

settled. But this were a waste of time; the simple and conclusive answer to this objection is, that the connection, the friendly communion which the Synod maintains with the Establishment is the grand evil of which we complain, and of which we equally complain, whether the Synod be regarded as *dependent upon*, or *perfectly independent of* the Establishment. It is by this connection and communion (as we have shown at length), that the Synod has made herself art and part with the Establishment in sin, and till the connection be dissolved; and the communion broken off, her guilt must remain the same, and the duty of separation from her must continue binding. Let the Synod, instead of passing vague and unmeaning declarations of independence, act on her independence, and cast off connection with the Erastian Establishment, and honestly enforce and carry out Free Church principles, and then, indeed, she will have freed herself from the guilty responsibility under which she now lies, and the breach caused by the disaption may be immediately healed. But till this be done, her "Acts declaratory of independence," do not even touch the evil from which the disruption flowed.

8. An eighth objection is, that we should still have been free, notwithstanding the connection of the Synod with the Establishment, to *preach the Gospel*, and that in these circumstances, when we could have laboured as freely as ever for the salvation of sinners, and fulfilled the great end of the ministry, there could be no occasion for secession.

This objection is plausible at first sight, but it is nothing more. The principle on which it rests is first of all unsound. Even freedom to preach the Gospel could never justify a man in continuing in a Church, guilty of encouraging Popery, or of supporting a Church involved in Socinian error, and as little could it justify us in continuing in the Synod while supporting the Erastian Church of Scotland. The principle, if admitted, would allow a man to justify his support of the most grievous errors, or his connivance at the most grievous sins into which a Church can fall, by merely pleading that still he was at liberty to preach the Gospel. But is it so that we should have been able to preach the Gospel in the Synod? We say it deliberately, that we should not, *i. e.*, not the *whole un mutilated Gospel*. The Church of Scotland, we have shown you, has denied the sole Headship of Christ over the Church, that Headship which he holds in virtue of his office as King, and they who support that Church, as the members of the Synod are doing, are committed to that denial,—the denial of one of the doctrines of the Gospel, a doctrine without which men cannot fully preach Christ, as Prophet, Priest and King. Or suppose that they should still use on this as on other doctrines, the form of sound words, would that amount to a full, and sound, and faithful preaching of it? Would not their conduct belie their preaching or operate as a practical commentary upon their meaning, leading to a wrong construction of their words? Would not men