

THE  
EVANGELICAL GUARDIAN  
AND REVIEW.

---

---

VOL. I.

JULY, 1817.

NO. 3.

---

---

**REMARKS ON THE IMPORT OF THE WORD "HEAVENS,"**  
IN 2 PETER iii. 12.

"The heavens being on fire shall be dissolved."

WE shall first explain the radical idea of the term translated "Heaven, or Heavens." The first place in which the word occurs in the Scriptures, is in Gen. i. 1. "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth." It is utterly impossible for us to obtain the radical idea of the term, simply by adverting to a translation: we must of necessity have recourse to the original. The word translated "heavens," is, in the original Hebrew, שָׁמַיִם. There is considerable diversity of sentiment among philologists respecting the derivation of this word; some there are who derive it from שָׁמַיִם *ibi*, an adverb of place, and which respects an object at a distance from us. Agreeably to this derivation of the word, the heavens are so called in consequence of their distance from the earth. Others there are who derive it from שָׁמַיִם, *nomen, gloria, decus*, because they are the most conspicuous and glorious of the works of God. Others there are who view it as a compound word, composed of אֵשׁ, *ignis, fire*, and מַיִם, *aqua, water*. This diversity of sentiment clearly proves the difficulty of tracing the original word to its source, or of ascribing to it its appropriate idea. In our opinion, neither of the derivations to which we have adverted, are agreeable to the idiom of the Hebrew language, or expressive of any property *peculiar* to the heavens; we, therefore, with diffidence reject them.

VOL. I...No. 3.

7

## REVIEW.

*An Address delivered before the Auxiliary New-York Bible and Common Prayer Book Society, in St. Paul's Chapel, in the City of New-York, on Tuesday, the 28th day of January, A. D. 1817, by THOMAS Y. HOW, D. D. Assistant Rector of Trinity Church, New-York.*

THE "odium theologicum," has, with many professing Christians, rendered religious controversy a matter of condemnation. Whilst we respect the honesty of some of those who pass this sentence upon such controversy, we enter our solemn protest against the conduct of the rest of this description. They whine in lengthened strains, and lament in studied sentences, the evil effects springing from this "root of bitterness," as they call it, in public; but in private, as they have opportunity, they are very studious to let their friends know, that there is "something rotten in Denmark;" that the faith, once delivered to the saints, is in danger, from the want of decision on the part of those who have influence in the Church. Between these two classes, they who, whilst they grant unto every person the right "*et sentire quæ velit, et quæ sentiat dicere,*" yet feel it their duty to oppose what they consider error, and defend the truth, are placed in a most unpleasant situation. "*Dextrum Scylla latus, lævum implacata Charybdis.*"

Of this truth, the Rev. Author of this Address appears to have been fully sensible. We cordially approve of the ground which he takes in the preface.

'For what, then, let it be asked, is the author of this Address to be blamed? For contending for the principles maintained by his Church? This was his most solemn duty. Does his offence consist in pointing out what he conceived to be serious error, and dwelling upon the consequences which must result from it? But Scripture expressly commands us to hold fast the form of sound words, and to contend earnestly for the faith.' p. iii.

'The true question is—Has the author of the Address contended for the doctrines of his Church in a bitter and unchristian spirit? To blame and abuse men for decorously maintaining their principles

is the very spirit of intolerance.'—' Let there be no impeachment of motives, and no application of contumelious language to our opponents.'—' Charity shows itself, not in renouncing opinions, or forbearing to express them out of deference to others, but in the spirit with which we argue. It is the highest act of charity we can perform to contend zealously for the faith.' p. iv.

By these rules we mean to regulate our review of this pamphlet, so far as we understand its nature and extent. Who the "brethren of other denominations" are, who have found fault with Dr. H. and his friends "for setting forth and defending" their "principles on proper occasions," we know not. We do not blame them for acting thus, but for not satisfactorily proving their scriptural warrant for the exclusive pretensions which they have made, as it respects Church government, or the condemnation which they have passed upon those doctrines commonly called Calvinistic. We have had, in observing the conduct of these Episcopalians, repeated occasion to recollect the following remarks made by the Editors of the Edinburgh Review, in Art. IX. of the 1st Vol. concerning Dr. Rennel's manner of treating infidels in his sermons: "It is a very easy thing to talk about the shallow impostures, and silly, ignorant sophisms of Voltaire, Rousseau, Condorcet, D'Alembert, and Volney, and to say that Hume is not worth answering. This affectation of contempt will not do. While these pernicious writers have power to allure from the Church great numbers of proselytes, it is better *to study them diligently*, and to reply to them satisfactorily, than to veil indolence, want of power, or want of industry, by a pretended contempt, which may leave infidels and wavering Christians to suppose that such writers are abused because they are feared, and not answered because they are unanswerable. While every body was abusing and despising Mr. Godwin, and while Mr. Godwin was, among a certain description of understandings, increasing every day in popularity, Mr. Malthus took the trouble of refuting him; and we hear no more of Mr. Godwin. We recommend this example to the consideration of Dr. Rennel, who seems to think it more useful, and more pleasant, to rail than to fight."

If we can form a correct conclusion from the writings of the Rev. Assistant Rector of Trinity Church, and his high church friends, we must say, that we think of them, as the Edinburgh Reviewers thought of Dr. Rennel. Let us not be considered as "motive hunters." We leave that for men, whose love of being in general is so ardent, that they forget courtesy, decorum, and truth towards their fellow-men, to glorify God. We do honestly respect the sincerity of these men in their opinions. But we object to the solidity of their defence of these opinions. We mean not to enter into the controversy on the subject of Church government. Very little, if any thing new, can at this day be advanced on the side of Episcopacy, Presbyterianism, or Independency. We only remark, that the difference between *High-church men* and Anti-Episcopalians is this, that the former leave the latter to the uncovenanted mercies of God; the latter do not exclude the former from the covenanted mercies of God. The former sing a constant *Io pæan* to their charity. But the reader will judge whose charity is the most diffusive, when he compares the views of Dr. How and those whom he condemns as barsh and contracted. In the Westminster Confession of Faith, "the visible church" is said to consist "of all those throughout the world that *profess the true religion*, together with their children." Chap. 25, sect. 2. In the preface to the constitution of the Reformed Dutch Church, the Church is said to consist "of all, in every age and place, who are chosen, effectually called, and united by faith to the Lord Jesus." In these definitions the stress is laid altogether upon the "profession of true religion," i. e. the doctrines which the Scriptures reveal as essential to Christian character and eternal salvation. Nothing is here said about Church government. Dr. How, on the contrary, p. 26, quotes Hooker, as expressing his opinion, in the following sentence; "It was the general received persuasion of the ancient Christian world, that the outward being of a church consisted in the having of a bishop." He thus considers no one a member of the visible Church who is not subject to a bishop; i. e. a diocesan bishop, who alone has the right of ordination. This is the radical principle for

which Dr. How and his friends are contending ; the principle which pervades their writings, and gives a distinctive character to their ecclesiastical conduct.

In reading this passage, we were forcibly reminded of a remark which a Presbyterian clergyman, long since gone to rest, made to a friend, explanatory of Christ's direction, "tell it to the church." "Tell it to me," said the minister, "I am the church."

We do not consider adherence to any particular form of Church government as essential to that hope which maketh not ashamed. It is the truth, the truth as it is in Jesus, the doctrines which he has revealed, that will avail any of us in the day of the Lord. "Circumcision," the apostle assures us, "availeth nothing, nor uncircumcision, but a new creature." As many as walk according to this rule, peace be on them. Would to God that these views were generally entertained, and the deportment which they are calculated to produce did prevail ! There would then be more honest contention for principles, and not for Church authority, or national attachment.

Our charity, it will therefore be distinctly remembered, extends to all who profess the true religion, whatsoever may be their ecclesiastical governments. We consider forms and ceremonies as of no avail in the all-important article of a sinner's salvation. But that declaration of Scripture is decisive with us, "If ye believe not that I am He, ye shall die in your sins." With all those who profess the true religion, we "are bound to maintain," (such is the doctrine of the Presbyterian church, Confession of Faith, chap. 26. sec. 2.) "an holy fellowship and communion in the worship of God, and in performing such other spiritual services, as tend to their mutual edification :"—"Which communion, as God offereth opportunity, is to be extended unto all those who, in every place, call upon the name of the Lord Jesus." With such avowed Catholicism, such enlarged liberality, are Presbyterians to be charged with a want of charity ?

But how is the fact between Dr. How, and the High-church party, whose views he has adopted, and the Presbyterians,

whom they condemn as uncharitable, so far as practice is concerned? They deny our ecclesiastical standing as constituting a part of the visible church of Christ—reject the validity of our ministry, and of course the validity of the administration of ordinances by our ministry. We, on the contrary, recognize in them a branch of the Christian Church—acknowledge their ministry as valid, and, of course, the administration of ordinances by them as valid.

Let the reader judge, whose conduct is the most liberal. We wish this matter to be strictly examined, and honestly unfolded. These men have so long, again and again, claimed for themselves the credit of peculiar charity, that it seems they think they have the prescriptive right to the claim.

For a proof of the truth of our remarks, so far as their claims are concerned, we refer the reader to the opinion of Hooker, already quoted, and to the uniform pretensions of these men, to an apostolic constitution. Such is their charity—no diocesan bishop, no Church. Our charity, as it respects those who differ from us in doctrines and ecclesiastical government, will be unfolded in the following extracts from “The introduction of the form of government and discipline of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America.” Sect. 5. p. 373. “There are *truths and forms*, with respect to which, men of *good* characters and principles *may differ*: and in all these, they think it the duty, both of private Christians and societies, to exercise mutual forbearance towards each other.” And in chap. 1. sect. 6. it is said, “There are some circumstances concerning the worship of God and *government of the Church*, common to human actions and societies, which are to be ordered by the light of nature and Christian prudence, according to the general rules of the word, which are always to be observed.” In perfect accordance with this view, is the language of the Reformed Dutch Church, “Nor do the various denominations and descriptions of particular Churches, under which, from many unavoidable circumstances of language, nation, or *other causes of distinction*, believers are classed, effect *any schism in the body*, or destroy the communion of saints.”

Pref. p. 6. Hence the Presbyterians belonging to the General Assembly, have, for years, had a friendly intercourse and fellowship with the Congregationalists of the New-England States. In the exercise of the same charity, the Reformed Dutch Church, in Holland, invited delegates from the Episcopal Church, in England, to attend in the Synod of Dort, where they were accredited as ministers of Christ.

The quotation from the constitution and standards of the Associate Reformed Church in North America, introduced in p. x, of the Rev. Doctor's preface, we do, by no means, consider as warranting his conclusion. "Though that Church do set forth Presbyterial Church government, as the true and only form which the Lord Jesus Christ hath prescribed in his word," it does not follow, that "they must, of course, maintain the *general* principle, that departure from Presbyterial Church government will exclude from the kingdom of heaven;" and that for this obvious reason, that they do not consider admission into that kingdom as depending upon the Church government which a person embraces, and to which he is subject, but upon the doctrines which he believes with the heart, and the life which he leads. Moreover, that Church does not practically deny the validity of Episcopal ordination—nor do any of the Anti-Episcopal Churches—especially those of them who are Calvinistic in their doctrines. They receive Episcopal ministers, without re-ordination, as ministers of Christ's Church, if they receive and support those doctrines which are considered as appertaining to the common salvation. But Dr. How requires *reordination*, by the laying on of the hands of the bishop, from those who have been ordained by the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery.

But the charity of the Rev. Assistant Rector appears more conspicuous in ranging Trinitarians and Antitrinitarians, Christians and Heathen, in one class of errorists. For all these, he thinks, there may be "circumstances of excuse which may attract the compassion of their Judge." p. xi. Precious charity! which makes as much allowance for them who boldly and contemptuously reject the divinity and atonement of the Lord Jesus,

as for those who, with humble faith, acknowledge these truths, and through their efficacy look for eternal life. Such will ever be the consequence of substituting ecclesiastical forms for the life of godliness in the soul; and confining the Church of God, which he hath purchased with his blood, within the pale of Diocesan Episcopacy. We now leave the reader to judge, whose charity is most diffusive? Their's, who reject the existence of a Church of Christ, where there is no diocesan bishop; or their's, who confine it to the *profession of the true religion*, leaving *forms* of worship and government to the choice of individuals, without consigning those, who differ from them, to the uncovenanted mercies of God.

[To be concluded in our next.]

---

FOR THE EVANGELICAL GUARDIAN AND REVIEW.

**THE HEBREW MOURNER.\***

**W**HY, trembling and sad, dost thou stand there and mourn,  
 Son of Israel! the days that shall never return?  
 And why do those tear-drops of misery fall  
 On the mouldering stone of the perishing wall?  
 Was yon city, in robes of the Heathen now clad,  
 Once the flourishing Zion where Judah was glad?  
 And those stones, that disjointed and scattered lie,  
 Were they once rear'd to heaven, and hallow'd on high?  
 Yet why dost thou mourn? Oh to gladness awaken!  
 Tho' Jehovah this city of God hath forsaken,  
 He preserves for his people a city more fair,  
 Which the ruthless invader no longer shall share!

\* The Jews are said, during the reign of the Emperor Adrian, to have purchased with money from the Roman soldiers, the privilege of weeping over the site of Jerusalem, or even of gazing on it at a distance.



THE  
EVANGELICAL GUARDIAN  
AND REVIEW.

---

---

VOL. I.

AUGUST, 1817.

NO. 4.

---

---

PRAYER.

(Continued from p. 60.)

**HAVING**, in a former Number, discussed some of the laws by which the important duty of prayer is to be regulated, we enter on the second point proposed, viz. "*The different methods by which God is pleased to answer.*" This, on a superficial view, seems to open a small field for investigation. If God hath promised (as he most assuredly hath done) to listen to his people's requests, and graciously answer them from the habitation of his holiness; all that is required on their part, is to know *what* they have requested, in order to ascertain *how* they will be answered. Such is the reflection which naturally rises in our minds. It is far, however, from being correct. Though the great God hath revealed himself as the hearer of prayer, he hath not, in doing so, sacrificed the glory of that awful prerogative by which "he doeth according to his will in the armies of heaven, and among the inhabitants of the earth." Even in his faithfulness, he frequently exercises an adorable sovereignty, and though he answers, he answers according to his own good pleasure, in a time, and by a way of his own devising. So mysterious are his dispensations in this respect, that the very fulfilment of his promise is frequently construed by his people into a breach, and his very *answer* to their prayers is considered an irrefragable argument, that "He hath forgotten to be gracious."

## REVIEW.

*An Address delivered before the Auxiliary New-York Bible and Common Prayer Book Society, in St. Paul's Chapel, in the City of New-York, on Tuesday, the 28th day of January, A. D. 1817, by THOMAS Y. HOW, D. D. Assistant Rector of Trinity Church, New-York.*

(Continued from p. 119.)

**H**AVING examined the pretensions of Dr. How and his High Church friends, to enlarged charity, we proceed to other subjects introduced in this pamphlet.

Desirous of preventing our readers from forming any mistaken expectations on these subjects, we deem it proper to state, that as we have already disclaimed entering on the controversy about Church government, so we now disclaim any intention of embarking in this Review, in the controversy about circulating the Scriptures without the Episcopal Book of Common Prayer. Whatever we may feel constrained, from a sense of duty, to do in future, we leave the public, for the present, to determine between the claims of Dr. How and his Episcopal antagonists on the latter point. We have no fear that he, or those who think and act with him in this matter, can refute their arguments. Opposed to such men as Lord Teignmouth and Mr. Dealtry in England, with the Lay-Member of the Convention who formed the American Bible Society, and his associates, their congregated force is merely "telum imbellis sine ictu." On the time consumed in their labours against the circulation of the Scriptures without note or comment, posterity will write this monumental inscription,

Eheu ! fugaces,

Labuntur Anni.

As the address, with the preface and notes, contains matter of a miscellaneous nature, we do not feel ourselves bound to follow the Author in the order he has adopted. We shall, therefore, range our subsequent remarks under the following heads :

1. The charges which Dr. How brings against the peculiar tenets of the Calvinists, supported by the Christian Observer's attack upon the religious state of Scotland.

2. The impossibility which he asserts, that departure from the true faith can enter the Episcopal Church while she retains her apostolical constitution and her evangelical liturgy.

3. The fact which he maintains, that many of those societies on the continent of Europe, which laid aside the divinely constituted order of bishops, have grievously fallen from the distinguishing doctrines of the cross.

4. Dubious, or incorrect use of Scripture.

5. Misrepresentation of Calvinistic doctrines.

The limits of a review, suited to a monthly publication, will prevent us from entering into such a detail as we could wish. Enough, however, will be said to show wherein we believe the Author to be incorrect in his positions and assertions, and also the grounds of our belief.

1. The charges which Dr. How brings against the peculiar tenets of the Calvinists, supported by the Christian Observer's attack upon the religious state of Scotland. These are found in pp. vi. vii. viii. and ix. of the preface, and pp. 25, 33, 34, 35. The following are extracts illustrating the views of the Author.

'He firmly believes, that if all Protestants had exhibited Christianity, under a decidedly Calvinistic aspect, a dreadful re-action would at length have been produced, which would have led no small proportion of the Christian world to infidelity.' p. vii.

'And, my brethren, what would there not have been reason to fear, if the whole Protestant world had embraced tenets scarcely less revolting than those of popery.' p. 33.

After which follow a collection of dogmas, not exhibited as Calvinists exhibit them, but in the garb of caricatures, etched and finished by *Episcopal Ministers*, as will appear, when we come to review the Rev. Assistant Rector's misrepresentations of Calvinistic doctrines. Similar to these censures, are those quoted from the Christian Observer.

'The character of these formularies (i. e. of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland) is, in general, too exclusive, severe,

and systematic, for certain deliberative minds. Called to the reception of them, they are staggered by the extent of the requisition. For a time, perhaps, they hesitate to obey the voice of conscience, and to desert the national *standard*. But the resolution once taken, and the reputation for orthodoxy and conformity sacrificed, they give loose to their fancy or ingenuity ; and at length, fashion to themselves a system perfectly at variance with truth and reason.' p. viii.

Hence, according to the *Christian Observer*, the "dogmatic theology introduced by John Knox into Scotland, and perpetuated by the formularies of the Assembly, have, to a certain extent, created, on the one hand, a body of bigots, and, on the other, a body of sceptics." p. viii.

The charges, which Dr. H. brings against the Calvinists, must be considered as these persons have avowed their belief in this country or Europe. And here we enter our protest against the practice of palming upon whole denominations of Christians the opinions of one or more individuals. The Churches, denominated Calvinistic, have adopted creeds of their own, which unfold their views of doctrine. They have never made the writings of Calvin, Beza, or Knox, the standard of their faith ; nor are, in the least, responsible for any of their opinions, so far as those opinions do not accord with their published Confessions. Were we to form our judgment of the creed of the Episcopal Church in this way, we would array before the public the greatest collection of monstrous inconsistencies, contradictions, and absurdities, which has ever attracted their attention. Of this we shall, before we finish, give a specimen, not to charge that Church, as a body, with the belief of these several and differing doctrines, but to disprove one of the Author's unqualified, round positions. In the meantime, we return to the subject under consideration. Dr. How "firmly believes" that decidedly Calvinistic principles have a tendency to lead men to infidelity ; and calls them scarcely less revolting than those of popery. If his judgment be correct, we ask the Rev. Assistant Rector of Trinity Church, how he will account for the fact, that the greater part of the Reformers, who

were, unquestionably, what he calls Calvinistic, and decidedly so, when they renounced popery did not embrace infidelity?

Men of more gigantic intellect, and more extensive acquirements, according to the erudition of that day, never have appeared on the theatre of action. Casting off the shackles of popery, they examined the Scriptures for themselves, with diligence and perseverance, to ascertain what system of truth they taught. And, strange to tell! they, with most astonishing unanimity, avowed their belief of those doctrines which are considered as peculiar to that system now called Calvinistic. Luther, in Germany, Calvin, in Geneva, Knox, in Scotland, Cranmer, in England, with their respective associates, a host of worthies, all united in the reception and defence of them, as constituting an essential part of the common salvation—the faith once delivered to the saints. That we may not be misunderstood, we do say, that these men did maintain the doctrines of *particular election—effectual calling—original sin—the imputation of Christ's righteousness—the freedom of the will—the unacceptableness of works before justification—the necessity of faith as the gift of God—and the perseverance of saints*. On all these points these men were agreed; and so far as they constitute the characteristic features of a system, that system might be denominated after Luther and Cranmer, as well as after Calvin. In the article of predestination, Melancthon himself, in his "Loci Communes," goes as far as Calvin. We state this on the authority of Toplady,\* not having the work ourselves.

We are aware, that on one point, there was a diversity of opinion, viz. the extent of the design of Christ's death. That it was DEFINITE, all agreed. Some, however, restricted it solely to the elect—others supposed it was for the whole world. Its efficacy they united in confining only to the elect. The modern hypothesis of *indefinite atonement, i. e. an atonement which related to not one single sinner, nor to the whole company of sinners, which left them personally still without an atonement,*

\* On Predestination. Toplady's Works, vol. v. p. 310.

had not yet been discovered, for that was an age of cautious, deliberate, and solid examination.

Here then we have a matter of fact, unquestionable fact, which we challenge any man to disprove, directly and unequivocally opposed to Dr. How's position. Nay, more, we have another matter of fact, that, during the prevalence of these doctrines in their purity, there were hardly any infidels to be found in the Reformed Churches. The few that appeared on the stage were held in universal detestation. And it was not in order of time, until those doctrines, which Dr. H. and his associates have espoused and defend, that infidelity acquired notice and reputation in the protestant world. We state it, as an historical fact, that the abolition of the test of ministerial subscriptions in Geneva—the defection of Amyraut, and other French divines, from Calvinistic principles, and the introduction of Arminianism, preceded the inroad of scepticism.

But we will bring Dr. How's position to the test of *our times*, confining our remarks to our own country. The Presbyterian—the Reformed Dutch—the Associate Reformed—the Associate—the Reformed Presbyterian Churches—the Congregational Churches of Connecticut and Vermont—the largest proportion of the Congregational Churches in Massachusetts and New-Hampshire—the whole body of the Baptist Churches, are professedly Calvinistic. Are there more infidels among them than amongst the Episcopalians and Methodists, both of which Churches are professedly Anti-Calvinistic. Will Dr. How and his high church friends venture to make the assertion? It cannot be. We assume the contrary, as a fact, and we challenge a contradiction of the assumption. Here then, our readers have a fair opportunity of judging for themselves on this subject. In this country there are no civil penalties attached to the open avowal of infidelity. Infidels are as eligible to civil offices as Christians. And yet “the revolting doctrines” of Calvinism—those doctrines which, “if universally professed, would produce a dreadful re-action,” are professed by at least three-fourths of the ecclesiastical population of the United States—but we see no “re-action.”

On the contrary, we see men of sense and learning, every where voluntarily embracing these doctrines; and wherever they do prevail, pure and undefiled religion, tested by serving God and doing good to men, flourishes. Are we then gravely to be told, and told by a Minister, who boasts "the Apostolical constitution and evangelical liturgy" of his Church, that Calvinistic doctrines lead to infidelity, and are scarcely less revolting than those of popery? The Calvinist, thank God, knows better than thus to act, and dares not advance such unfounded charges against his antagonists.

We now proceed to examine the attack of the *Christian Observer*, on the religious state of Scotland, which Dr. How has quoted in support of his "firm belief," that Calvinism leads to infidelity, and "is scarcely less revolting than popery." That attack charges the production of bigotry and scepticism on the Confession of Faith of the established Church of Scotland. As that Church is evidently meant, we shall confine our remarks to the effects of her Confession on these two points, as they are displayed in the actual state of her avowed members. The attack being made by a member of the Church of England, is predicated upon the assumption "that the articles and formularies of that Church are of a more Catholic and charitable character, making, though without any license to latitudinarianism, larger allowances for the discrepancies and varieties of the human mind (being rigid only where Scripture is decisive, and general where Scripture is obscure) than those of the Church of Scotland." P. viii. of the Pref. Quotation from the *Christian Observer*, for October, 1815, p. 685, 686. The assumption we shall subject to the process of trial, under the next subject of review in this article. The only use we intend to make of it here, is to ascertain the matter of fact, whether the conclusion, drawn from this assumption, be true, as it respects either the bigotry or infidelity prevalent within the pale of the Church of Scotland. Let us then see, how the charge of bigotry against the members of that Church is substantiated against them, from their actual conduct. The religious bigotry, here meant, includes in it a blind zeal, for preju-

dice in favour of, and unreasonable attachment to, the constitution and doctrines of their Church. Are the Ministers of that Church guilty or not, in this particular? The truth is, that, in the year 1799, the General Assembly prohibited any probationer, who had not obtained his licensure from a Presbytery of that Church, and any ordained person in similar circumstances, or, "who, by going without the bounds of the Church to obtain ordination, although he was not called to a particular congregation in another country, or by any other part of his conduct, has forfeited the license which he has obtained," from being received in any of their Presbyteries. This prohibition, which was founded on previous canons, adopted by the different Assemblies of that Church, does not invade the rights of any other Church, for it does not reject the validity of either licensure or ordination by such Church, but only guards, what was considered the safety and benefit of their own Church. The cause of its adoption was the rise and spread of Independency, espoused and maintained by men who had received no regular collegiate education, or had not attended the halls of divinity in any of the colleges connected with the establishment. The practical comment upon the canons, previous to 1799, is, that the Rev. Mr. Simeon, of Cambridge, an Episcopalian, preached in one or more of the Churches of the establishment; and, since that time, that Ministers, not educated or ordained in Scotland, have done the same. And *we know*, that the general construction of the prohibition, given by the most enlightened Ministers of that Church, is perfectly consistent with the most enlarged Christian liberality; and upon this construction they act. Not less liberal are the lay members of that Church. A member of the established Church of Scotland *a bigot!* We have had abundant proofs of the contrary, *both there and here*. In Edinburgh, Glasgow, and other places, we do know, without multiplying facts, that both the Baptist and the Church Missionary Society have received ample encouragement and support from the members of the Scottish Church. And it is notorious, that such members, as emigrate to other countries, in-



stead of carrying with them a spirit of bigotry, display a contrary spirit. Instances are numerous, of such who, when they could not attend the worship of God, according to their own formularies, have not merely attended, but supported that worship, according to the Episcopal formularies. The charge will not apply, even to all the Secession Churches. Against the Relief Church it cannot be brought with the shadow of truth; and with less truth against the Burgher connexion. The only denominations who come within the purview of the Christian Observer's attack on this score, are the Antiburghers and Reformed Presbyterians. But even they do not require the re-baptism of an Episcopalian, or the re-ordination of a Minister of the Church of England. We, however, recollect, that the children of a Lutheran Minister, after his entrance into the Episcopal Church, were re-baptised—and they who disapprove such re-baptization, consider Presbyterian baptism as mere lay baptism. As for re-ordination, in all cases it is required by that Church, of which the Editors of the Observer and Dr. H. are members. Who then are the bigots?

Equally unfounded is the other charge which the Christian Observer brings against the formularies of the established Church of Scotland, viz. That they produce infidelity. We shall, at a future period, furnish our readers either with the whole, or sufficiently copious extracts from the reply of the Edinburgh Christian Instructor, to the attack of the Christian Observer, upon this subject. We now merely refer the reader to the contrast, which the number of infidels of established reputation in the Church of England and Scotland affords. In the Church of England we find Lord Herbert, Tindal, Woollaston, Chubb, Shaftesbury, Bolingbroke, Hobbes, Blount, Collins, Gibbon, all conspicuous characters—Some of them members of the government. In the Church of Scotland, Hume, Lord Kaimes, and Lord Monboddo, are the chief infidels that have attracted notice. The members of the Church of England accuse the Church of Scotland with producing infidels! Who, that knows the history of both, would ever have thought of such a thing?

(To be continued.)

THE  
EVANGELICAL GUARDIAN  
AND REVIEW.

---

---

VOL. I.

OCTOBER, 1817.

NO. 6.

---

---

*THE SIN OF PROFANING THE SABBATH.*

**I**N a former number we endeavoured to prove the morality of the Sabbath; and, if (as we believe) the argument is conclusive, it follows, that the "Holy Day" ought not to be devoted to common or worldly concerns—that such devotion is a gross and heinous sin.

As we design to descend to some minuteness, in detailing instances, in which we suppose the Sabbath to be *profaned*, it will be proper to notice those works of *necessity* and *mercy*, which constitute exceptions to the general rules, by which we are to judge of such profanation.

*Works of necessity* on the Sabbath, are either the interpositions of Divine Providence, (in which God has authority to suspend his own laws,) or they are such as cannot be dispensed with, and at the same time promote the good of man, for whom the Sabbath was made. Among these works we may instance—flying from, and *defending* ourselves against an enemy; dressing and eating food, provided too much time be not employed therein, nor too many servants thereby kept from the worship of God; quenching fires, accidentally or wilfully kindled; standing by the helm, or managing a ship at sea: it being understood, that it is not lawful, because it is not *necessary*, to weigh anchor or set sail on the Lord's day. These, and other instances which might be noticed, could

as clear as the definition ;—and, full of delight, an admirer of the orator asked his friend, what he thought of the discourse?—the reply was laconic and decisive : *I think it was the dark side of the preacher set against the dark side of the hearer, to increase his darkness.*

ἀγαπᾷ.

---

## REVIEW.

*An Address delivered before the Auxiliary New-York Bible and Common Prayer Book Society, in St. Paul's Chapel, in the City of New-York, on Tuesday, the 28th day of January, A. D. 1817, by THOMAS Y. HOW, D. D. Assistant Rector of Trinity Church, New-York.*

(Concluded from p. 177.)

**WE** proceed to examine another position of the Rev. Orator, viz.

2. The impossibility which he asserts, that departure from the true faith *can* enter the Episcopal Church, while she retains her apostolic constitution and her evangelical liturgy, p. 25. Though, in this assertion, he immediately refers “to the denial of the divinity of Christ, and salvation through the propitiatory merits of his atonement,” yet, evidently, from *the design* of the address, its whole strain, and the manner in which he speaks of other doctrines, particularly in the series of connected remarks, from p. 20—25, intended to prove, that “the Word and Church of God ought to be united, for the purpose of diffusing the light of religious truth,” he meant to leave the impression upon those who heard it delivered, or may read it, that any *fundamental* error could not enter into that denomination, which he considers as constituting the Church of Christ.

We do not mean to take *our opinion* of "the true faith" for our guide, but the Author's, as expressed in this Address. Calvinistic principles, of course, are excluded from it, by him. He, moreover, condemns the doctrine of meritorious good works, (p. 30, 31. note)—of the Novatians, Donatists, and Arians, p. 23—the Congregational societies of Boston, p. 25—the Socinians, p. 35. He has thus furnished us with materials, by which we will now try the correctness of his position. That our readers may understand the nature of these materials distinctly, we shall, in a few words, explain the doctrines condemned. Of meritorious good works, we need say nothing here. Of the Novatians, Mosheim says "there was no difference, in point of doctrine, between them and other Christians. What peculiarly distinguished them, was their refusing to re-admit to the communion of the Church, those who, after baptism, had fallen into the commission of heinous crimes, especially those who had apostatized from the faith, though they did not pretend that such were excluded from all possibility or hopes of salvation. They also required such as came over to them, from the general body of Christians, to be re-baptized."

The Donatists, according to the same author, maintained "that the sanctity of their Bishops gave their community alone a full right to be considered as the true, pure, and holy Church." They avoided all communication with other Churches—pronounced the sacred rites and institutions void of all virtue and efficacy among those Christians who were not precisely of their sentiments; and not only re-baptized those of them who joined their ranks, but obliged those who had been ordained ministers of the gospel to be ordained a second time, if they did not deprive them of their office.

The Arians maintain, that the Son of God was totally and essentially distinct from the Father: that he was the first and noblest of those beings whom God had created—the instrument by whose subordinate operation he formed the universe; and therefore inferior to the Father, both in nature and dig-

nity: also, that the Holy Ghost was not God, but created by the power of the Son.

The Socinians maintain the simple humanity of the Lord Jesus, and reject his atonement for sin, together with the other doctrines connected with these.

The Congregational societies in Boston, to which the Author refers, are those who have rejected the doctrines of the Trinity and the atonement by Christ. They are better known by doctrines which they reject, than by those which they avow. Such of our readers as are disposed to ascertain the truth of this remark, will find authorities in the late Boston Anthology and Cambridge Repository, in the Christian Disciple, and in Mr. Channing's pamphlets, occasioned by the "History of American Unitarianism."

The motto, inscribed upon the theological escutcheons of the ministers of these societies and their adherents, is to be found in 2 Tim. iii. 7. "Ever learning, and never able to come to the knowledge of the truth." They seek that "one thing needful," of which the Redeemer spake to Martha, conscious, from their misgiving fears, that they have not, as yet, obtained it, but consoling themselves with the hope, that they shall have peace, though they walk like blind men. But, whilst we thus characterize these men, we take the liberty of reminding Dr. How, that *all the Congregational societies* of Boston do not deny "the divinity of Christ, and salvation through the propitiatory merit of his atonement." Two, at least, of them, are orthodox in those doctrines to which he refers; and we do know, that very many, in most of the rest, do adhere to the faith of their forefathers, in these particulars.

As to the fear, which he expresses, that the Congregational societies of New-England and other religious bodies may imitate the Bostonians, he may rest assured it is groundless. Throughout the General Association of Connecticut, a Socinian minister cannot be found. So soon as any one avows his departure from the true faith, he is compelled to relinquish his place. The attempts made to procure a footing for Socinianism in Vermont, have failed. And, even in Massa-

chusetts, its supporters are not increasing. We trust, this statement of facts will operate as a quietus to the Doctor's fears.

Such then are the errors, some of them denominated impious, viz. Arianism and Socinianism, (p. 24.) which our Author says "never can enter" the Episcopal Church, "whilst she retains her apostolical constitution and evangelical liturgy."

Now let us see, how far *facts*, indubitable facts, prove the Assistant Rector's position. Either the position is true, or that Church has abandoned her "Apostolical constitution and evangelical liturgy," he, himself, being judge.

The radical principle of the Novatians, "that those who had committed gross sins, or apostatized after baptism, could not be admitted into the communion of the Church," and of the Donatists, "that the sanctity of their bishops gave them the exclusive right to be considered as the Church of Christ," it is true, are rejected by all the members of the Episcopal Church, so far as our knowledge extends. But it is worthy of notice, that their conclusions from these principles, made the re-baptization of those laymen, who joined them from the general body of Christians, a necessary measure for their admission in both these denominations, and that, in one of them, they required the *re-ordination* of those ministers, whom they received. Both of them, in their practice, recognized the authority of diocesan episcopacy as apostolical, are not charged with changing the liturgy then in general use, which, *of course*, must have been evangelical, and held the same leading doctrines with the Church at large. And yet both, according to Dr. How, were chargeable with "fundamental errors." p. 23. We will not avail ourselves of the argument, which this fact affords us, that a "departure from the true faith can enter the Church which has an apostolical constitution and an evangelical liturgy." We wish our readers merely to recollect, that, in the Episcopal Church, *re-ordination* of ministers is required, and that, to escape the necessity of re-baptization, they admit the validity of *lay* baptism.

The doctrine of "meritorious good works," our Author justly, as we think, condemns, quoting, with entire approbation, the eleventh article of the Confession of his Church, and the Homily on Justification. We were pleased and gratified, in no ordinary degree, to find him so explicit in stating, that "the ground of the justification and salvation of fallen man is simply and exclusively the merits of Christ."

We perfectly agree with him, in the following observations, "When it is considered, how far we fall short of the pure and perfect law of God, the idea of attaching *merit* to any thing connected with us, whether it respects faith or works, is so utterly preposterous, that we are at a loss to conceive, how it should ever, even in the darkest ages, have entered the human mind." We join issue in the astonishment, expressed by our Author, on this subject: but must inform our readers, that this very "preposterous" doctrine of meritorious good works has been maintained, and is maintained, in that very Church, which possesses, as he thinks, "an apostolical constitution and evangelical liturgy." Our proofs for this assertion, we take from Overton's True Churchman ascertained. Chap vi.

Dr. Hey, the Norrissian professor of Divinity in Cambridge University, teaches, that the Reformers went too far in depreciating good works, and extolling "the necessity of founding *all pretensions to reward on the merits of Christ.*" He talks of making our article (on Justification) more acceptable, by softening some expressions, seemingly tending to Antinomianism, and by strengthening expressions, tending to encourage virtue, and the hopes of *its rewards.*" He, moreover, says, "the merits of Christ supply imperfection."

Mr. Fellowes says, "those persons, who expect justification upon easier conditions than those of good works, will find themselves miserably and fatally deluded."

Dr. Burns, Chancellor of the Diocess of Carlisle, roundly asserts, that "the laws (of the gospel) never promise any thing but to *obedience.* No man will be acquitted at the day of judgment, but only for working and obeying. There is no pardon to be purchased without obedience. Our obedience is

the only thing which will be admitted as a just plea; and as a qualification able to save us in the last day." "Nor," adds Mr. Overton, "is it obedience taken in an extensive sense, as consisting especially in believing in him whom God hath sent, that is here chiefly meant; but obedience to the moral law, obedience as distinct from faith." This is clear from what follows. Having observed, how fatally "men evade this doctrine, because the gospel promises salvation to faith, love, being in Christ, &c." "*These,*" he says, "save us no otherwise than by being springs and principles of our obedience—so that, first or last, *obedience is—that alone condition* which our Judge will accept, and which we may safely trust to."

"Were we," says Mr. Benson, "to utter those pressing calls, which elsewhere you may hear—'Come to Christ, and throw yourselves on his mercy—come to him, bringing nothing but your sins—seek him, not by your deeds, but seek him by faith'—Were we, I say, to call you in such terms, we should but turn conspirators against the welfare of your souls. The call you desire to hear, is uttered *only* to the **RIGHTEOUS**. He (Christ) speaks comfort to the **RIGHTEOUS**."

To Bishop Fowler it appears self-evident, that "None but **HOLY** souls ARE CAPABLE of remission of sin."

Mr. Daubeny, now Archdeacon of Sarum, if we are not mistaken, says the clergy "feel themselves called upon to enforce obedience to the moral law as necessary to the accomplishment of the Christian scheme; necessary to bring fallen man into a state of acceptance with God, by **QUALIFYING** him for the salvation which has been purchased."

These extracts prove, that the "abominable system," as Dr. How justly calls it, which represents man as able, by his own unassisted powers, to prepare himself for grace, so as to *deserve* it; and, with the help of grace thus deserved, to attain to that higher degree of merit which entitles him to heaven, is actually propagated and defended in that Church which boasts of her apostolical ministry and her evangelical liturgy.

This departure from the true faith is not the only one, with which the members of this Church are chargeable. Bishop



Newton denied the eternity of future punishments. Dr. Clarke, Rector of St. James, London, was an Arian. The celebrated Dr. Whitby, the Commentator on the New Testament, espoused Dr. Clarke's opinions. Woolston, a fellow of Sidney College, Cambridge, was tried for blasphemy. Dr. Middleton, the author of the life of Cicero, was charged by Bishop Pierson, with infidelity. Dr. Clayton, bishop of Clogher, in Ireland, maintained Arian principles. Bishop Law, of Carlisle, was a Materialist. The celebrated Chillingworth, in answer to a letter of a friend, who "desired to know what judgment might be made of Arianism from the sense of antiquity," replied, "In a word, whosoever shall freely and impartially consider of this thing, and, on the other side, how the ancient fathers' weapons against the Arians, are, in a manner, onely places of Scripture, (and those now, for the most part, discarded as impertinent and unconcluding,) and how, in the argument drawne from the authority of the ancient fathers, they are alwayes defendants, and scarce ever opponents; he shall not choose, but confesse, or at least be very inclinable to believe, that the doctrine of Arrius is eyther a truth or no damnable heresy." Fellowes is a Socinian.

For the correctness of this statement, we refer to the writings of the persons mentioned, and to Kippis' *Biographia Brittanica*, and Chalmers', with Lempriere's *Biographical Dictionaries*. We forbear enlarging, satisfied that these cases are sufficient, until they are disproved, to show that the apostolical ministry and evangelical liturgy of the Episcopal Church cannot prevent a departure from the true faith in those matters which Dr. How has particularized.

These cases also show the degree of credit which is due to the assumption of the Christian Observer, which we noticed, p. 174. The articles and formularies of the Church of England do, unquestionably, license latitudinarianism, to the utmost extent, as appears from the fact of the prodigious variety of opinions, discordant with each other, on subjects of fundamental importance, which actually exists in that Church, and is tolerated.

3. We proceed to examine *the fact*, which Dr. How maintains, "that many of those societies on the continent of Europe, which laid aside the divinely-constituted order of bishops, have grievously fallen from the distinguishing doctrines of the cross." The Church of Holland, the Swiss Churches, the Reformed Churches of protestant Germany, and the Church of Geneva, must be meant by him. We say "must be meant by him," because he and his coadjutors claim the Lutheran denomination, as well as the Russian and Greek Churches, as Episcopal, in their controversy with Presbyterians. He and his friends may take their choice, for we are little concerned about the issue. As the High Church party have committed themselves, we, for the present, meet them on the position assumed by Dr. How, in this address, connected with the claim of the party of the Lutheran Church, on their side, as it respects the question of government.

The Church of Holland, which is purely Presbyterian, we do know, from correct information, has never departed from the true faith, *in point of doctrine*, as that true faith is described by Dr. How. Nor have the Swiss Churches departed from this faith, in the sense of our Author. In Geneva there have been defections, and sad ones, but never until Bishop Burnet, an Episcopal divine, succeeded in producing an abolition of the subscription to Calvinistic principles, by the authority of Geneva. With the Church of Geneva, as it now is, "that Church, which has an apostolical ministry and an evangelical liturgy," must settle the controversy, in reference to departure from the true faith, in Dr. How's sense.

We are aware of the fact, that, on the continent of Europe, there has been a sad and grievous departure from the truth. But, reader, be it known to you, that it is to be found among a denomination, whom the Episcopalians claim, as on their side, in the article of government. Bahrdt, Eberhard, Dam, Teller, Semler, &c. were all Lutherans. These men, who supported "the impious system of Socinus," never had been Calvinists. So much for Dr. How's assertion, relative to the continental Churches, who have "laid aside the divinely-con-

stituted order of bishops." p. 24. "Passing from one extreme to another," says the Doctor, "they have exchanged the absurdities of Calvinism for a system still more frightful"—"the impious system of Arius and Socinus." Besides the absolute and utter want of proof for this assertion, as it respects the Calvinistic Churches on the continent, there is an unfairness, as it respects the Lutheran Church. As a Church, they never have embraced the heresies of Arius and Socinus, though many of their ministers and professors are supporters of these heresies. Nay, more, we say, that "not a single society," if Dr. How means, by that appellation, a denomination of Christians, "not a single society," Presbyterian in their government, on the continent, have embraced the system of either Arius or Socinus. We challenge the Rev. Author to prove his assertion.

Not less unhappy, because equally incorrect, is his statement of the condition into which England was brought, when, as he is pleased to call them, "the barriers of a primitive Episcopacy," were thrown down, p. 24. We venture to say, and we appeal to the impartial histories of that period, that there were less "impiety and heresy" in the nation then, than there were after the restoration of Charles, and since that time, until the rise of the Methodists. With all the canting hypocrisy of the day, there was a high degree of external morality and attention to religion, throughout England. The scene was sadly reversed, when Charles ascended the throne. Did Episcopal authority interfere to prevent the debauchery of the nation? Let the reader cast his eye over Burnet's history of his own times, but particularly over his prefaces to the first and third editions of his Pastoral Office, and he will see what had been done by them so far down as his day.

4. We proceed to examine the dubious or incorrect use of Scripture which Dr. H. has made. We confine our remarks to the interpretation which he gives of Antichrist, and of the passage in Timothy, where the Church is called the pillar and ground of the truth.

With respect to the first, viz. his view of Antichrist, we consider it to be dubious. It would not have been noticed by us, were it not for the positive and imposing manner in which the author states his view. Dr. H. well knew that all the old Protestant writers on prophecy, consider the Romish Church as Antichrist. Faber, however, has ably and conclusively corrected some of the mistakes of his predecessors, but has certainly failed in settling decisively the question concerning Antichrist. The word is found in only four places, all of them in John's epistles. We will present our readers with them in their connection. The first place is 1 John ii. 18. "Little children, it is the last time; and as ye have heard that Antichrist shall come, even now are there *many Antichrists*; whereby we know that it is the last time. They went out from us, but they were not of us." The second place is the 22d verse of this Chapter. "He is Antichrist that denieth the Father and the Son. Whosoever denieth the Son, the same hath not the Father." The third place is 1 John iv. 3. "And every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh, is not of God; and this is that spirit of Antichrist whereof ye have heard, that it should come; and even now already is it in the World." The last place is 2 John 7. "For many deceivers are entered into the world, who confess not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh. This is a deceiver and an Antichrist." The discriminating character of Antichrist then, according to the beloved disciple, is, that he confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh. The want of such a confession is exhibited as a denial of the Son; and whosoever denieth the Son, hath not the Father, and of course denies both the Father and the Son; for Christ and his Father are one. Moreover we are informed that there were many Antichrists in the disciples' days, who he says "went out from us, but they were not of us;" which description proves that they were apostates. Their apostacy, from the discriminating character marked by the disciple, to which we have just referred, related to this one grand point, that they confessed not that Jesus Christ was come in the flesh. That is, they rejected the incarnation of the Son of God, and consequently all the doctrines connected with, or flowing from his

incarnation, such as atonement for sin by the one sacrifice of himself on the cross, his essential divinity, or oneness with the Father, to make his atonement complete and satisfactory, and his Almighty power to apply effectually, his purchased redemption to the salvation of sinful men. Such rejection is strictly antichristian, because it is aimed at the essential part of the whole Christian system, which discriminates it from all other religions, viz. salvation purchased by the death of the Son of God. Thus the ancient Cerinthians, Artemonites, &c. and the modern Socinians, are Antichristians: and by way of eminence the Church of Rome, by the doctrine of her unbloody sacrifice of the mass, with the doctrines flowing from, or connected with this, is the Antichrist, since by these doctrines she rejects *in fact*, the one offering of Christ for sin; and thus confesseth not that Christ has come in the flesh. We state our difference of opinion on this subject, from Dr. H. not to charge him with heresy, but merely to observe that we do not consider Mr. Faber has succeeded in attempting a new explanation and application of the term Antichrist.

The passage from 1 Tim. iii. 15, from the use which our author makes of it, deserves particular animadversion. He has committed "the Bible and Common Prayer Book Society" of this City, as a body, with himself individually, as considering that "the Church is denominated in Scripture, the pillar and ground of the truth; whence the conclusion seems fairly to follow, that the Church being removed, the truth of which it is the support and bulwark, will not long continue to stand," p. 22. We shall first examine the premises assumed, and then the conclusion. The premises are found in the above-mentioned passage from Timothy. It is allowed by all the established biblical critics and commentators, that this is one of the most difficult passages in the New Testament, and has furnished accordingly a field for a more than ordinary diversity of constructions. Dr. H. and the Bible and Common Prayer Book Society of this City, would have acted wisely had they referred to Suiceri thesaurus Ecclesiasticus, under the word *Στόλος*, for some information on this subject. Had they done

so, they would have avoided the awkward predicament in which they have placed themselves. Cameron, Schultetus, Bengelius, Griesbach, Heinrich, Doddridge, and the late Dr. J. Erskine, to mention no more names, consider the punctuation of the received text to be incorrect. They make the 15th verse to end with the words, "the Church of the living God," and the 16th verse to commence as follows, "the pillar and ground of the truth, and without controversy, great is the mystery of godliness, &c."

Those who consider the punctuation correct, differ among themselves. Procopius, Cyril of Alexandria, and Epiphanius, made Christ the pillar and ground of the truth. Others suppose that Timothy is meant, and in support of this opinion Chillingworth has given his name. Of those who refer the pillar and ground of the truth to the Church, we omit the opinions of Chrysostom and Theophylact, who gave one interpretation, Francis Junius another, and John Gothofredus a third, whilst we proceed to exhibit Dr. How's and his associates, which is their conclusion from the premises assumed. As the former are disputed by the best authority, the reader will not be surprised to find the latter not entitled to much credit. In fact it is the Popish doctrine, avowed by the council of Trent. We shall arrange the Dr. and the council in separate columns.

*Dr. How.*

"The Church is denominated in Scripture, the pillar and ground of the truth; whence the conclusion seems fairly to follow, that the Church being removed, the truth of which it is the support and bulwark, will not long continue to stand." p. 22.

*Council of Trent.*

"The Holy Church forbids all men whatsoever to explain the Scriptures, in things relating to faith, and the doctrine of manners, by trusting to their own lights according to their particular sense, contrary to the senses which our holy mother, the Church has held and does hold, to whom only it appertaineth to judge of the sense and interpretation of Scripture." Sess. IV. second decree: Dupin's Eccles. Hist. of the 16th Cent. Book 3. chap. 1.

Here we have on the one side, the apostolick protestant Episcopalian Assistant Rector, gravely and peremptorily saying that the Church is the support and bulwark of "the truth," without which it (i. e. the truth) could not long continue to stand: and on the other the apostolick Roman Council, saying that to the Church only, it appertaineth to judge of the sense and interpretation of Scripture. The former unquestionably means by "the truth of the Church," the Scriptures; and therefore as he insists that the Church supports and defends the Scriptures, he must unite with the latter in claiming for the Church the right of judging of the sense and interpretation of Scripture. We say that *he must* thus unite; we ought rather to say that he has thus united with the apostolick council; for his rule and that of the Bible and Common Prayer Book Society of this city, is "give not the Scriptures, i. e. the truth," without giving with it the Church, i. e. the liturgy of the Episcopal Church. If our author does not identify (in p. 20, 21, 22, 23) with Scripture, the above-mentioned liturgy, he reasons most strangely and absurdly. But we cannot mistake his meaning; inasmuch as he has been at such pains to be plain. He informs his hearers and readers, "the Church supports and defends the truth." If they ask, what is the truth? his answer is the word of God, or the Scriptures. If, which denomination is the Church? Our's, i. e. the Episcopal, of course. If they prosecute the inquiry and desire to know, what constitutes your Church? The Episcopal liturgy, the Episcopal liturgy, the Episcopal liturgy, that is, the Church of the living God! But may not the word of God be given without the Episcopal liturgy? Oh no; for the latter, which is the Church, is the candlestick, and the former is the light. "The candlestick being taken away, the light is in perpetual danger of being thrown down and destroyed." How can that be? Because *the Church*, i. e. the Episcopal liturgy, the production of sinful, frail men, is the support and bulwark of the word of the infinite and holy God! Worthy is such a view of the Church, and the Scriptures, to be advanced by the man of sin; but utterly unworthy, when advanced by a protestant, boasting of the apostolical constitution and evangelical liturgy of his

Church. We refer him and his coadjutors, the Bible and Common Prayer Book Society of this City, to Whitby on this passage, who refutes the popish interpretation which they have adopted. Such interpretation, whether given by protestants or papists, wherever we meet with it, reminds us of a pleasant story, which amused us in early life. A Collier being asked, what he believed, answered, what the Church believes. Being again asked, what that was, he answered, what I believe. And again, when the inquiry was, "what do you and the Church both believe?" he replied, "the Church and I *both* believe the same thing." Thus it is that men roundly claim for themselves the faith of the Church. On examination, the faith of the Church is just what each of them believe. Hence Universalists, Arians, Socinians, Materialists, as well as Arminians, sign the articles of the Church of England.

5. We proceed lastly to consider the author's misrepresentations of Calvinistic doctrines. On this subject we shall not long detain the reader. The radical defect in the treatment of our doctrines, is the habit of our opponents to exhibit garbled extracts, or if any thing like a system, a caricature, so as to produce effect.

We have already extended this article to such a length, as to compel us to draw to a conclusion. We shall subject to the process of examination only two of the author's misrepresentations. The one is with respect to the heathen world. The Larger Catechism to which Dr. H. refers, does not determine the fact whether there is mercy for the heathen world; but it states the truth, that the light of nature cannot save. We do not pretend to limit the application of Christ's blood to the heathen in a manner of which we have no conception. In the third sect. of the tenth chapter of the West. Confess. it is assumed as a principle, "that persons incapable of being outwardly called by the ministry of the word, may be elect." But of this we shall say a little more under the next head.

The other misrepresentation relates to persons dying in infancy. Because *elect* infants are named in the Westminster Confession of Faith, it does not necessarily follow that there are reprobate infants. The word as used evidently alludes to such



cases as those of Jeremiah the prophet, and John the Baptist. We, who believe in the doctrines of this Confession, do not conceive ourselves as prevented, in good faith, from believing, so far as we can be said to believe without positive information, that *all infants*, whether Christian or heathen, dying in infancy, belong to the election of God. But as this is not revealed, it is right in public Confessions of Faith to go no farther than the written word. Therefore in the West. Confess. "elect infants" are mentioned, not however to constrain the supporters of that Confession, to believe that there are any infants reprobate. The great truths recognized in the Calvinistic system are these. "There is but one way of salvation, that is, through Christ; they who hear and are capable of improving this way, and reject it, shall perish; they who, though born in a Christian land, are incapable from infancy or idiocy, of improving this way, may be saved." Upon the same principles, without relinquishing one single article of our faith, we consider that God may apply to all infants dying in infancy, and to the dying pagan, the blood of Christ. We state it *hypothetically*; merely to show that Dr. H. has not sufficiently examined the standards of the Calvinistic Churches.

But we must draw to a conclusion, assuring our readers that when the proper occasion offers, we are not unwilling to enter the lists in defence of Calvinism.

Though we have declined taking a part in the Episcopal controversy, yet we cannot resist the temptation which the present address affords us, to endeavour to teach the author a little wisdom, prudence, and moderation in the controversy. In p. 28 he says, "In the ecclesiastical history of Eusebius, composed within 200 years of the Apostolick age, the lists in question (*viz.* of Bishops) will be found as copied from the records of the different Churches by Eusebius himself." Then in a note our author gives the succession of the Bishops of Jerusalem, as given by Eusebius, who he says, transcribed the same from the Church records. As Dr. H. has not referred to the place in Eusebius where he found the above account, we had to search for it as well as we could. It is in the fifth book and twelfth

chapter of his history we meet with these words, *αι ταις επιδι-  
 διασιν αποχαι περιιχουσι*, *episcoporum series*, quæ in *archivis illius  
 ecclesiæ*, servantur, ostendunt, in plain English, "after whom  
 the successions of the (Bishops) there do show." Upon this pas-  
 sage, Valesius, the editor of Eusebius, after mentioning that the  
 Churches founded by the apostles, did keep a record of their  
 bishops with great care, adds, "these our Eusebius had dili-  
 gently examined, as appears from this place: and he has di-  
 gested the Bishops of the principal sees from these tables on-  
 ly." Thus then Dr. How has palmed upon his hearers and  
 readers Valesius for Eusebius, the Editor for the Historian.  
 Besides the plain import of the words quoted, we have more  
 decisive authorities from Eusebius himself, concerning these  
 said Bishops of Jerusalem, so imposingly introduced in the  
 note to p. 28. In the fourth book and fifth chapter of his his-  
 tory, Eusebius says, "moreover, the space of time which the  
 Bishops of Jerusalem spent in their presidency over that see,  
*I could in no wise find preserved in writing: for as report says,*  
*they were very short-lived: But thus much I have been inform-*  
*ed of from old records, that unto, &c."* Such then is the fact as  
 stated by Dr. H. from Valesius, contradicted by Eusebius him-  
 self. Of this contradiction, see Pearson de success. prim. Rom.  
 Episc. c. 2, p. 8, as quoted in Reading's Cambridge ed. of Eu-  
 sebius by Valesius, p. 225.

We now conclude our long review. Nothing but the stand-  
 ing of the author, and the credit which he has with his party,  
 would have excited us to pay so much attention to so short a  
 pamphlet. The style is better than that of the author's other  
 productions. The characteristic fault of the man appears  
 throughout, to make assertions without proving them, and to  
 discolour, for the purpose of exciting disgust, doctrines which  
 he does not understand. Many things are introduced, not for  
 giving unity to the whole, but to disclose party views. We  
 honour his honesty in avowing his sentiments, and respect his  
 motives; but wish he may in future afford a better specimen of  
 his talents, and the correctness of his reading.