ce, but the

en of the

jected, and

from the

uture fove-

cal election,

nimfelf, but

e people to

utward ap-

s publickly

nander of

of many of

late King,

proves the

 $e\,I$ fractites

ation, and

rity. Ac-

that God

rty waxed

adherents

nd Ishbo-

ly fubmit

ce by the

as in the

anointing

d a right

heir king.

id's eleva-

important

vernment

of

rity.

The in-

of the Jews. It formed a part of the mysterious fystem of redemption. That Messiah, whose coming, and the manner of it had been revealed by a fuccession of prophets, and most particularly unfolded to the patriarch Jacob, was not only to be of the race of Abraham, but the fon of David, and of all the Kings of Judah. It was in this relation that God promifed David "that his throne should "fland for ever." Now if, as Mr. Burke atferts, David was made king by the appointment of the people, under the right of chuling their own fovereign, under a free choice, dependent upon their own will; which includes an alternative of rejecting, it would follow, that they would have had the right and the power, of defeating God's plan respecting the Messinh, and that the whole scheme of human falvation flood trembling upon the event of a popular election.

The examples of Saul and David then afford no argument in favour of the Rights of Man. Nothing like election appears in the fuccession of the other kings of Judah. The throne was established in the family of David, and the government was hereditary. Yet the same form of inauguration continued which had been employed upon the appointments of Saul and David. The new king was anointed, crowned, and received the acclamations of the people. Thus Rehoboam succeeded Solomon by the hereditary succession, yet the scripture uses the same language, for it says that all