection to the eternity of Christ's Sonship, on the score of inferiority is of easy solution. It comes with a profession of kindness, as if to vindicate the dignity of the Saviour, otherwise it would be unworthy of notice. *Haud tali auxilio*. The Son we know is the Father's equal; for God hath spoken it. Behold the man that is my *Fellow*: and he thought it not robbery to be equal with God. Even among men, the Son is not necessarily inferior to the Father. He is on the contrary often superior in talent and endowments. And the term, *Son*, instead of implying inferiority of nature, necessarily implies *identity*. The expression, *Son of man*, as applied to the Saviour, denotes the nature which he assumed. The expression, *Son of God*, denotes the divine nature: and the related state of two divine persons, from Eternity, in that nature. Every Son of man has the essential attributes of humanity; and God's own Son is necessarily divine.

Still it is urged that the term, *Sonship*, implies *derivation*; and Mr. Stuart protests against the worship of derived divinity. So do we. Deity is self-existent—underived and incapable of derivation. God is *one*. The objection is notwithstanding, more superficial than solid. The premises are not true; and if they were, the inference would be erroneous. This argument supposes that a man derives his person from his own Father: and by *analogy* it is urged against the Sonship of Christ as God. The analogy, however, is inapplicable. We are treating of a divine, not a human filiation; and ideas, merely human, do not belong to the subject. We go further, and say, there is an abuse of language, in playing upon the words, *produce* and *production*, *derive* and *derivation*, as if these terms were synonymous with the Scripture term *begotten*, or the parallel expressions *generation* of the Son. *Generation* and *deri-*

vation are not synonymous; nor does the One necessarily imply the other. Any reasonings, founded upon such a supposition, are therefore fallacious. This objection, from analogy, is moreover founded upon an imaginary basis. There is a false fact supposed to exist, contrary to physiology; for the *philosophy* of the objection is as bad as the *logic* and the *philology*. The truth is, that the Person of a Son is, in no case, *derived* from that of the Father. Derivation, literally, *is out of the question*. To affirm it as a positive fact, would require, *first*, a settlement of the question of *personal identity*, which Mr. Stuart will not undertake; *secondly*, an admission that the word, *derive*, is employed figuratively, on account of the poverty of language.

No Son of man, *derives* his person literally from his Father. Let Mr. Stuart be the example. We place him again in his chair to lecture before his Class; where, and as, he is wont to be. Some one affirms, that the Professor, *was*, from his infancy, *is* now, and *will always be*, the Son of his *own* Father. To this affirmation all the Class assent. Of his Sonship there is no question. He is *begotten* of his own Father.

*Student.*—Is that *person* in the chair *derived* from the *person* of the old gentleman, his Father?

*Fellow-Students.*—We hesitate; but after some hesitation one of them replies. The Professor is not a *derivative* of his *sire*. Not one drop of his Father's blood ever flowed in his veins; nor do we know that any particle of his body, as it is at this moment, ever did belong to the body of his worthy Father. I speak without figure

*First Student.*—May not the Philosophers be mistaken when they teach that doctrine?

*Second Student.*—If Physiology were, indeed, so far mistaken, on the question, as that we may suppose his body is actually made up, out of a piece of his Father's body, there is something more than mat-

## *Review of Western Seminaries.*

ter necessary to the constitution of his *person*. Professor is a man of mind. His soul, certainly not made out of a portion of his Father's soul dy: there, is not therefore a literal *derivatio* his Father, any more than a natural or real inity to him.

We will again warn our readers against misour designs in the preceding reference. It is not in explanation of the eternal generation Son of God, but in refutation of the objection l ed upon a false philosophy.—that the person of is necessarily derived from his Father.

Human Generation is a fact inexplicable, and not of course furnish any analogy against the ship of Christ. We know what is meant b related state of Father and Son; but it is not vation of person, of body or of mind. We what is meant by the Scriptures in repre Christ as the only begotten of the Father, as di persons in the Godhead, thus necessarily relat one indivisible essence. Here, then, let us re joining that however restricted our knowl *through him we have access by one Spirit to the ther.*

(To be concluded in our next.)

---

### REVIEW OF WESTERN SEMINARIES.

I. The System of Education, the code of cipline, and the Professorships, adopted by the tees of the Western University of Pennsylvania gether with the addresses of the President of o board to the public, and of the principal to the dents.

Pittsburgh, 1822, pp. 32. 8vo.

II. An inaugural address, delivered in Jeffe College, by the Rev. Matthew Brown, Nov. 18



THE

# EVANGELICAL WITNESS,

VOL. I.

MARCH, 1823.

NO. VIII.

DIALOGUE ON MESSIAH'S HEADSHIP OVER THE  
NATIONS.

*A Senator of the United States and a member of Congress.*

*Senator.*—I am glad to see you again, safe at the seat of government. I trust we shall have a pleasant winter.

*Mem. Con.*—I thank you sir, and to see you in so good health and spirits gives me great pleasure. For the pleasant manner in which we shall spend the winter, my wishes are as strong as yours. Long and many speeches we may expect to hear again, in the capitol, not much to our gratification or improvement. In our own lodgings, I do hope again to spend many pleasant evenings.

*S.*—Have you much activity in the political world in your state?

*M. C.*—None at all. Our new state constitution has, for the present at least, put an end to all that. We have an entire calm. Our most active, noisy, and experienced demagogues can hardly excite any interest in the towns and counties. Where any is got up on the eve of an election, it all evaporates on the last day of the polls, and the people hardly ask who is the successful candidate. The people know

REVIEW OF DR. KIDD AND MR. STUART.

(Concluded.)

We took great pleasure in learning, from good authority, that Mr. Stuart was under a mistake when he stated in his Letters that the clergy of New-England were generally opposed to the doctrine of Christ's Eternal Sonship; and we have equal pleasure in announcing it to the public. The Theory, of the Professor, we know, has been maintained for many years by the leading advocates of "the new divinity," and has marched onward to the city of New-York, into the heart of the Presbyterian churches. How far it may have already extended under the covert of the name Presbyterian, which usage has appropriated to the churches under the *General Assembly*, we have not ascertained; but while supported by the assiduity and influence of Dr. Spring, now confessedly the chief of that sect, in the city, there is reason to apprehend its prevalence would be great if it were otherwise; but, perhaps, to much respect, that, after the great change there on the principles and of the es, a-ny effort will be a beh *distin-*guish Jesus *Son of* G which, *un-*

10.—W  
the G  
the Son  
the Hol  
eterni  
terian  
of the

tear of  
and  
rears  
not  
face

The  
was  
his  
right  
mo  
enl  
can

We  
Miller's  
in fact

His  
work  
also  
trav  
ingenu  
and  
the  
The

The  
question  
of  
the  
any  
pos-  
the  
grad  
from  
cor-  
and  
of  
sub-  
not

generation. It proves no more than that ancient writers both wrote and spoke accordingly; but from these premises we have no right to infer that Jesus is not eternally begotten of the Fa-

criticism on the Greek words *γεννησθε* and *γεννησθαι* goes indeed to show that both these words, and the English words *substantive*, *generate*, &c. are often used figuratively, and in various senses by different writers, a fact which no man would be at liberty to deny. But this fact does not warrant the inference that the Filiation of the Son of God is not real.

Treatise on the idioms of the original languages, though he had not set the case out in this manner, as he has done,) proves nothing more than in reasonings. This is also proved by the remarks made respecting the various figurative uses of the Greek *γεννησθε*, without having any reason to infer the extent of the figurative usage. That there is such a related state as Father and Son in reality, and that of figures we still believe that there was among the Hebrews and the Greeks, as well as among the Germans and the Britons, since a relation as Father and Son, and the sacred Scriptures assure us there is really such a relation in the Gospel—Jesus Christ is the Son of God.

The very erudite discussion of the words *γεννησθε* and *γεννησθαι*, begotten, and *γεννησθαι*, begetting, is not completely conclusive so far as it goes to prove that a man, and even a woman, is very apt to have a son, and a daughter, and even a woman, is very apt to have a son, and a daughter. But we think the criticism upon these words is not well founded, and the fact taken for granted by all parties in the controversy. Yes, the only manner in which a man is begotten of his father and his mother. In this part of the country, where, as yet, it is not generally known that filial affection is selfish and sinful, but is generally known to be filial and benevolent, and often very generous.

Newburgh certainly, and so far as we can judge through the whole great and patriotic state of New-York, it is admitted, without the aid of Greek or Hebrew that an only Son is usually very much beloved by his parents. When we have ourselves laid aside our pen and our spectacles, and descend to the Parlour, or the Nursery, we feel that a Father *may* love a Son. But for our life, with all our learning, we cannot agree with Mr. Stuart in believing that *μωυογενς* and *αγαπηλος*, are synonymous, or to *love* and to *beget* a Son is the very same. The fact is not so: and, of course, the whole argument of the Professor is good for nothing. The only begotten of the Father is indeed beloved of the Father; and yet *beloved* does not denote the same idea as *begotten*. We fear moreover, that did we grant to Mr. Stuart, that *μωυογενς* signifies, *αγαπηλος*, he would proceed a step further. For unless he would shelter himself under the protection of Dr. Emmons, and maintain that there is mutation with God, or that Jehovah has passions, he might turn upon us and say, there is neither Sonship nor affection at all in the case. He might certainly affirm this with as much propriety as many other things, and so let *αγαπηλος* and *μωυογενς* perish together. Love is a passion, God is immutable, and therefore God does not love Jesus Christ would be as good logic as most of the conclusions drawn by the Professor in the course of his correspondence.

The assertion, that Messiah never spoke to the Patriarchs is utterly unsupported. The fact is quite otherwise.

To say the divine essence is a *result*, is abominable.

Mr. Stuart, and indeed all who have taken *Logos*, as the only proper name of the second distinction in the Godhead, have fallen upon a very unhappy expedient. The objection which is made to the eternal filiation of Christ will apply to the terms eternal *counsel*, *purpose*, or *covenant*, nay to eternal exist-

fidels have argued to the notion of e-  
Eternal duration is incomprehensible  
tomed to measure time by dates. No  
ned by substituting the *eternal word*  
terms, *eternal Son of God*; and be-  
e the related state of two persons in  
the term is altogether inadequate.  
e joyfully admit, one of the personal  
names of Jesus Christ; and divine attri-  
scribed to the word: for "in the begin-  
ne Word, and the Word was with God,  
Word was God: for there are three that bear  
n heaven, the Father, the Word, and the  
host, and these three are one." Although,  
er, this term is applied to the second person of  
Godhead as distinguished in the Godhead, it is  
ne proper term to denote *wherein* the distinction  
ists. To answer this purpose it is inadequate,  
cause it has no *correlate*. *Father* is the correlate  
Son. There is no related name to denote *the oth-*  
*r distinctions* of the Godhead if *Word*, be the relat-  
ed name of the *second*: then the *first* and the *third*  
e without such name, which to admit would be ab-  
urd; for it would imply that the related state is not  
clared in divine revelation at all: but such incon-  
sistency is not to be charged on the Scriptures. On  
e contr the Bible itself satisfactorily settles the  
count. The glory of the *Logos*, is the glory of the  
m—the gotten Son which is in the bosom  
the l *ὁ υἱὸς ἰσχυρῶς ἐκαστῶν*. The *υἱὸς*  
oyevns *υἱὸς* proper distinctive name which de-  
otes h. related state. The *Father* is its  
reph- to denote the related state, of  
e Godhead. These correlates  
red times in the Bible.  
which Mr. Stuart gives to *Logos*  
enoting an eternal relation in the  
e astonished us were we not  
ings of serious critics and e

philologists. It cannot, however, have escaped the observation of the reader, though it has escaped the attention of the writer of the Letters to Dr. Miller, that all his objections to the term, "eternal Son of God," apply much more strongly, against the terms, "The Eternal *Word* of God." If the term *Son* seems to imply *posteriority*, so does *word*. If *Son* be a *derivative*, *word* cannot be otherwise. If *Sonship* imply *inferiority* much more does *word*. We are aware that the critic himself in regard to *time*, may have uttered many words before he had a Son; but we are also confident, that in regard to personal *dignity*, he esteems *himself* of more worth than any *speech* his own father ever made.

We have already shown that the relation of *Sonship*, necessarily implies identity of nature, with the Father, and as applied to an eternal relation, in the simple immutable essence of the Godhead, necessarily precludes every idea of derivation or posteriority. But while the term, *Son*, really indicates sameness of nature, the term, *word*, literally denotes the reverse, and of course, denotes both derivation and inferiority. It is figuratively, therefore, that the *divine Son*, is denominated 'the *Word of God*.' This name is given, moreover to the second person of the Godhead, not at all to denote the related state of that person in the divine essence; but truly because he declares the purposes and perfections of Jehovah, being himself "the Image of the invisible God."

By the term *Son* the Scriptures denote the eternally related state of the second to the first person of the God-head. It is the term to which Philosophy has least to object. It is the term to which plain Christians are best accustomed. It is the term employed by the ablest Divines, and which is adopted in the Creeds of the several Churches of God in every Land. It is the term, most appropriate imaginable, and we recommend it accordingly to the Professors of Sacred literature at Andover, and in all the Seminaries of Christian Theology.

To Sciolists in Theology, and, alas, there are too many of them, the Letters of Professor Stuart may appear profound; to us however great our personal regard for their author, they seem to be otherwise. The work as a whole, we pronounce a bad book: and the author deserves to be considered a hardy adventurer in polemic Theology. In his warfare against the terms, "The person of Christ is One," "there are three persons in the Godhead," "Christ is the eternal Son of God," he is at War with the whole Church of God in every age, and like the eldest son of Abraham, challenges to battle either friend or foe. No one within our knowledge is more fit in the sphere of his influence to promote the belief of Socinianism than he; for he has succeeded in creating a mist of words, and of losing himself in the darkness. He has availed himself of the criticisms of former and more open heretics to confound our religious language: he has unsettled the belief of hundreds in the common faith of God's elect: he has held up to the ridicule of the profane our ablest and our best men of every age; and he has treated as nonsense, theological terms familiar to our understandings and dear to our hearts—terms consecrated, not only by the usage of our Fathers, but also, by our Bibles.

We love the man, we know the importance of his station and his rank among the Ministers and the Scholars of our time: and we pray that, like the good and the great Dr. Owen, in regard to some of his earlier opinions, he may himself in his ripened years furnish a triumphant refutation of his mischievous doctrines.

The Dissertation of Dr. Kidd is an able production throughout; and the sentiments in which we differ from him are of minor importance, and merely incidentally introduced without at all affecting his great argument. Of that we approve, and pronounce the whole book, the work of a workman who needeth not to be ashamed. To verbal criticism we shall not de-



cent : but we could wish he had employed a less splendid diction. His mode of thinking and his style of writing have some resemblance to those of *Drew* and *Foster*, no mean men : and perhaps we might add a name forever to be respected in the more profound researches of metaphysical Philosophy, *Dugald Stuart*. The style of that entire school appears nevertheless to us, less adapted to the philosophy of mind and the depths of Theology, than to what is usually called elegant literature. We admire it exceedingly in some of the *Essays of Blackwood's Magazine* ; and especially in the *Lights and Shadows of Scottish Life* ; but the imagery is too abundant and too brilliant for such subjects as Dr. Kidd selects for discussion. A sufficiency of light properly directed to the painting, serves to exhibit the finer strokes of the pencil to better advantage than would a blaze of sunshine throughout the whole apartment. A glare of light is no auxiliary to accurate discrimination.

We close this review with some extracts from the excellent book to which we have applied these remarks.

“ When our opponents affirm that the Sonship of Christ cannot be eternal, because it is a contradiction, this is only taking for granted the thing to be proved, and then reasoning in a circle on their own assertion. They take for granted the newness of a relation on the part of God, towards man ; they take for granted the impossibility of the Eternal Sonship of Christ ; they admit related states within the Godhead, and assert that one of these is a state not eternal, viz. that of Son, arising from the aspect of God in the plan of salvation. The state of Son must either be a mere name without meaning, or a reality. If it be a reality, it is real within the Godhead ; for the most determined opponents of Christ's sonship do not say that it is a relation between the person so called and man. It must, consequently, be within the Godhead, and between Divine persons. What is within the Godhead must have been always there ; otherwise the Godhead is changed. A relation between Divine persons can no more have a beginning than the Divine persons themselves ; otherwise, the Divine persons are not eternal, but fortuitous, in their state of existence. If the term Son be a mere name indicative of no state, but chosen by accident, and given because it is as

good as any other name,—the related states of the Godhead and the persons of the Godhead are nullities—language is no more the signification of human thought—universal scepticism respecting ourselves, all things, God himself, is introduced.

“But an eternal and immense person acting according to his own nature, cannot, by his own act, become a new person, or exist in a new relation to another. When we divest their reasoning of all ambiguity, it resolves itself into this:—that the eternal persons of the Godhead, in restoring man, became what they were not from eternity; one of them, consequently, did become Son in relation to another, or he became Son to man, or his designation of Son is an empty name. We reply; he could not, thereby, become Son to the other Divine persons, because he is an eternal person; he could not become Son to the creatures, because their nature is not his nature, because they cannot change that which is eternal; he could not be Son by mere empty name, because such an assertion overthrows all principles of belief in the existence of God, of created mind, or of created matter. Can the procedure of Divine persons in creation, in providence, or in redemption, cause them to exist in states in which they were not prior to such external exhibition? Can the mode in which man apprehends Divine persons, constitute in them new states? Can the feelings of man, experiencing in salvation, these persons to be Father, Son, and Holy Ghost—be also *their* feelings, and produce in them such states? Legitimate reasoning answers, No.”

“The human nature of our Lord did not possess the constitution of existing separately, for this express reason, viz. that it might exist far more gloriously than it could have done separately. Hence, when exalted, it exists in a constellation of glories, more illustrious than any being in the universe can possess. It has the utmost extent of perfections resident within it; for all the perfections of Godhead are exerted upon it, that it may pour forth a flood of perfections more effulgently than any other created being. It is a central existence, where the Godhead, the angels, glorified spirits, and good men, meet. It is the vehicle of union, by which men who have departed from God, may return to him. It is an adaptation which meets the wants, and removes the crimes, of countless myriads. It is that bright and benevolent object, before which the darkness of crime, and the sorrows of earth shall disappear. It is the Schemmah of heaven; for in it the Godhead manifests its presence. It possesses the principle which obliterates the principles of evil and expands the principles of good. It has undergone the vicissitudes of earth, and enjoys the raptures of heaven. From it flows an “exceeding and eternal weight of glory,” which is laid up for the just in other scenes. It has expelled the principles of sin, that men might dwell with God—that God might be their God, and they his people. It is the “all in all” to celestial and terrestrial beings. It kindles within men’s souls the warmth of devotion which was extinguished by sin—restores them to

that community from which they have estranged themselves—brings them within the circle of that family from which they have strayed—and procures them pardon for that rebellious conduct by which they have broken fealty to their Governor. Through the abundance of its merits, and from the influence which it imparts, the sorrows of life are alleviated and sweetened—its joys are enhanced; the gloom which shrouded eternity from time is removed, and the intellectual vision extends to those scenes where the virtuous of this world enjoy “rest from their labours, and their works do follow them.” It has, in one word, “finished the transgression, made an end of sins, made reconciliation for iniquity, and brought in everlasting righteousness.”

#### FAREL AND CALVIN.

##### (THE DEATH OF SERVETUS.)

On this subject it may not be irrelevant to notice a fact which is but little known. Indeed, the mistakes relative to it, arising in the first instance, from malicious misrepresentation seem to have been handed down from age to age, without being ever accurately scrutinized afterwards, and thus obtained a validity which they ill deserved. And here, the writer of this note must express his regret to be obliged to differ from the author of the “*Evangelical Biography*.” It is well known; that Mr. Middleton visited Geneva for the purpose of procuring documents relative to the peculiar circumstances connected with the lives of the eminent individuals, whose memoirs he subsequently published, but at the same time it *does* appear that several, which have been since brought to light, eluded his research, while others were presented to him which were forged or mutilated.

In his sketch of the life of Farel, Mr. M. makes no mention of his attending Servetus to the stake, and not only this, but in the memoir of Calvin, it is stated, that Farel was at Neufchatel, where the unhappy and deluded being suffered, and Calvin’s let-