

THE
GOSPEL MAGAZINE.

No. XXXVII...For JANUARY, 1799.

OF THE SEVERAL DISPENSATIONS OF THE
COVENANT OF GRACE.

[From the Manuscript of Mr. Toplady.]

Communicated by the EDITOR of his Works.

The first time printed.

HAVING shown, in a former paper, that the covenant of grace was, in all ages, the same *essentially*; we shall, in this, consider the several *dispensations* of it; and how, under each of them, it shone brighter and brighter, 'till the actual appearance of God in the flesh improved the Gospel Revelation into perfect day. These dispensations have been various; that they may all be included in these *two* general ones, the Old Testament, and the New; which shall therefore be considered distinctly and apart.

SECT. I. of the covenant of grace, as exhibited under the Old Testament.

Under this head, we shall, for method's sake, take notice of God's gracious discoveries to man, of salvation by Christ, in the following order: 1. As they were made, in the *first* age of the World, to the time of Noah: 2. As they were continued from Noah to Abraham: and, 3. From the time, of Abraham to that of Moses.

1. We are to consider the revelation of the covenant of grace, as it was vouchsafed in the first age of the World.

The first discovery of God's eternal favour to his elect, and their redemption by Christ, was made to Adam presently after the fall; which discovery, though comprised in a few words, and those not altogether unobscure, was nevertheless exceeding comprehensive, and contained a precious epitome of the Gospel. It is recorded *Gen. iii. 14, 15.* "And the Lord God said unto the serpent, Because thou hast done this, thou art cursed above all cattle, and above every beast of the field; upon thy belly shalt thou go, and dust shalt thou eat,

all the days of thy life : and I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed ; it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel." Luther is said to lament, that none of those among the primitive fathers and bishops, who were most eminent for piety and learning, have transmitted to posterity so copious and accurate an explanation of this passage as the importance of it deserves : we, therefore, who live in these later times, should be the more diligent and exact in searching out the nature and unfolding the contents of these momentous words. Many learned and judicious interpreters have already done this very happily, and to great advantage ; and it shall be our business, at present, to follow them step by step, and shew that the principal doctrines and leading articles of the Gospel are compendiously revealed and held forth in this first and most glorious of promises.

It should seem that, under the character of a *serpent*, (because he had assumed the body of such a creature, in order the better to impose on man) *satan himself* was condemned by this sentence: for, to imagine, as some do, that this awful denunciation of the Almighty was designed to take place only on that species of animals, would be to the last degree *jejune* and trifling. Now, not to urge how incompatible it must have been with the dignity of the great God, to address himself, in terms so tremendous and august, to an irrational creature ; many properties here mentioned, if taken in their literal sense, are *natural* to that kind of animal, and therefore could not be *inflicted* as punishments : such as, *going on their belly, and eating dust*. The Jews, indeed, tell us, that "before the fall, serpents had feet; or, at least, went erect: and did not "then live on dust, as they do since." All this is dotish and unscriptural ; for dust is not the *only* food of serpents. Aristotle ranks them *εν παντατοις* among the creatures that will eat almost all sorts of things, such as flesh, herbs, &c. and testifies that they are *λιχνοφαγεσ των ζωνων*, the most given to dainties of any animal that lives. Dust, therefore, may be called the food of serpents, because, since they creep on the ground, they cannot help taking up some dust when they eat : So David, in his humiliation of soul, complains, that he "eat ashes like bread," *Psal.* cii. 9. because, as he lay groveling on the ashes, his food was placed there beside him, and might probably be mingled with them.

It should moreover be noticed, that what are here said of the serpent, viz. his going on his belly, and eating dust, are

are properties common to many other kinds of vermin, such as worms, &c. See Bochart. Hierozoic. l. i. c. 4, and why should that be esteemed a curse to the serpent, which is natural to so many other animals beside: or, does the malediction of that creature consist in this; that its poisonous and hurtful qualities render it obnoxious to the hatred of man? But this likewise is true of various creatures besides, which, since the fall, have been odious and dangerous to the human race. And 'tis worthy of observation, that there are *some* kinds even of serpents, which are remarkable for the affection they bear to man; see Vofs. de Orig. Idol. l. 6. c. 58, and others that are good for food, and served up as such even to royal tables, *ib. cap.* 62. Add to this, that, by the condemnation of the serpent which had seduced man, God intended to comfort our dejected parents after their apostacy; but how could it be matter of consolation either to them or us, that serpents should ever after eat dust and creep on their belly? and as this sentence is not strictly nor universally true, as taken *literally*; it must refer to something *mystic* and *spiritual*.

Satan is, in scripture, styled *the serpent*, 2 Cor. xi. 3. And *that old serpent*, Rev. xii. 9. And his overthrow is called a bruising him under the saint's feet, Rom. xvi. 20. And even if we should grant, (which, however, we by no means can) that the curse pronounced by God, in the text under consideration, primarily refers to the animal known by that name, and in which satan spoke; yet, it would be evident from the very nature of things, that it must and ought to terminate ultimately in the grand seducer who actuated the body of that beast: for, as Chrysostom rightly argues, "If that, which was only a subordinate instrument, became so obnoxious to the divine indignation; How great must be the vengeance incurred by satan himself!" should it be objected, that "those words, *all the days of thy life*, cannot be meant of the devil, inasmuch as he is an immortal spirit, and therefore can never die;" the answer is plain; that there is a *sort of death* reserved even for him, which will begin to commence at his condemnation in the great day, when he "shall be cast into the lake of fire and brimstone, and be tormented day and night, forever and ever," Rev. xx. 10. In the mean time, satan may be said to *live*, because he now works powerfully in the children of disobedience, and thereby demonstrates himself to be the prince of this world: and then

to die, when he is shut up in hell, and God shall still the enemy and the avenger, *Psal.* viii. 2. and destroy him that hath the power of death. So that the days preceding his final judgment, may be aptly enough termed *the days of his life*, i. e. of his liberty and power among men.

It may be asked, "whence it was, that, since this malediction of satan was intended principally for the comfort of our parents; God should chuse to address himself to *him*, rather than to *them*?" This might be, 1. To make the punishment of that proud spirit additionally grievous, by having sentence pronounced immediately upon himself, in the presence and hearing of those frail creatures whom he had just seduced, and over whom he was in hopes of tyrannizing for ever. 2. To administer the greater consolation to them, to whom the just vengeance, denounced against their grand enemy, could not fail of being extremely pleasing; especially, as God, in condemning him, tacitly absolved them. 3. To shew the certainty and irreversibility of his sentence, and, therein, of every sentence pronounced by God, whether of justice or mercy. Satan was convicted of a fresh crime, which he could neither deny, nor lay the blame of on any but himself; he is, therefore, without farther delay, absolutely and irrevocably condemned. Just so, on the other hand, our first parents were given to understand that all the benefits, both spiritual and eternal, which are insured to the elect, are equally absolute and irrevocable; as again being suspended on conditions of their fulfilling, but freely assigned to them by the peremptory and immutable will of God.

In order to come, as near as possible, at the full meaning of this capital promise, made to man just before his expulsion from Paradise, it may be necessary to consider,

1. The *blessings* more particularly comprehended in it; 2. Who was the *author* of these blessings; 3. The *meritorious cause* , whereby they should be procured; 4. The *manner* of procuring them; 5. For *whom* they were procured; and, 6. The *medium* , through which all, for whom these blessings were obtained, should arrive at the enjoyment of them.

1. The *blessings* comprehended in it to man, were four;

(1.) An absolute *curse* denounced against the serpent: "Because thou hast done this, thou art cursed above all cattle, and above every beast of the field." All beasts are liable to destruction, according to that of the apostle, "natural brute beasts are made to be taken and destroyed," 2 *Pet.* ii. 12. And, in consequence of man's sinning against God, even the irrational part of the creation became subject

subject to vanity, *Rom.* viii. 20. And were made, in some degree or other, miserable with their fallen master. But against satan it was denounced, that he should be more vile and wretched than the very beasts themselves: which denunciation implies, 1. The extremest degree of folly and wickedness; that, with all his art and cunning he should be neither *wise* nor *good*; but become inferior even to “the horse and mule which have no understanding,” *Psal.* xxxii. 9.

2. The most abject *meanness*. So that, he who, when in heaven, impiously affected equality with God; and, when banished from thence, strove to acquire dominion over man, the masterpeice of divine workmanship; should be reduced to a state more despicable than that of the meanest beast that goes, or the most insignificant insect that crawls. 3. Never-ending *misery*; The irrational world are thought to die and are extinct forever: but the old serpent, cursed in this respect above them, has everlasting fire prepared for him and his angels. This complicated malediction sets off, as a foil, the blessings conferred on the elect; to whom Christ is made wisdom, righteousness, sanctification and redemption; *1 Cor.* i. 30.

The second thing promised to man, was,

(2.) The *destruction of satan's power*; which destruction is set forth by three very opposite phrases; 1. “Upon thy belly shalt thou go,” i. e. thou shalt be compelled to creep upon the earth; thou shalt be shorn of thy strength, and rendered totally unable to accomplish thy malicious designs against the people whom I have set apart for myself. To this purpose Pareus argues; the adversary, says that great man, “is obliged now to creep on his belly; for, being thrust out of heaven, he is condemned to grovel below, and will never be permitted to lift up his head again: and it is recorded of him, that, as part of his present punishment, he was *cast out into the earth*, where he shall persecute the church in an hostile manner, but shall not prevail against her.” The 2d expression is, “and dust shalt thou eat,” which implies a state of absolute subjection: for, in the language of scripture, to *lick the dust*, is spoken of enemies who, being totally vanquished and subdued, lie prostrate at the feet of the conqueror. So *Psal.* lxii. 9. “His enemies shall lick the dust.” *Mic.* vii. 17, “They shall lick the dust, like a serpent.” *Isai.* xlix. 23, “They shall bow down to thee with their face toward the earth, and lick up the dust of thy feet.” And again, *Isai.* lxxv. 25,
“Dust

“Dust shall be the serpent’s meat ;” which last cited passage implies, *first*, a restriction of satan’s power to *earthly-minded* men, who are entirely devoted to this world, and seek their whole happiness from the riches, honours and pleasures of it. These persons are the serpent’s prey, and the dust which he shall devour. And even this subserves to the common good of the church : for, when the devil is commissioned by God to extirpate and destroy wicked men ; then stumbling blocks are thereby removed out of the way of righteousness, the people of God are freed from the molestations occasioned by such disturbers of Zion, and satan’s own kingdom in the world is apparently lessened. *Secondly*, with regard to the elect, it signifies, that the power of satan over them extends no farther than their *bodies*, which, because of sin, must return to the dust, whence they were formed. These their bodies may therefore, in this sense, be said to be *the serpent’s meat* ; i. e. being, for a while, separated from their souls, they *die* ; and are kept in the prison of darkness and corruption until Christ comes to judgment. But with their *souls* that malignant spirit hath nothing to do : they are safe in heaven, where they shall continue until the day appointed for the re-union of them with their respective bodies. And it is profitable for the saints, that their bodies should be thus detained in the grave ; inasmuch as by this temporary resolution of them into their first principles, they are freed from the imperfections and infirmities which so closely clave to them before, and exempted from all the remains of sin and corrupt nature. *Thirdly*, a man is supposed to *eat* nothing but what he *loves* ; the phrase therefore, of satan’s eating dust, denotes the hellish *pleasure* he takes in putting men upon evil practices, and thereby hurrying them into eternal ruin. Our Lord said it was his *meat* to do his father’s will, *John* iv. 34. i. e. it was his *delight*, and that in which he took the greatest *satisfaction* ; even to fulfill the father’s purpose, by converting the elect, and preserving them when converted. On the contrary, it is satan’s *meat*, i. e. his joy and pleasure, to impel the reprobate to wickedness, and, as far as he is permitted, to vex and buffet even gracious persons ; which, as it shows the blackness of his malice, will but enhance his punishment, and aggravate his misery.

Lest this interpretation of that word, “dust shalt thou eat,” should seem novel and hitherto unknown ; I shall subjoin the remarks on this subject, of two or three distinguished writers. Fagius says thus ; “ If we refer these

“ words,

“ words, as we certainly ought, to that spiritual serpent, the devil; their signification will be this: that that adversary of our’s, who once appeared so formidable, shall be cast down and put under our feet; and that he shall be only authorised to consume and devour men of earthly minds, who are immersed in sensuality; for his power does not extend to them who, despising worldly matters, are devoted to things pure and heavenly. Satan is a spirit, and must therefore require immaterial food; which can be nothing else but the sins of men, on which feeds with pleasure. For, as a snake creeps on earth, eats it, and dwells upon it; in like manner it is satan’s policy to draw men downwards, to make them love and desire earthly things, and to call off their affections from higher and better objects.” Pareus argues much to the same effect; his words are these: “Satan was also condemned to eat dust; that is, to be glutted with the impunities of guilt and wickedness. He is thus fed, not only when he himself contracts fresh defilement by the repeated commission of sin: but when he plunges reprobates into the same abyss of wickedness and perdition with himself. This is satan’s sweetest food: for that may be termed a person’s food, with which he is most delighted. Hence that observation of Augustine. By dust are meant sinners; so that sinners are given to satan for his prey.” If then we would not be food for the serpent, we must not be earthly-minded.” And St. Ambrose says, that “by dust, we are to understand the flesh of men, on which God permits satan to feed; i. e. sometimes to torment and grieve the bodies even of believers: But this is all; for over their souls he has not the least command.”

The 3d phrase, denoting the abolition of satan’s power, is, “He [i. e. the seed of the woman] shall bruise thy head.” ’Tis well known, that the poison, cunning, strength, and life itself of a serpent, all lie in his *head*; crush *that*, and *these* are no more. Therefore, by the head of the serpent, we are here to understand all that depth of artifice, all the malignant venom, and dangerous strength, for which satan is remarkable: in a word, all that tyrannical and pernicious influence which he hath, by fraud or force, acquired among mankind. By the *bruising* of his head, is meant the total annihilation of his power, with regard to the elect; under whose feet the God of Peace shall shortly bruise him, Rom. xvi. 20. Of this spiritual exemption from the hand
of

of satan; the miraculous powers granted by Christ to the apostles, were emblematical, *Mark* xvi. 18. *Luke* x. 19.

(3) The third blessing promised, was the putting of enmity between his seed and the seed of the woman: I "will put enmity between thy seed and her seed." In which words is implied the *sanctification* of the elect. When this work of sanctification is begun, and man commences satan's enemy, and the infernal league between them is dissolved, the renewed soul breaks off from communion with Belial; hates and renounces him, with all his works of darkness; strives to weaken and extirpate his diabolic influence both in himself and others; loves what satan hates, and hates what he loves. And though the Devil should, and certainly will, strive to recover such a person into his snare again, his aims shall be so far from taking effect, that they will only stir up the christian to redoubled diligence, prayer, and watchfulness. As long as any man is totally un sanctified, he so long cultivates friendship with the devil, and yields himself to be his slave. Hatred of satan, and hostility against him, can only proceed from a principle of holiness supernaturally infused into the soul. This supernatural infusion is included in that promise, "I will put enmity," &c. wherein God not only forbids his people to parley with satan, or to re-contract friendship with him; and orders them to look on him as the sworn enemy of their peace and salvation; but likewise expressly binds himself to work so powerfully and effectually upon their hearts, that they shall never be permitted to give themselves back to satan any more, but that the enmity between them and him shall continue for ever. Thus *Rivetus* "when mention is made of putting enmity, &c. the meaning is, that sinners shall be so brought to themselves, as to hate the galling yoke of satan's tyranny and seek to shake it off; and that, when they are once happily delivered from it, they shall take all imaginable care that they be not again entangled with it" *Exerc.* 37. in *Gen.* And the excellent *Cloppenburgius*, *Schol. Sacrif.* page 75. "Eve could never have enmity against satan, until that enmity against God, which she had contracted by the fall, was first taken away by justification; and the dominion of sin superseded by justification. Therefore the Lord, by saying he would put enmity between her and the serpent, and also between their two seeds, exhibited to her the covenant of peace, whereby justification and sanctification were ensured to her" and her elect posterity.

(♣.) The

(4.) The fourth benefit promised, to the chosen race, in these words, is the *resurrection* of their bodies to eternal life. These were to be reduced to dust, by him who hath the power of death, even the devil: through whom, as a seducer, temporal death, as well as spiritual, entered into the world. This resurrection was remotely hinted at, when it was said to the serpent, "dust shalt thou eat all the days of thy life," implying, that with regard to the elect, the time should come when he should *cease* to eat dust: to wit, at the morning of the last day, when the bodies of God's children shall, with triumph, emerge from the dust of the earth, and all the marks of satan's power in them, such as pain, corruptibility, indwelling sins, &c. shall be totally expelled and done away. Then shall they be no longer, in any sense, the captives of death and darkness; but, being made glorious in holiness, as becomes the temples of the Lord, they shall be caught up to his right hand, and, amidst the eclats of rejoicing angels, be admitted to the benefit and interrupted vision of the beatific presence.

(To be concluded in our next.)

TO THE EDITOR OF THE GOSPEL MAGAZINE.

DEAR SIR,

I HAVE taken the liberty of sending you a third Letter, written by my good friend S. E. P. I hope the matter it contains will be a sufficient apology for its length.

Yours in our blessed Lord,

Dec. 21st, 1798.

T. W.

LETTER III. to T. W.

DEAR SIR,

June 7th, 1787.

LONG since it was my intention to give you a line, and I indeed gave you reason to expect a letter from me concerning our most beloved and precious Lord Jesus, which would be worthy your attention.

It appeared to me you were well pleased to be questioned in public, before the whole congregation, concerning your unbelief, and to be reprov'd for your slowness to believe all that Jesus is; hath done, and spoken.

I put these words of our divine Lord to you, and others, saying—*Why are ye so fearful? how is it that ye have no faith?* and you profess'd to receive real satisfaction from

the sermon. I then first thought I would give you the substance and outlines of what was then delivered, which I have now taken up pen to do.

May the great God our Saviour shine upon—bless with his divine unction—refresh with his life-giving presence—and warm my heart with a real sense and enjoyment of his love;—then my pen will be as *the pen of a ready writer*, to set forth his work and excellency, and make *his praise glorious*. His person is the glory of heaven. His love is the wonder and admiration of his saints in glory. In his favour there is life.

His loving kindness is better than the life itself. His name is most excellent. His love is heart warming. His mercy is soul-refreshing. It overcomes our hearts with its omnipotent sweetness. It bears down all thy sins. It infinitely exceeds all our guilt. It exceeds all our unworthiness. Christ's finished work is the whole of our salvation. His immutable word is the ground of our faith. His exceeding great and precious promises are for our consolation. They all serve to encourage and strengthen our faith.

Every thing in us proves our want of Christ. Every thing revealed of him, and testified of and concerning him in the written word, serve to shew and prove him to be exactly suited to us and all sufficient for us. To heal all our wounds; to purify us from all our uncleanness; to supply all our wants; and to do in us, and for us, *exceeding abundant above all that we can ask, or think*; to turn all our miseries into mercies; to defend us from, and to deliver us out of the hands of all our spiritual enemies, he being *Jehovah the Saviour*—Almighty to save. The sacred writers styled *Evangelists*, give us, in the Gospels wrote by them, such an account of the life of Christ, as is alluring. In it such perfection shines forth, as exceeds all thought, and surpasseth all comprehension. The holiness and righteousness of Jesus, is consummate and divine. All his acts and actions were influenced by it, and received worth and efficacy from it; and his love, which was the fountain and spring of all the good he spake and did for sinners, passeth knowledge.

Every thing recorded of our Jesus should render him to us inestimably precious. And when we read the revealed account given us of him in the sacred pages, and mix faith therewith, it makes him more and more glorious in our view. For that very purpose the scriptures were wrote. To this very end we read and study them. The words of
Christ

Christ are life-giving words. "They are spirit and they are life." They contain eternal life. Our life is contained *in* them, maintained *by* them. On them we live, and in them is the life of our souls. In reading the word, a believer should act thus: Looking up to Jesus he would say, Lord, this is your word, given on purpose to lead me into the true knowledge of your person, love, and work of salvation. I have opened it to see and understand more clearly your worth and excellency, and how you stand related to me, and how I stand related to you. Send down thy spirit to shine a fresh on it, and on my understanding to receive it. Give me so to mix faith with it, that I may grow thereby, and have growing evidence and experience, that the Gospel is the power of God unto salvation to me, and every one that believeth. The believer being thus prepared to read it in faith, should look on every part and tittle of it as wrote on purpose for his benefit, to strengthen, increase, and build him up in his most holy faith. When he reads of the glories of Jesus, he should say, he is my Jesus, my everlasting glory. When of the love of Jesus, he should look on himself as the object and subject of all the Saviour's love. When of the holiness, purity, obedience and worth of Immanuel, he should view it as his own, and consider himself as shining thereon before the throne of God. When of the great and miraculous acts of Christ, such as his opening the eyes of the blind, his opening the ears of the deaf, curing the leper, raising the dead, casting out devils, speaking the storm into a calm: all this should be viewed by him as a solemn testimony of Christ's power and all-sufficiency. This Jesus who hath "all power in heaven and earth," who hath proved his power in these stupendous acts, is my Jesus, saith faith. In brief, the believer, reading his Bible under these views, cannot but be profited by it. For he hereby takes in such views of Jesus, as makes his name and praise glorious. But God's people have their fears. They have; but they are all needless. Whence do they arise? from themselves. What are they afraid of, and why are they so fearful? I answer, they have their natural, legal, and also unbelieving fears. I wish God's beloved ones knew their own frame and constitution, then they would clearly see many of their fears arise from thence. A nervous person is never without ten thousand needless fears. Yet if he lives on Christ by faith, though he will never be without them, yet he will be a gainer by them. Here is a cordial for him, let him make use of it. The Psalmist says, *like as a father*
pitieth

pitieth his children so the Lord pitieth them that fear him. For he knoweth our frame, he remembereth that we are but dust. I cannot express how precious this scripture hath rendered Christ to my view. Our Lord knows our frame and constitution; sees how easily we are affected in our frames and feelings, and what is produced in our minds thereby. *He remembereth we are but dust.* This is the grand catholicon for all nervous persons who believe on Jesus.

There are a Legion of legal fears which spring from within, and originate from the body of sin and death. I am a sinner: I am full of guilt: I am unworthy of Christ. I am nothing in myself but wounds and wants: I have examined myself, and can find nothing is in myself to entitle me to God's favour. Nothing in me to place my faith and hope on. Many more such objections might be named: yet nothing is in any of them but the very essence of unbelief and legality. I add, there are many unbelieving fears: I am afraid Christ does not belong to me: That he will not save me: That my sins are too many, and great: That I have not the true work of God on my heart: That I never came rightly to him.

There is every thing in Christ, in his work, in his word, to remove all these fears. Hence he saith to his disciples, who were filled with fear, *Why are ye so fearful? how is it that ye have no faith?* Let me now take up our Lord's words, *Why are ye so fearful?* Is not Jesus a perfect Saviour? Is he not the Saviour both of body and soul? Hath he not said, *even the hairs of your head are all numbered. I will never leave thee, nor forsake thee.* So that the belief of this is a remedy for all your natural fears. You may well commit the keeping of your bodies to his care, and we may well cast all cares upon him, and be well persuaded from his own immutable word, that *he careth for you*: Jesus may well address us on the subject of our legal fears, saying, *Why are ye so fearful?* Why look into yourselves? Why not look unto me, and be saved from them? Why look to your sins and corruptions? Why not look off them to my blood and righteousness? Why look at your own worthlessness, why not view my worth and grace? Why look at your own emptiness, why not at my inexhaustible fulness? Why look into yourselves for the foundation of your faith? Why not at my word and work? As to your unbelieving fears, where, saith our Lord, is there any cause for them? Have I not loved you, and given myself for you? Is not my righteousness your garment of salvation? Am I not your propitiation? Is not my blood your endless purity? Do I not ap-
pear

pear in the presence of God for you? Am I not your advocate before the throne? have I not said, *Because I live, ye shall live also? Be not afraid, then, only believe.* May I not well put this further question to your hearts? *how is it that ye have no faith?* Since my person as Jehovah incarnate, God-man, is an immutable rock, against which the gates of hell cannot prevail; seeing my love is immutably fixed on you, and I love you with my whole heart, and with my whole soul, *how is it that ye have no faith?* Having taken away all your sin, and put it away by the sacrifice of myself, so that my Father looks on you in my person and work, and beholds you in me without any spot or stain of sin, *How is it that ye have no faith?* Since I am *Jehovah your righteousness*, and present you righteous before the throne, *How is it that ye have no faith?*

Beloved believer, 'tis wholly owing to our forgetfulness of Christ—his love to us—his union to us—his relation and interest in us—his finished work, his unfailling word, that our faith is so weak and unsettled. We should know Christ is most divinely suited to us. 'Tis not what we are, which is of any importance, 'tis what Christ is. This looking at Jesus is God's ordinance to heal, quicken, comfort and strengthen us with strength in our souls.

No sinner on earth is more suited to Christ, nor to any one is Christ more suited, than *yourself*. Cease from yourself. Look at Jesus with his crown, and say, *He is worthy of it, and he will wear it with increasing glory for ever and for ever, for loving me, and washing me from my sins, in his own blood.* I believe what I have wrote is the substance of what was delivered. You may add to it, and say, Jesus is mine, he belongs to me; I am saved in the Lord, with an everlasting salvation. I am in Christ, and shine in his person, righteousness and blood, before my heavenly Father; who sees me in him—loves me in him—yea, with the same love with which he loves Jesus himself.—He hath accepted me from everlasting, in the person of Christ, his beloved; so that nothing remains, but for you to live the whole subject. Then you may sing these words, wrote, as I am informed, by Mr. Romaine,

- “ Life is the road to death,
- “ Death heaven's gate must be,
- “ Heaven is the throne of Christ,
- “ And Christ is life to me.”

They are inscribed on Mr. Parker's Grave-stone, in Bunhill-fields.

I remain yours, in Jesus, S. E. P.

OF PREDESTINATION.

THIS scriptural term seems very offensive to some people, who profess great love to their Bibles. But why? It must arise from either ignorance or knowledge. No person would express displeasure at the sound of a word which he professes not to understand; this would betray something besides ignorance; a something which few persons are ingenuous enough to confess. And yet, in such a case as this, that something must evidently have dominion over the objector, and make him renounce the plain dictates of common reasoning: for, what harm can there be in the sound of a word, especially, if not understood?

But such a case it seems does not exist. The word, you are told, is "well understood, and is of bad tendency, and therefore should never be used." If it be of bad tendency, I should think the fountain of knowledge must be fully sensible of it, and would not, for that reason, have put it in the sacred writings; because his book is designed to produce good, and not bad effects. If, therefore, this term is of bad tendency, and yet the Lord has repeatedly adopted it; will it not follow that he did it in *ignorance*? And, if this be admitted as the fact, the conclusion necessarily is, that the creature, though less than nothing and vanity, is infinitely superior to his Creator in understanding and wisdom; because the Bible, which was designed to do good, has this word in it, which is of such a bad tendency.

Now in order to judge of its tendency we will look at all the places where it occurs: *Acts* iv. 28, For to do whatsoever thy hand and thy counsel *determined before* (predestinated) to be done. Its object here is the death of our great high priest, with all its circumstances of time, place, persons, dispositions and motives. And the meaning of it in this connection is, that God determined the whole assemblage of circumstances, with the event itself, before hand, so that none of them could be but as they were. The Jews and Romans were all sinners before, and therefore were not made such by this act; nor did they ever attempt to exculpate themselves by setting up that plea. The crucifixion of the Son of God, is a kind of central link in that astonishing chain, the whole of which was formed, and has hitherto been exhibited, in favour of lost sinners. For this reason, *predestination* appears to be so far from being of a bad tendency, that, without it, we had all been in the state of fallen angels,

Eph.

Eph. i. 5. Having predestinated us unto the adoption of children by Jesus Christ to himself. According to this verse, the God of all grace forms to himself a family of children in Jesus Christ; and in verse 11 you see that the same predestination alligns them an inheritance, which is sure to be possessed, because it is reserved in heaven for them. Now, can that be of bad tendency which puts us into the family of heaven; makes us sons and daughters of the Lord Almighty, and gives us an inheritance that is incorruptible, and undefiled, and that fadeth not away? Among these brethren the Lord Jesus Christ is the first-born. He is their glorious elder brother. And is it a bad thing to belong to that family, whom the great God condescends to own, and to treat as his brethren? Or, can that be of bad tendency, by which such distinguished honour is conferred upon us?

Rom. viii. 29. For whom he did foreknow, (and adopt into his family) he also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of his Son. We know there is nothing bad in our adorable Jesus; but that all is beautiful, and blessed, and glorious; and all the children are predestinated to be conformed to his image; which must of necessity include a conformity to him in holiness and happiness, *Eph. iv. 24.* Our vile bodies shall be fashioned like his glorious body, *Phil. iii. 21.* Our souls are changed into his image, by the Lord the spirit, *2 Cor. iii. 18.* Our persons shall be blessed with him for ever; according to our next quotation.

Rom. viii. 30. Moreover, whom he did predestinate, them he also called, and justified, and glorified. Here you see a cluster of good things; things which constitute their subjects truly happy and blessed—as truly blessed and happy as God can make them; and all flowing from this PREDESTINATION, and terminating in eternal glory. All which the great apostle confirms in another place, (*1 Cor. ii. 7.*) in these words. But we speak the wisdom of God in a mystery, even the hidden wisdom God ordained (predestinated) before the world unto our glory. By which you observe that predestination does not leave us till we awake in the likeness of our blessed Immanuel; then we shall be satisfied; for, seeing him as he is, we shall be completely like him: and what is this, but consummate glory and happiness.

These are all the places where predestination occurs; and this evidence is sufficient, by which to judge of its native tendency, and final termination. To have Jesus the son of God die for us; to be adopted into his family, and to have

have an inheritance provided for us in the heavens; to be conformed to the image of Jesus Christ, in body and soul, in holiness and happiness; to have all the blessings of grace in time, and all the blessedness of eternity conferred upon us; this is good, nothing but good; the highest, the greatest good: and, according to God's account of it in his word, **THIS IS PREDESTINATION!** For this reason, it is safe to assert, that those who say *predestination* is of a bad tendency, are strangers to its nature, design, and importance. Or, if not *strangers*, they must be *enemies*; because the statement just given is the evident truth of God. After such conversation I have known it said,

“The doctrine may be abused, and therefore it ought not to be named. Did the Lord know it would be abused? The answer is easy; and need we be more cautious than the Lord in his word? But, by the way, I would observe, the very declaration confirms its *truth*, because *error* cannot be abused. Besides, by whom has this doctrine been abused? By *friends*, or by *foes*? Not the *former*; for those who partake of its blessings, and so are taught its truth, ascribe their whole salvation to it, and give God the glory of it for ever. *Rom. vi. 1. 2 Cor. v. 14.* Then it follows, if abused, it must be by the *latter*; and *enemies*, we all know, are not disposed to speak well of persons or of things. What they cannot with open face deny, it is usual for them to misrepresent. But, it should be remembered, that misrepresenting the truth of God, is virtually making the God of truth a liar. Again,

It is asked, “of what *use* is it, what *good* comes of preaching or printing on *predestination*?” If it be *no use* in the sacred page, that charge lays against the *wisdom* of God, whose word it is; and not against his servants, who did not coin the doctrine it teaches. Besides, the blessings of grace and of glory must have some *cause*; and is it of *no use*, will it do us *no good*, to know the *origin* of all our happiness in time and eternity?

But, if I mistake not, the true reason of all offence at *predestination* is this; man is a proud, self-opiniated, self-sufficient unwilling creature; to confess his real character as a fallen, hell-deserving sinner; whereas this doctrine, while it honours its subjects with the richest treasures, and gives them experience of the sweetest blessings in hand and hope; it perfectly strips them of every plume, effectually teaches them to disclaim every pretence of deserving favour,

and

and represents them, which is the fact, as mere pensioners on the bounty of him who is gracious to whom he will, and only because he will, *Mat. xi. 25, 26. Rom. ix. 24.* If this doctrine had left any room for the creature to boast of his goodness, or if it allowed even of the smallest composition with the Most High, it would be admitted; and, of course, be received with applause; but, seeing the whole is excluded, that sovereign grace alone may be exalted, therefore it gives offence. *Man is displeas'd, but the doctrine stands.*

May the reader of this short essay understand the doctrine spiritually, receive it affectionately, live under its influence constantly, and then he will glorify God for its truth eternally. Amen and Amen. MINIMUS.

THE ABOMINABLE ERRORS OF POPERY EXPOSED.

In a series of Letters to a Lady; a Member of the Church of Rome.

[Continued from page 453.]

LETTER IV.

MADAM,

IT has been frequently and justly remarked, that truth in principle, is the solid foundation for consistency and virtue in practice: whereas error and sin are congenial, and are as inseparably connected as cause and effect. It is no wonder that the espousal of so pernicious a principle, as the lawfulness of persecution for conscience sake, should have produced so tragical a history, as that alluded to in the foregoing letters. The inhumanity of the effects loudly proclaim the malignity of the cause; while they concur to fix an indelible blot on the communion from whence both have originated, and must excite proportionable abhorrence in the breast of every man, who is not hardened into a misanthrope or become a worshipper of Moloch. But I hope to make it appear that the church of Rome has taken as great liberties with the capital doctrines of revelation as she hath done with the rights of humanity.

In all religious inquiry there must be some standard of truth, from which there can lie no appeal; otherwise, upon a supposition that no such test existed, we might be justified in calling any man master upon earth, or in embracing the first heterogenous system that offered itself; or, amidst the clashing opinions of contending parties, we might wander

der on through inextricable mazes of doubt and speculation, and at last drop into our graves, without having arrived at the least certainty in those matters, which are of infinite concernment. To obviate these alarming consequences, it hath pleased God to favour us with the inestimable blessing of his own infallible revelation; of which St. Paul says, "all scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness; that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works." *2 Tim. iii. 16, 17.* As God is the inspirer of scripture, it must consequently bear the impress of unerring and infallible truth; so that whatever doctrines will not bear this touchstone are to be rejected as spurious, though sanctioned by the name of ten thousand popes, councils, fathers, &c. What originates from God must be perfect; and what is revealed for the benefit of mankind must answer that end perfectly; otherwise it would not be worthy of that goodness and wisdom which are infinite; therefore, as might be expected, whatever is necessary to inform the understanding, to arrest the conscience, to change the heart, or amend the life: whatever endowments, graces, or virtues are requisite to form "the man of God," the gospel minister or sound believer: All this is to be derived from that uncorrupted source of divine intelligence, the scriptures of truth. So that if there were not extant another book in the whole world, the Bible alone, especially now that the sacred canon is complete, would be sufficient of itself to answer the great purpose of "making us wise to salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus," *2 Tim. iii. 15.* A truth that cannot be denied, without shaking the authority and blaspheming its divine author. Oral traditions, legends, &c. are therefore, mere chaff, when weighed in this balance; and, in the hands of men "who lie in wait to deceive," turn out nothing but a cunningly-devised fable, by which unstable souls are beguiled and ruined. "To the law and to the testimony: if men speak not according to their word, it is because there is no light in them." *Isa. viii. 20.*

Here then, in what concerns the authority and investigation of religious truth, our complaints against the Church of Rome begin. By secreting the Bible, and prohibiting her members the free use of it, she keeps in dreadful ignorance, and acts contrary to the express command of Christ, "Search the scriptures." By conducting her public worship

ship in an unknown tongue, she does all in her power to confirm that blindness, and equally contravenes the words of the Holy Ghost by St. Paul, and the method recommended by that great apostle; who says, "I had rather in the church speak five words with the understanding, than by my voice I might teach others also, than ten thousand words in an unknown tongue." 1 Cor. xiv. 19. But error cannot bear the light. And an interested priesthood finds its account in secreting the "key of knowledge," and making an unknown tongue the vehicle of idolatry. An acquaintance with the former would soon tend to expose the latter with all the mystery of iniquity, couched under that craft, by which certain ecclesiastics get their wealth, and support their unscriptural dominion over the faith and consciences of deluded multitudes. They, who would teach us to see, by putting out our eyes, or by preventing the rays of the sun from reaching the organs of vision, would be deemed prodigies in optic reformation, and shuned as impostures of the most absurd complexion. Yet Romish occultists practise this manœuvre; and it is astonishing that any creatures endowed with reason can tamely submit to so monstrous an imposition. But the melancholy acquiescence in such pious fraud is accounted for by St. Paul in 2 Cor. iv. 3, 4. If the veil of superstition hath been thrown over your eyes, madam, resolutely pull it off, and dare to see for yourself. Trust not to the sayings of fallible men, until you have previously compared them with the infallible truths of God. Revelation will soon dispel the interposing mists, in which the church of Rome finds it necessary to envelope her credulous votaries. And, if the Holy Spirit assist your inquiries, a flood of light will break in upon your understanding, and fill your heart with joy and wonder; constraining you to acknowledge with the young man in John ix. though in a different and more sublime sense: "This one thing I know, that, whereas once I was blind, now I see."

1. Have you ever carefully examined, upon what grounds the church of Rome espouses the notion of *transubstantiation*? According to her the sacramentary elements are, instantly after consecration, changed into the real body and blood of Christ: so that the very body which our Lord took up with him into heaven, if you receive this doctrine, is brought into existence on earth, every time the Lord's Supper is administered; and it multiplies into millions of
distinct

distinct bodies, eaten, with all their constituent parts of flesh, bones, sinews, and blood, by communicants in the church of Rome. According to this idea, the eucharist is considered as a real bodily *sacrifice* offered unto God, under the forms of bread and wine. One would have thought that the very mention of a tenet, big with such monstrous absurdity and blasphemy would have been sufficient to reprobate it in the eyes of all mankind. But, a perverted ceremony, which transforms an officiating priest into a sort of mediator vested with power to offer up a propitiatory sacrifice, that is supposed to procure remission of sins for the communicants, must be pleasing to the assumed pomp of the former, and to the blinded consciences of the latter: and so superstition serves its interests by this double delusion. But the *scriptures*, however superseded in their authority at other times, are here quoted in justification of this doctrine. It is urged that our Lord, said, when instituting the sacrament, "This is my body" *Luke xxii. 19.* If the *verb* in that sentence be construed to signify a real change of the bread into a human body, and that the elements are thus transubstantiated instantly after the consecration; then it will follow, that our Lord must have exhibited one body to the eyes of his disciples, and that they must at the same time have contained another, and yet the same intire body in each of their stomachs respectively; that they must have eaten a crucified body *before* its crucifixion, without which it would possess no virtue, and have drunk blood *before* it was shed. And, since Christ said "This cup is the new testament in my blood," according to such interpretation, a chalice of any metal must be actually changed into the new covenant. By the same reasoning, the *rock* in the wilderness must have been substantially changed into the person of Christ, because St. Paul says, "This rock is Christ," *1 Cor. x. 4;* and the body of a woman must have been transformed into a mountain because the same apostle says, "This Agar is Mount Sinai in Arabia," *Gal. iv. 25.* But if the word "*spiritual*" be added in the former of these instances, and "*answereth to*" be substituted for the verb *is* in the latter, according to the apostle's own interpretation, the absurdity that would arise in both from a literal comment instantly vanishes. As scripture is the only safe interpreter of itself, we have here a positive directory to guide us in our explanation of our Lord's meaning. The rock in the wilderness *was* Christ *typical*, of whom, as of a "*spiritual rock*," the Israelites drank the water of life. Agar *was*, that is "*answered to*" Mount Sinai, which was allegorically

gorically put for the covenant that was delivered on it. So, in the sacrament, the bread is, or "answereth to" the body of Christ, because it is broken in the act of consecration as a figure of his sufferings on the cross, and feeds the body as Christ spiritual doth the soul. Therefore St. Paul says, that "the" sacramental "bread which we break is the communion of the body of Christ;" but if the *communion*, then surely not the body itself. But what overturns the doctrine I am combating to the very foundation is, that St. Paul, in 1 Cor. xi. 26. expressly calls the elements, even after consecration, by the very same names which they bore before they had been consecrated. "As often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, &c." Compare the words with the verses that go before, and you will see the force of the argument. And let it be observed here *en passant*, that the apostle, when alluding to the custom of the primitive church expressly mentions the *breaking* of the bread as a circumstance too significant to be omitted in the act of consecration, and says, that the Corinthian church drank of the cup, as well as ate this bread. Yet the cup is denied the laity in the church of Rome, and a little *unbroken wafer*, which neither the teeth nor the palate of the mouth is suffered to press, is dissolved on the surface of the tongue, and made an unmeaning and idolatrous substitute for the sacred and significant symbol of our Saviour's crucified body.

In order to elude the force of this reasoning, the church of Rome flies to mystery; and argues, that, as there are many truths of revelation which are above human reason, and their incomprehensibility is no objection to the receiving of them, the doctrine of the real presence is to be considered in the same predicament. But this is poor fallacy. What relates to the abstract nature of *God*, or to "God manifest in the flesh," or to *spirit* in general, cannot be the object of our corporal senses, falls not within their line of evidence, but must rest on a kind of proof totally different. But body or substance, in every state of change or modification which it undergoes, becomes the object of our senses, because they possess organs suited to the nature of those tangible or visible qualities of which they are to form a judgment. When our Lord would convince his disciples, that he was no spirit, when he appeared among them after his resurrection, he said, "Handle me and see, for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see me have, Luke xxiv. 39, making, in that instance, an appeal to their own senses as
the

the standard of their conviction. And the same criterion is admitted in the increase, diminution, or modification of any sensible subject, though both *mode* and *agency* are wrapt up in inscrutable mystery. Jesus, by a miracle, fed five thousand with a few loaves and fishes. Here was a miraculous increase of the food. But that increase became an object of their senses, otherwise it would have been imposition upon them. For this great multitude were *filled*, and *saw* twelve baskets full of fragments remaining after the repast, *Mat. xiv. 20.* Moses's rod, by a miracle, was changed into a serpent, *Exod. vii. 12*; and as a proof that the change was *real*, and that the form or existence of the serpent was not occasioned by any *deceptio visus* cheat put upon the senses; it performed an act suited to the nature of a living animal by swallowing up "the rods of the Egyptian magicians." The axiom, illustrated by these examples, and confirmed by this reasoning, is, that whatever changes, increase, or modification, sensible objects undergo, whether by the course of nature as in progressive vegetation, or by miracle, as in the instance of Moses's rod, still the evidence of their changes and the several qualities that distinguish them falls directly within the cognizance of the senses; and whatever substantial form contradicts them, is to be considered as a delusion, an imposition, or no change at all. If Moses had insisted, that his rod had been changed into a serpent, before it assumed the *form* and performed the *actions* of that animal, would not the magicians have despised and laughed at him as a fool or an impostor, asserting what was contrary to their senses? But the miracle appealing to sensible demonstration for the reality of the change which it affected, left them without excuse, and all power of a reasonable contradiction. If the church of Rome can furnish a *similar* proof of the miracle, which *they* suppose to be wrought in the elements after consecration, we will readily subscribe to their doctrine: but, wanting *that*, it wants every thing that can give it credit with those who are guided by scripture or sound philosophy, and have not attained to such a height of gigantic faith or enormous credulity, as the man, who cried out, "*Credo quia impossibile!*" I believe it because it is impossible!" The elements appear *after* what they did *before* consecration, and in proof that their nature is not changed, like all bread and wine, the one would in time grow sour, and the other become mouldy. So that the attempt to impose an article of faith concerning a sensible object

object in direct opposition to our senses, is the most bare-faced imposition that ever was practised, because it has not the appearance of specious legerdemain to recommend it; and it is no wonder that they, who can receive so gross an absurdity, should become the dupes of imposition in points of still greater magnitude.

Conceive, Madam, if you can, into what inextricable difficulties and absurdities an adherence to this doctrine must involve its bold abettors. 1. If they assert, that the matter of the bread, in the eucharist, appearing such after as well as before consecration, is nevertheless changing into the body of Christ; a change is maintained respecting a sensible object directly contrary to the evidence of our senses: and the plea of *miraculous* interposition, instead of aiding, tends to expose and overturn the argument. For, when our Lord changed water into wine, the miracle appeared to the *sight* and *taste* of the guests of the marriage in Cana, in demonstration of the reality of the change. But what would they have said, if it had been insisted that the wine was produced and lay concealed under a liquid, retaining the *colour* and *flavour* of pure water? As the Romanists argue, that the body of our Lord really exists under the form of a wafer? Would not such an attempt to impose upon the senses have been deemed a species of the weakest imposture? But the notoriety of our Lord's miracles, and the changes which they produced, were so attested by a conviction carried to all the senses of the spectators or subjects of those miracles, that when the pretended eucharistic miracle of the church of Rome is compared with them, it deserves only to be ranked with those "lying wonders" with which that church abound.

2. Can any thing be more incredible, than that our Lord's body exists in or under the form of the consecrated wafer; since it must be there invisible and impalpable, occupying no determinate place, without extension of parts, and without any of the organs appropriate to a human body? And is not such a supposition totally repugnant to the idea of body, which in every transformation may be seen and felt?

3. Do you seriously believe, that when a profane priest repeats the words of consecration over a thousand wafers, that they are instantly changed into the substantial body of Christ, multiplied a thousand times; so that a series of miracles

acles are perpetually reiterated at the discretion of ignorance and profanity?

4. Can ye seriously believe, that if any domestic vermin should devour any of those consecrated wafers, which has sometimes happened, that that body which is now on the right hand of divine majesty, can be substantially and really incarcerated in the stomach of a mouse? Pardon this question. I mean not to be jacobite, but only to state a case, which, however ridiculous and blasphemous as an article of faith, must nevertheless be assented to by every consistent Romanist. Or, are you of opinion, that after one article has changed the eucharist into the real body of Christ, another is repeated to re-convert that body into the original substance of the wafer, in order to prevent the ignominious disaster alluded to? To shew in what a serious light, an accident of this sort has been considered by some members of your church, and in what tremendous circumstance a poor harmless little quadruped might be involved by a casual deglutition of the *hoste*; in the history given of the trial of *Ann Askew*, we are told that the popish Lord Mayor, who sat as her Inquisitor, among other curious questions respecting transubstantiation, asked her, with solemn ignorance, "What would become of a mouse that should happen to eat the sacrament?" To which *he* answered himself, "That the mouse would certainly be *damned*." And, though this opinion, as may well be supposed, occasioned an irresistible shock on the risible muscles of the whole court; yet, for not believing this, and the absurd doctrines from whence it sprung, she was condemned to be *tortured* and *burnt alive*; as multitudes have been both before and since the martyrdom of that pious lady, and for the same cause too.

5. If the consecrated elements are changed into the real body of Christ, and, thus transformed, are received into the stomachs of the communicants; what becomes of his body afterwards? To say it becomes annihilated, is neither sense nor philosophy. For creation does not furnish an instance, and perhaps never will, of that absolute *destruction* of matter, however constituent parts in organized bodies may be separated and dispersed.—Does it return to *heaven* where it was before? Or is it *substantially retained* in the stomach unyielding to *digestion* or *decay*?—But I will proceed no further with these queries, however naturally suggested by the subject: since to pursue them in their consequences, and resolve them into answers, might incur the charge of levity and indecency;

indecenty; though that charge would rebound with full force on the erroneous tenet, which places a farinaceous god in so many ridiculous points of view, that its deluded worshippers are necessitated, in the opinion they entertained of its miraculous edification, to involve every monstrous hypothesis, that is shocking to piety, common sense, or common decency.

Not to multiply arguments, that the doctrine which I am combating is unphilosophic as well as unscriptural and absurd in the highest degree; because, by multiplying the body of Christ, *ad infinitum*, it destroys its identity, and gives to that which is local and uncircumscribed, the attribute of spirit. I cannot close my thoughts, on this point, without observing, that one error, here, begets another, if possible, more monstrous than itself: The *sacrifice* of the mass is founded on the doctrine of the real presence; by which Christ is supposed to be *offered up* in his human body as he was upon the cross. But, at the same time that this stupid supposition destroys the very *nature* of a sacrament, by making it the *thing signified* instead of a *sign*, it expressly contradicts the words of the Holy Ghost, by St. Paul, who says, that "Christ being raised from the dead, dieth NO MORE;" *Rom. vi. 7.* That "he did not offer himself *often*; and that by ONE offering of himself ONCE offered, he hath, &c." *Heb. ix. 22. 25.* Whereas, according to the sacrifice of the mass he must "have OFTEN suffered,"—the very point against which St. Paul argues in the epistle just quoted. Like another hydra, another head shoots up by the side of that which we have just cut off. The real presence begets *idolatry*. The consecrated elements, supposed to be changed into the real person of Christ, are carried about with pomp through the streets; those who meet the *hoste**, as it is called, are required to bow the knee; and thus a wafer-deity is one of the many ridiculous idols worshipped by the church of Rome. As the Roman breviary or mass-book is throughout *in Latin*, and all the litanies, prayers, psalms, hymns, and select passages of scripture, which it contains, are in that language; that you may know what you are saying, when required, by way of penance or devotion, to go through its tedious ceremonies or chant its barbarous Latin truly, I think it necessary to inform you, that there is a parti-

* From *hostia*, a peculiar victim.

cular office in the missal for the *feast of the body of Christ*, and a particular litany, in both of which the wafer is *adored*. In the latter, which is at the end of the book, the *hoste* is made an object of adoration in the very same prayers, that are presented to Almighty God himself. Its mercy is supplicated under the pompous and blasphemous titles of "*the perpetual sacrifice, the lamb without spot, the word made flesh, the propitiatory for the living and the dead, the heavenly antidote and preservative against sin, the stupendous miracle, the omnipotent bread of the word made flesh, the unbloody sacrifice, the offering and oblation, the viaticum of those that die in the Lord, &c. &c.*" But if it could be proved, which is impossible, that a wafer appearing such, both to sight and taste is changed into the crucified body of our Lord; still, abstracted from his indwelling divinity, it ought not to be worshipped; unless they will complete the absurdity, by asserting, that under the wafer they swallow down his *deity* as well as his flesh and blood; which I find St. Thomas has done in a hymn * of jingling Latin, which begins in the following blasphemous strains. Addressing the eucharist, he says, "I devoutly adore thee, *O latent deity*, who under these signs art really concealed." And again, "On the *cross*, only the *deity* is hid; but *here*, both *deity* and *humanity* together lie concealed †." Nothing can surpass this in point of absurdity; nor can the idolatry of the heathens furnish any thing more gross. Yet all this you are required to *believe*, if you can bring your mind to believe contrary to your senses, to scripture, and to reason. If the representation shocks you, as indeed well it may, please to remember that the church of Rome has herself to thank for all the monstrous consequences that spring from the doctrine of transubstantiation, praying that you may see it in that light, and abhor the thing in the picture which he hath drawn of it.

I remain, your's, &c.

CHARISTUS.

* At the end of the missal, after orationes post missam decendæ.

† The words translated here, are in the Latin as follow: "ADORA te devote LATENS DEITAS quæ sub his figuris VERE latitat cruce latebat SOLA Deitas ac hic latet SIMUL ET humanitas." The hymn from whence I have quoted these blasphemies, which is ascribed to a spurious Saint Thomas, is addressed *ad sacram eucharistiam, TO the holy eucharist*; and any one who understands Latin, will tell you that my translation is as faithful and literal as possible.

ORIGINAL POETRY.

Poetic Hint from the sixth Psalm.

THE heavens and firmament above,
 God's noble works declare;
 While earth lifts up th' astonish'd eye,
 And owns them lovely fair!
 That there exists a gracious God,
 Day tells to brother day;
 Night and her train the like proclaim,
 In language plain as they!
 Creatures like these, 'tis true; are mute,
 No accent utter forth;
 Yet they with silent eloquence,
 Address th' astonish'd earth!
 A time will come when those bright orbs,
 Shall cease to gild the pole;
 When fons, and skies, shall all convolv'd,
 Shrink like a shrivell'd fowl!
 Still tho' these planetary globes,
 No more may roll, and shine,
 Thy servant, Lord, shall tune his harp,
 In praise of love divine!

Hymn on Luke xvi. 26.

FIX'D was the eternal state of Man,
 Ere time its rapid course began,
 Appointed by God's firm decree,
 To endless joy or misery.
 'Twas nought in fains or reprobate
 That mov'd him or to love, or hate,
 'Twas his unerring will, that fix'd
 That great eternal gulf betwixt.
 Fix'd was this vast eternal deep,
 Between the goats, and chosen sheep;
 Nor can an union ere take place
 'T'wixt heirs of wrath, and heirs of grace.
 Yet studious fools make much ado,
 And strive to work a passage through;
 But ah! what vain attempt is this,
 To strive to ford that deep abyss!
 All glory to the great *I am!*
 Who choose me in the blessed lamb;
 Whilst millions of the human race,
 Shall never know, nor taste his grace!
 And blessings on atoning blood,
 By which I'm reconciled to God;
 Which set my captive spirit free,
 From sin and Satan's slavery!

A New Year's Gift.—by F. W. L. L. D.
Redeeming the time, because the days are evil. Eph. v. 16.

TIME conquers all, and all to time must yield.
 Each day, each hour, proclaim his ravages:
 And the gray hairs which variegated my brow,
 Mind me by contrast of their youthful hue.

These dying embers lately were on flame;
 These faded briars once form'd a rose at
 bow'r:

The solemn cast of these embow'ring shades
 Of evening dim remind me of past morn.
 Look round the world, and learn from
 time's abuse,

How great a blessing 'tis to value time!
 Fav'rites of Princes both, Wolfey disgrac'd,
 And dying Beaufort, lecture one on this—

BRITAIN, to thee I turn my patriot song!
 —Time like a giant eager in pursuit,
 Whose flight with daily conquest, posting on,
 Hath added one Year more to former spoils,
 Now combats with another—Europe too,
 Like him, throws out her menaces, untrid
 It seems, like him, of turbulence and toil.
 Discord, as yet, o'er half the globe extend
 Her iron sceptre, while proud Gallia's fons
 Mad from defeat, from vict'ry furious
 grown,

Seek to lead Empires captive in her chains.
 The Lunatic in frantic mood, thus deem'd
 His own, each sail which whit'ned Athens
 port!

(ders pedled
 For months of late war's deep-ton'd thun-
 In Britain's favour: Some perchance wou'd
 learn

(spint,
 Why flash the flames of battle? Time mi-
 Time unimprov'd, and sabbaths long de-
 ipis'd,

Supply a ready answer. Christendom.
 Spurning his name from whom she takes
 her own,

(been
 His wont protection forfeits. Time has
 When the fore sufferings of a bleeding God,
 Impured righteousness, and pardon seal'd
 By blood divine, and everlasting love,
 Echoed from pulpits, ran thro' England's
 streets!

BRITAIN, few moons, full well thou
 know'st, have wain'd,

(flores
 Since thy brave fons dy'd Alexandria's
 With carnage deep, purpling her swelling
 tide;

(and Hell
 While, hand in hand conjoining, Death
 Smil'd at the crimson overthrow:—thence
 learn

To fast from sin, or little will avail
 Fasts, and Thanksgivings, and profusive
 prayers,

(least,
 Now may the bow be bent, sentence at
 While here I play my uncouth minstrelty,
 Be passing on thee: What and if God waits
 Still to be gracious, wilt thou still rebel,

Slight profer'd mercy, and outbrave his
 wrath? (my numbers rude,
 Wou'd thou might'st know, through these
 The day of Visitation ere too late;

Thus I be Laureat of the New-born
 Year!

REVIEW OF RELIGIOUS PUBLICATIONS.

Life of EMELIA GEDDIE, daughter of John Geddie, of Hiltoun, in Falkland, in the sheriffdom of Fife, in Scotland, from her infancy to her death, on the 2d of February, 1681, in the 16th year of her age; as it was gathered from her parents and other judicious persons. With a Recommendatory Letter, by the late Rev. GEORGE WHITEFIELD. New edition. 6d. Griffiths.

THE beauty of evangelic truth consists in simplicity, which conciliates the heart, and alleviates the fears of man. Previous to the reception of divine knowledge, the mind is made humble and teachable, a disposition equally necessary for the learned and illiterate, persons of great or mean capacity. Let it be remarked, that the wise and the unwise, the prince and the peasant, the aged and the youth, must stoop to become the disciples of Jesus Christ.

God forbid we should despise the day of small things. When we perceive children asking their way to heaven, and warbling forth their prayers and praises to our adorable Saviour, let us not by any means retard them in their course, but encourage them in their early devotedness to God. For as the rising of the sun is gradual, and dispenses his rays, dispels the clouds, and urges his way to meridian splendour, so in like similitude is the spirit's work upon the human heart, by dispersing prejudices, banishing ignorance, and enabling the children of God, as it were step by step, to see the uncreated light of the reconciled countenance of their heavenly Father.

This little Tract is very properly adapted to the perusal of young persons. It was originally recommended by Mr. WHITEFIELD, and is now sent forth at the solicitation of a Lady of title. An extract or two will give the reader some idea of this excellent young creature.

“ On a certain day being sick, she said, I have had but a tossed body and a sickly life all my time; and if it were the Lord's will, as to what concerns myself, I would be away; yet if it be for the glory of God, and the comfort of my parents, I would be content to live, and to be denied my own desires. Accordingly she lived some years after this.

“ Upon the occasion of ones saying to her, “ Emely, other children call their parents Sir, or Mistress: but you do not so.” She answered, I am ready to do so, if it be their pleasure; but the mentioning the relation, raiseth awe and reverence.

sence in my spirit when I speak to them; and I find it was the way of the patriarchs of old to say to their children, "My son," &c. and of the children to say, "My father."

Mr. CECIL's Life of the late Mr. CADOGAN concluded.

IN resuming our remarks on the work before us we beg leave to premise a few things necessary to be attended to, by those who undertake the delicate and difficult task of writing the lives of others, and we do this, because, from some specimens that have come under our review, we are persuaded, that *biography* is a province to which few men bring adequate talents or dedicate a due proportion of industry and application. It is, however, a very tempting province, hence so many invade it: but it is a very dangerous one, hence so many fail in the enterprise. 1. Much care should be exercised in the collecting of *materials*, and some ingenuity displayed in the *arrangement* of them; the narrative itself should not be interrupted by digressions, or clogged with extraneous matter; the *ORDER* of the principal chain of incidents should never be inverted, and occasional remarks should appear to arise naturally out of the history. This rule appears to be violated in more senses than one, by what is narrated in *page 23*, when compared with the observations made by Mr. Cecil in p. 25. In the latter page of his "Memoirs," Mr. Cadogan is represented as "not in the true secret of producing," (by his ministrations) "the fruits of righteousness, nor as having yet learned what he afterwards taught; viz. that he who would fill the world with the fruits of righteousness, must take care to be a preacher of that righteousness which is to produce them." If the righteousness *finished on the cross* be intended here the remark is excellent indeed. But then, how comes it that, *before* Mr. Cadogan attained to this great gospel secret, he is made to form "an excellent christian" by his ministry in the case of a Lady? p. 23. Surely this is to build with one hand, and to pull down with the other. It is to make a man exercise an *efficient* ministry without the *gospel*, and to suppose a christian formed without the knowledge of christian principles. The biographer seems not a little embarrassed, himself, in his statement of the case alluded to. As to his comparison about "the vigour of life constituting the healthy and *efficient* man" we beg leave to remind him that there can be no spiritual vigour or life giving influence, where *truth* is absent. No pretensions or plausible appearances in religious profession can ever invalidate the solidity of this remark, because in giving light, life, purity, and power, the gospel alone is the grand efficient mean of salvation, and that too by the institution and declaration of God himself, *Rom. i. 17*. And as to the quaint remark that "grace can live where we cannot," admitting it to be true in a certain sense,

sense, we maintain that *grace can never live, and operate separately from GOSPEL TRUTH as its concomitant and instrument.*

2. The most scrupulous and circumspect regard to truth and probability should always guide the pen of the biographer, and no circumstances should find a place in the narrative that overstep the bounds of credibility. *Incredulus odi.* This rule we think not sufficiently regarded in what occurs p. 12. That a child should at "six years of age read the English Bible INTO French," and *vice versa*, is an instance of such early vigour and extraordinary promptitude of genius as could be true of such prodigies in literary attainments only as the celebrated *Parretier*. Allowing Mr. Cadogan to have possessed all the advantages and reaped the fruits of a liberal education, in a general knowledge of languages and sciences, yet those who are competent judges of the full extent of his attainments, will agree with us, that what his biographer ascribes to him at "six years of age," Mr. Cadogan would have found it difficult to accomplish even when his intellectual powers reached their full meridian.

3. Where biography records the life and actions of a saint and servant of God, some regard should be paid to style and composition. No style can be pleasing that is so concise as to be obscure, or so desultory as to degenerate into the levity and incoherency of table talk. Next to tedious and verbose prolixity or tumid bombast, nothing is more disgusting than that kind of style which affects to *creep and grovel*, in order to be understood. But a writer may be perspicuous without being *vulgar*. Without being in the least disposed to cavil, we cannot help observing that the language in the "Memoirs" often breaks this rule. Witness that extremely awkward remark about "the private notation of *John a Nokes* and *John a Stiles*," in p. 101. To cull fictitious titles and bring forward ideal beings from the *jargon of the law*, and then anon to exhibit, in a comparison on evangelical subjects, those heroes of heathen antiquity, *Ajax and Ulysses*," p. 117, is such an unhappy mixture of the grave and ludicrous, that however it may display the extent and profundity of an author's reading, it certainly indicates a want of taste in the choice of words and the judicious adaptation of them to particular subjects.

4. We would recommend it to every biographer to beware of complaining of the "*scantiness* of his materials," p. 9. If such a complaint be affected, it sinks an author very low indeed; if real it is excusable. Because, how can that writer be entitled to any apology for his rashness in undertaking with his eyes open, what, by his own confession, he has not proportionate materials to accomplish?—Unless, by a sacrifice to vanity, he means to astonish us with a display of the amplitude of his creative powers, that could bring something vast out of nothing; and spin out a subject into chapters and "*periods*, as if, instead of
the

the life of an individual, we were, to look for the chronology and revolutions of an *empire*! All this is very foolish, for *ex nihilo nil fit*. But vanity loves to "burn incense to its own DRAG."

5. Every thing that looks like *negligence* should be carefully avoided in every writer who would conciliate attention and make his productions pass with credit before the public eye. Typographical errors will escape often the most discerning, but may easily be distinguished from those for which the author himself, and not the press, becomes responsible. It is certainly a matter of no great moment in itself, yet it deserves to be noticed, that the last Sunday on which Mr. Cadogan officiated at his church was "on Sunday, January 7." page 103. And then his biographer says that "on Thursday evening, January 12, he was seized &c. p. 109. Where, as Sunday was the 7th, Thursday could only be the 11th; yet this error is carried on to the next paragraph, "On Tuesday the 7th; he (Mr. Cadogan) relapsed," *ibid.* whereas Tuesday could only be the 16th. A false date of this kind repeated and not marked among the *errata* at the end of the work, and that respects too the melancholy event of Mr. Cadogan's fatal seizure and subsequent relapse, is a sort of anachronism, which, though immaterial, ought not to have appeared in such a work. A similar specimen of inattention occurs in the *dedication*, p. 7. where, if the memoirs had not been written to prove the contrary, the awkward structure of the last paragraph, would lead a reader to suppose that Mr. Cadogan was still *alive*.

But these are trifles compared with what now demands our attention. Mr. Cecil, like some other divines is very apt to reason and draw conclusions from a supposition too hastily taken up, that a man's language and ideas may be perfectly orthodox and accurate, yea, that he may have "the knowledge of the truth itself" p. 50, and yet that he may be *wrong*, totally and radically so, be under the dominion of the most unhallowed tempers, be a disgrace to religion, live a deep self-deceiver, and die a stranger to the power of godliness. That he thinks this a very possible and even a common case, let his own words testify: "If divine grace does not prepare the heart to receive divine truths, the truth itself becomes but a barren speculation, at best, and not unfrequently is the knowledge that puffs a man up, instead of humbling him as a sinner before God, and disposing him rightly to embrace his remedy in the Gospel." p. 51. We do not remember to have seen a set of more unwarrantable positions, unsupported either by sound reasoning or by the analogy of faith, than those which occur in the paragraph just quoted. In proof, let it be observed, that,

1. Mr. Cecil takes it for granted that "divine truths" may be received where "divine grace" has contributed no influence whatever towards that reception. If by divine truths be meant the whole counsel of God, the "record he hath given concern-

ing

ing his Son," the pure uncorrupted "truth as in Jesus," we do not scruple to say that Mr. Cecil supposes a case that never existed since the day that the mind of fallen man was first made susceptible of truth, and felt its renovating influence; and that it is directly contrary, not only to the general current of scripture, but to its most express declarations, which attribute the implanation of divine truth to the agency of the holy spirit, and make it the great privilege as well as the distinguishing characteristic of *believers*. "to receive *the truth* in the love of it. 1 Cor. xii. 3. 2 Cor. iv. 6. 2 Thess. ii. 10. But,

2. We urge that men are not to be credited, when they themselves, or others for them, *say*; that they "*receive* divine truths" though they do not produce the *evidence* necessary to accredit their profession. The fair inference here ought to be, that where the truths do not appear, there is some defect in the root, or rather that there is no root at all; and that, instead of allowing such characters an endowment, that is the exclusive privilege of those who *know* the truth, we should rather conclude that their professed reception of the Gospel, is either *partial*, or blended with some fatal *error*, that by corrupting or perverting the truth, alters its nature, destroys its efficacy, and leaves its abettors the sport of their own deceivings; in short, that whatever, in such a case, they receive, it is not *truth*.

3. It is equally unguarded and erroneous to say, that "the truth itself becomes a barren speculation." Men's own ideas, reasoning, traditions, controversies *about* religion, are often nothing but mere "speculation;" and nothing certainly but "barrenness" can ever attend those sceptical reasoners who are "ever learning and never able to come to the knowledge of the truth." But the *truth itself* as to the record of God, when the mind is cast into this sacred mould, so far from ever leading to fruitless speculation and painful uncertainty, removes both; and, instead of leaving the heart "barren," in comfort and moral purity, is the only efficacious mean to secure its fertilization, and enrich its prospects. *Error*, though it may employ the head and the imagination in the pursuit of its own chimeras, and exhaust all its zeal and ardour about the object of its own favourite investigation, yet can go no farther than to give exercise to genius, and amuse the fancy with the hope of imaginary good. *Darkness*, after all, is its proper element; and what soil can be *fruitful* without the *sun*? *TRUTH*, on the contrary, like that luminary's quickening and prolific beams, not only dispels darkness but also carries life and light into all the faculties, and, like rain on the tender herb, makes "the wilderness blossom as the rose. *Isa*. lv. 11.

4. But the most unguarded position is the following: "The truth itself not unfrequently is *the knowledge* that *puffs* a man up, instead of humbling him as a sinner before God." Making as many

many grains of allowance, as candour can demand, for the embarrassment that attends Mr. Cecil in the structure of his sentences, whenever he attempts that style which the French rhetoricians call *periodique*; we appeal to the most partial admirers of this gentleman, whether any other meaning can be put upon the words just quoted than that most exceptionable one, which appears upon the face of them. And we appeal to the friends of true religion of every denomination, whether to affirm, as Mr. Cecil has done, that "*the truth itself*" and the "*knowledge*" of it may generate *pride*, and prevent a man's receiving the Gospel remedy, be not indirectly to asperse truth, to misrepresent its native tendency and operation, and to put a stumbling block in the way of those who are anxiously inquiring "What is truth?" since after all their diligent researches, even successful attainment here may in the end prove a misfortune, and the most inestimable jewel of divine truth, instead of enriching them with humility, may poison their minds with satanic pride, and prove a bar to their salvation. It is easy to see, that the error here, in all its ramifications, arises from an assumption in argument that governs the opinions, and though altogether sophistical, gives a tone of something like oracular decision, to the dogmas of modern theology. The assumption is this, That a man in a mere *state of nature* may embrace every precious *doctrine* of the Gospel, or, (to use Mr. Cecil's own words) "receive divine truths," and yet be a total stranger to any work of regeneration and to all divine influence whatever. This is the hypothesis that some gentleman *take for granted*, and from which they draw inferences, as if they were reasoning upon a point that had been *proved*: but it is impossible to prove it, if for no other reason than this, that FAITH, whose immediate object is divine truth, is *the gift of God*, and that to be "*taught of him*" and to "*know*" him according to his true character in his own revelation, is among those exalted privileges which are secured in covenant promises made expressly and exclusively to God's elect, *Rpb. ii. 8. Isa. liv. 13. Jer. xxiv. 7. Heb. viii. 11*; and that "*the belief of the truth*" which is the very nature and essence of faith, *never* is in scripture represented as forming the character of unregenerate men. They may, indeed, as multitudes of hypocrites have done, "*profess to know God*," and *PROFESS to believe* in his Son, and *profess to "receive divine truth," Tit. i. 16*; but the same evidence which shews the shallowness and obliquity of their profession proves decisively that, the reason why "*in their works they deny him*," is because they never did *know* Christ, or *believe*, or *receive the truth*; otherwise it must have "*made them FREE*," *John viii. 32*.

But doth not the scripture authorize Mr. Cecil in saying that "*knowledge puffeth up*?" It certainly doth. But as a man may have a great extent of knowledge, and yet *not* know Christ and *the truth as it is in him*, the great question here is, whether the *latter*

kind of knowledge be that to which the power of "puffing up" is attributed. It will help greatly to clear our way in this enquiry, if we go to the passage on which Mr. Cecil grounds the authority of his assertion. Because, should it appear that he has mistaken the meaning of the scripture he has quoted, and applied it to a purpose foreign from what is authorized either by the context or the tenor of scripture, the whole fabric he has built upon it must fall to the ground. The whole passage runs thus: "Now concerning things offered unto idols, we know that we all have knowledge. Knowledge (*ἡ γνῶσις*, that knowledge) puffeth up, but charity edifieth." 1 Cor. viii. 1." The *knowledge* here respects but *one* subject, *that* which relates to the insignificance of idols, and the indifference in point of moral turpitude, of things offered to them. But lest it should be supposed, that this kind of knowledge which "puffeth up" its possessors with vanity, and led them to treat with contempt and arrogance those who had some scruples about meats offered unto idols, was necessarily, or at all, connected with the knowledge of "the truth," as in Jesus, the *very contrary* is more than intimated by the apostle, when he says, "If any man think that he knoweth any thing he *knoweth* nothing yet as he ought to know." So that the "knowledge" here is, not only partial, confined to one uninteresting subject, but is so extremely defective, that it may comport with a great degree of *ignorance*, and an equal proportion of *self-conceit*. A man may *think* he knows something, and be "puffed up" with that conceit when in fact he knows nothing as he ought in point of duty and obligation to know. Besides, the "knowledge" of which the apostle speaks, may be without "charity,"—love. But this cannot be the knowledge of "truth" because that is always accompanied with *love* to God, and is inseparable from its effects on the hearts of them that believe.

Let any man, therefore, now judge, how the assertion, "Knowledge puffeth up," can, consistently with scripture, interpreted by itself, or with sound argument, be applied to "the truth," or justify any of the inferences deduced from such an erroneous application of the word of God, to a subject in which the text is not at all concerned. The knowledge that *puffeth up*, is of that specific kind, that leaves a man in total *ignorance* of all that is essential to salvation. But will the knowledge of "the truth" by which a believer is led into an acquaintance with his own wretched and ruined character, with the true scripture character of God and his Messiah, with the evil of sin, and the extent, purity, and spirituality of the moral law and the impossibility of justification by the deeds of it—will *knowledge* of *this* complexion, of this evangelical nature, ever "puff up" any man, or fill him with pride? No, it will lay the axe to the root of that hateful temper, and fill the soul with astonishment and humiliation. *This* knowledge says with *Job*, "I have heard of thee by the hearing of
of

“ of the ear, but now mine eye seeth thee, wherefore I abhor myself and repent in dust and in ashes.”

When men make the holy scriptures talk nonsense by a mutilated quotation of them, they ought to blush for their folly. But, when by misinterpreting and misapplying them, they propagate error, and of a mischievous complexion too, they ought to tremble for their rashness. Yet as long as they are directed more by the *sound* of words than by their sense, and the connection in which they stand; as long as the popular interpretation of certain passages and stale phraseology prevail against the analogy of faith, and supersede a *close and accurate study* of the sacred writings, so long men deluded by custom, will go on to say and sing, “*knowledge alas! is all IN VAIN,*” although the Holy Ghost hath said, “*This is life eternal to know thee, the only true God.*”

One error leads to another, and often carries its influence into questions, where it presumes to sit in judgement and to decide, contrary to that charity which hopeth all things, as well as in direct repugnancy to the maxim that truth in principle, and truth in practice are inseparably allied as cause and effect. Mr. Cecil says, p. 79. “*Some people speak well upon religion. We can only reply true—it is so—you are right—but all the time we have reason to fear that they themselves are wrong.*” How is this curious position proved, that people are at the same time right and wrong? Why, *Jupiter* in the *fable* decides the question thus! “*The thing is acceptable, but not the presenter!*” The comparison here is profane, the application violates the great Gospel rule already laid down, and the affected distinction is palpably erroneous. The true God in the œconomy of his grace, *never* accepts the thing whatever it be, and rejects the person who presents it. Both are always comprehended in the acceptance and justification of believers, through Christ. Without faith in his blood, it is impossible that any thing or any person can please God, who can see nothing good out of Christ. The contrary doctrine, which attempts to separate what God hath joined together, and *vice versa*, is in every point of view erroneous: it is such doctrine as the old “*Serpent*” would “*bring in his mouth,*” like “*a rose*” in appearance, but in fact more baneful than the deadly night-shade, for the purpose of corrupting men from the simplicity that is in Christ. This comes of blending fiction with truth, of going to *fabulists* to illustrate an important question, and of letting a sportive imagination wander into the Utopian regions of fable and romance, instead of making a sanctified judgement curb its eccentricities and chastise its errors.—With this remark we conclude; only observing, that if any apology be demanded for the freedom of our structures, we give it in the well-known words of the old philosopher, *Amicus Socrates, amicus Plato, sed magis amica VERITAS.*

New Theological Books, published in January, 1799.

- A Discourse preached at the Brethren's Chapel, Bristol, on November 29, 1798. By the Rev. *T. Greenfield*, 1s. Matthews.
- The efficacy of Courage in a good Cause: A Sermon preached in the Cathedral of St. Paul before the Lord Mayor, the Sheriffs, and Common Council of the City of London, the Artillery Company, &c. on the 29th of November, 1798. By *Thomas Brown*, 1s. Rivingtons.
- Mason's Family Bible, Number 1, to be continued Weekly, 1s. Griffiths.
- Sermon delivered in the Church of West Bromwich, on the last day appointed for a general Thanksgiving. By *William Jaffe*, M. A. 6d. Vernor and Hood.
- Comfort for the Feeble Minded: Three Sermons preached at the Chapel, Grub-Street. By *John Bradford*, A. B. 1s. 6d. Trepas.
- A Charge delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of Chichester, at the Primary Visitation, in the year 1798. By *John*, Lord Bishop of Chichester, 2s. Robson.
- A Sermon preached before the Lords, on Thursday, November 29, 1798. By *John*, Lord Bishop of Chichester, 1s. Robson.
- A new Edition, with new Plates, and a number of additional Notes, a Translation of the Latin and Greek Quotations, and a Life of the Author of Derham's Physico-Theology, 2 vols. 8vo. 14s. boards. Cadell and Davies.
- The unparalleled Favour of Providence towards Britain; a Sermon preached on the late National Thanksgiving. By *Robert Walker*, F. R. S. E. 1s. Kay.
- A Sermon delivered in the Church of St. Magnus, London Bridge, November 25th, and in the Church of Allhallows, December 16, 1798, before the Volunteers, in the Wards of Bridge, Candlewick and D. wgate. By *William Vincent*, D. D. 1s. Cadell and Davies.
- The Free-Willer Exposed; being a Vindication of the Sovereignty of God in Opposition to the Armenian and Baxterian sentiments lately advanced by S. Mansell, Snow's Fields, with his Iniquitous Conduct towards the author; addressed to the Church under his Pastoral Care. By *J. Parsons*, 6d. Griffiths.
- A New Edition of the Life of *Emelia Geddie*, Daughter of *John Geddie*, of Hiltoun, in Fife, in the Sheriffdom of Fife in Scotland, from her Infancy to her Death, on the second of February, 1681, in the Sixteenth Year of her Age; as it was gathered from her Parents and other judicious Persons. Recommended to all Young Ones especially. By the Rev. *George Whitefield*, 6d. Griffiths.
- The Will of God that the Children of Religious Parents should be Church Members, intended as the Ground of Infant-Baptism, for the Establishment of Young Converts in the Church of Christ. By one that wisheth to follow Peace with all men. 6d. Griffiths.
- Motives for Public Thanksgiving, stated and enforced, a Sermon preached at the Foundling Hospital, Nov. 29. 1798. By the Rev. *John Howlett*, B. D. 1s. Johnson.
- A Sermon, preached before the House of Commons, 29th November, 1798. By *Thomas Reynell*, D. D. 1s. Rivington.
- A Sermon, preached in the Chapel in the Dock-yard Portsmouth, 29th November, 1798. By the Rev. *Toussin Charles Scott*. Published for the benefit of the Widows and Orphans of the brave Men who have fallen in the present glorious contest. 1s. Cadell and Davies.
- A Sermon, preached at the Meeting-house in the Old Jewry, on the 29th November, 1798. By *Abraham Rees*, D. D. Robinson.
- A Sermon, preached before the Military Association of the Parish of Trinity, Minories, October 7, 1798. By *Henry Fly*, D. D. 6d. Sacl.
- A Discourse on the Use and Intention of some remarkable Passages of Scripture, not commonly understood. By *William Jones*, M. A. 1s. Rivington.
- A Sermon, preached at a Meeting of the Governors of Addenbroke, Cambridge. By *W. Crewen*, D. D. 1s. 6d. Loe and Hurst.