

earth, there is reserved to the supreme power which made the law, a right of *dispensing* with its demands, when the general good admits of such a dispensation. Of what use, then," he adds, "can it be to retain a mere *fiction of law* in the process of our final justification and acceptance." Here Dr. Stuart sides with the Socinian heretic, who denies that justice is an essential attribute of God, since its exercise may be *suspended*. But justice never appeared more respected, nor the law more magnified in the presence of rational intelligence, than when Jesus poured out his holy soul unto death, that God might be just while he justifies the sinner that believes in him. Grace reigns to us, not through a *dispensation* from justice, but through *righteousness* unto eternal life, through Christ Jesus our Lord. To us, the pardon is a free gift; but to Christ, the dear purchase of his blood. Could the God of mercy and love *dispense* with the claims of law and justice, his beloved Son died in vain. Well might a certain periodical say, that he "gratuitously denounced doctrines which have not only always been regarded as part of the common faith of Protestant Christendom, but which he himself over and over either asserts or implies."

3. Dr. Stuart carries away the greatest proof, that Paul gives of Christ, being the Son of God, viz., that taken from his resurrection from the dead (Rom. i. 4), "proved to be the Son of God with power, according to the Spirit of holiness, through his resurrection from the dead." But Dr. Stuart asks, on this verse, "How could the resurrection declare, in any special manner, that Christ was the Son of God?" and refers to the case of Lazarus, and others raised from the grave, and says: "How an event common to him, to Lazarus, and to many others, could of itself demonstrate him to be the Son of God, remains yet to be shown." This is astonishing reasoning: it shows that Dr. Stuart is entirely mistaken as to the manner in which the resurrection of Christ bears testimony to his character. Jesus Christ came into the world professing to be the Son of God, and was put to death for that profession. His resurrection then was God's seal to the truth of his pretensions. There are some other errors of no trivial import; but if these remarks are just, Dr. Stuart's commentary misleads the mind in pursuit of Divine truth. Your's, &c. W. F.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor.

Sir,—Having read a paper in your Miscellany for September, by Mr. Pike, "On

the Person and Character of Melchisedec," I beg leave to offer a few remarks on this (in my opinion) much perverted subject. Mr. Pike says: "There is an air of *obscurity*" around the character of Melchisedec; and immediately tells us, "This obscurity, however, arises more from what is *not* said than what is said respecting him." This is a self-evident, but unimportant truism. The obscurity of all things, human and divine, arises from what is *not* made known respecting them. In regard to things human, the human mind has full scope; but as regards things Divine, if we step beyond what is written, we are sure to err; hence human curiosity is checked—his impious arrogance is reined, by the only sure guide to the understanding and judgment for faith and practice. "The secret things belong to the Lord our God, but those things which are revealed belong unto us, and to our children for ever, that we may do all the words of this law."—Deut. xxix. 29. "Verily I say unto you, Whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child, shall in nowise enter therein." Luke xviii. 17. If we attend to what is written respecting Melchisedec, we will find (Gen. xiv. 18) this personage meeting Abram, conferring and invoking blessings upon him, bringing forth bread and wine in the character of the Priest of the Most High God, and receiving tithes from Abram who had the promises, and who was himself a Priest. If we observe the peculiarity of the declaration in connexion with what is afterwards written: "And he was the Priest of the Most High God," being in the singular, it would appear expressive of a certain degree of ineffability, indicative of something infinitely superior to either Priest or King in that country, that were filling up the measure of their iniquity, Gen. xv. 16. It is indeed difficult to guess why our religious teachers have followed the tract St. Jerome pointed out. Have we not, throughout the Patriarchal age, many instances of Divinity appearing in human shape to men? See Gen. iii. 8. xii. 7. xvi. 7—10. xvii. 22. But of all the appearances the ever blessed God vouchsafed to man, there are few more striking and singular than that recorded in Gen. xxxii. 24—32, and Joshua v. 13—15. In the former of these the Patriarch wrestled with a man; "he would not let him go except he would bless him, and Jacob called the name of the place Perriel, for I have seen the face of God, and my life is preserved." In the latter case, Joshua beheld "a man with a drawn sword." This man announced himself as "Captain (Prince) of the host of the Lord." And Joshua worshipped and paid the reverence due to the Divine presence, putting his shoes off his feet. To Joshua, the Captain of Sal-